



Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure

Policy for Roehampton- and Bradford-validated programmes

Document owner	Academic Services Team
Approval authority	UHE(UK) Academic Board
Academic year	2026/27
Applies to	Taught programmes validated by the University of Roehampton or the University of Bradford
Operational lead	Campus Director / Quality Office
Review date	September 2027

Mandatory interpretive rule UHE(UK) may use one supportive process to gather facts and manage a case, but only where this fits the rules of your validating university. The formal definition, category, penalty, assessment consequence, Board authority, appeal route and any change to your student record must follow your validating university, cohort and approved programme variation.

Document control and how to use this policy

This policy explains what academic integrity means, what happens if there is a concern about your work, and what you can do at each stage. Read it alongside the UHE(UK) Academic Regulations 2026/27 and the rules for your validating university: the University of Roehampton or the University of Bradford. Your programme specification, assessment brief and any approved programme-specific rule also apply. If there is a conflict, the relevant validating-university rule or approved programme requirement takes priority.

Look for these labels to identify which information applies to you:

Label	Meaning
COMMON	A UHE(UK) educational, administrative or fact-finding process that can be used for both cohorts, provided it follows the relevant validating-university rule.
ROEHAMPTON ROUTE	This information applies only if you are registered for an award validated by the University of Roehampton.
BRADFORD ROUTE	This information applies only if you are registered for an award validated by the University of Bradford.
PROGRAMME VARIATION	An approved rule that applies specifically to your programme, for example a professional-body requirement recorded in the programme specification, operations manual or variance register.

1. Purpose and principles

1.1 Academic integrity means being honest and responsible in your learning and assessment. It protects you, other students, academic standards and the value of the award made by your validating university.

1.2 This policy explains how UHE(UK) helps students understand good academic practice and how concerns about academic practice or academic misconduct are considered.

1.3 We will handle cases fairly, consistently, promptly and confidentially. If a concern is raised, we will tell you what the concern is, what evidence is being considered, which university route applies, what the possible outcomes are, when and how to respond, where to get support and how to appeal.

1.4 A decision is made on the balance of probabilities. This means the decision-maker considers whether it is more likely than not that the concern occurred. Academic staff may decide whether the issue is poor academic practice or possible misconduct, but the formal category and any penalty must follow the rules of your validating university.

2. Scope and regulatory identity

2.1 This policy applies to students on taught, credit-bearing UHE(UK) modules or programmes leading to awards validated by the University of Roehampton or the University of Bradford. It may also apply to former students or graduates where the validating university allows this.

2.2 Your validating university is shown on your offer, registration record and programme specification. This decides whether the Roehampton route or Bradford route applies to you. Academic Services will check and record the correct route before your case proceeds.

2.3 Every formal letter or notice about your case must clearly state your validating university, programme and cohort, the assessment and attempt involved, the route being used and who has authority to make the decision.

2.4 If this policy conflicts with a validating-university regulation, validation agreement, operations manual, programme specification, professional-body requirement or approved programme variation, the approved requirement takes priority.

2.5 UHE(UK) staff may investigate and make recommendations where they have authority to do so. They cannot change a mark, apply an academic penalty, end your registration, remove credit or an award, or decide an appeal where that power belongs to Roehampton or Bradford.

Mandatory validator check Before your case moves beyond the initial check, Academic Services must confirm your validating university, cohort, programme, level or stage, assessment attempt, any relevant previous findings, any approved programme variation, and the correct Board and appeal route.

3. Responsibilities

Role	Responsibility
Students	Submit your own authentic work; follow the assessment instructions; acknowledge sources and any permitted AI use; keep drafts or other evidence showing how you produced the work; take part in the process; and use the support or appeal route stated in your letter.
Module and Programme Teams	Teach good academic practice, write clear assessment briefs, raise concerns responsibly, preserve evidence and avoid deciding the outcome in advance.
Independent Investigator	Reviews the allegation and your response impartially, gathers relevant evidence and makes only the decisions or recommendations allowed within their authority.
Academic Integrity Panel	Considers serious, complex, repeated or disputed cases and makes a decision or recommendation within the authority allowed by the validating university.
Academic Services Team	Checks the correct validator route, sends notices, keeps records, prepares matters for the correct Board and implements only authorised outcomes.
Quality Office	Checks that the correct regulations are being used, keeps case records and identifies the correct Roehampton or Bradford appeal route.

Role	Responsibility
Quality Office	Is responsible for the fairness of the procedure, accurate records and communication with the validating university.
Director of Teaching and Learning	Leads academic-integrity practice, staff training and oversight.
Validating-university Board or authorised body	Makes any decision reserved to it under the relevant regulations, including decisions about marks, progression, continuation, termination, credit or awards.

4. Good academic practice and categories of concern

4.1 Good academic practice means submitting your own work, acknowledging your sources accurately, collecting and reporting data honestly, following assessment conditions, using generative AI only as permitted, and collaborating only where the assessment brief allows it.

4.2 Concerns may include plagiarism; unauthorised collaboration or collusion; contract cheating; impersonation; fabricated or falsified information; unauthorised materials or help in an examination; obtaining or sharing secure assessment material; submitting the same work more than once without permission; unethical research practice; or using generative AI outside the rules in the assessment brief.

4.3 COMMON educational distinction: poor academic practice usually means a limited or unintentional mistake, often linked to inexperience, where there is credible evidence that you tried to follow the rules. Academic misconduct means conduct that could give you or another person an unfair advantage. Serious or gross misconduct includes deliberate, organised, repeated or high-impact conduct, such as contract cheating, impersonation, forged evidence or compromising assessment security.

4.4 These UHE(UK) descriptions help us decide how to manage a concern. Your formal allegation and outcome will use the definitions and categories required by Roehampton or Bradford.

4.5 A similarity report or AI-detection result is not proof by itself. The decision-maker must consider all relevant evidence, which may include your submitted work, sources, drafts, version history or metadata, your explanation, an oral discussion and any relevant circumstances.

5. Prevention, briefing and support

5.1 Programme and Module Teams will explain academic-integrity expectations at induction, before summative assessments and at appropriate points during your programme.

5.2 Your assessment brief must explain what collaboration is allowed, how to use and reference sources, whether and how generative AI may be used, any declaration you must make, examination conditions, how you may be asked to show that the work is yours, and the possible consequences of misconduct.

5.3 Before you submit, you should be able to access practice activities, referencing and academic-writing support, library guidance, digital-literacy resources and opportunities to ask questions.

5.4 At a formal meeting, you may normally be accompanied by a current UHE(UK) student, a member of the Student Support Team or another person allowed by your validating university. Legal representation is not normally allowed unless the validating university requires it or exceptional permission is given.

5.5 We will make reasonable adjustments where required. Adjustments support your access to the process but do not change the evidence standard or the academic requirements of your assessment.

6. Raising and preserving a concern

6.1 A concern may be raised by a marker, moderator, external examiner, invigilator, member of staff, another student or another credible source. The concern must be reported promptly to the Programme Lead and Academic Services.

6.2 The report must identify the student, programme, module, assessment and attempt involved, describe the concern, provide the available evidence, state when it was discovered and identify anyone involved or any immediate risk to assessment security.

6.3 Staff must keep the original submission and all relevant evidence, such as the similarity report, assessment brief, AI-use statement, examination record, communications and source material. Evidence must not be changed in a way that hides or alters the original.

6.4 Your mark will remain provisional and your result may be withheld while the concern is considered. Results for other students should not be delayed unnecessarily.

6.5 Where more than one student is involved, cases will normally be considered separately. We will aim for consistency while protecting each student's confidential information.

7. Stage 1: academic concern and early educational response

7.1 You may be invited to an Academic Concern Meeting. The purpose is to understand how you produced the work, clarify authorship, identify whether the issue may be poor academic practice, direct you to support, or decide whether a formal allegation is needed.

7.2 This meeting is not a formal misconduct hearing and cannot itself result in a formal misconduct finding or penalty. We will explain the purpose of the meeting and tell you that information you provide may be used if the case later moves to a formal investigation.

7.3 If the issue is resolved as poor academic practice, your work will be marked using the approved criteria and you will receive feedback and support. A local note will not be treated as a formal misconduct finding unless your validating university permits this.

7.4 If there is sufficient evidence of possible misconduct, the case moves to Stage 2. If there is not enough evidence, your work will be marked normally, subject to the usual moderation process.

8. Stage 2: formal investigation

8.1 Academic Services will send you a written allegation notice. It will state your validating-university route, explain the allegation and evidence, identify the possible categories and outcomes, tell you how to respond, explain the support available and give you a response deadline.

8.2 You will normally have at least seven calendar days to respond. You may be given longer where your validating university requires it, a reasonable adjustment applies or the evidence is complex.

8.3 An investigator who has not previously made the assessment decision and has no conflict of interest will consider the case. They may ask for more evidence or invite you to a meeting. They cannot rely on evidence that has not been shared with you.

8.4 The investigator will decide whether the allegation is not proven, is poor academic practice, is misconduct that can be decided within UHE(UK)'s delegated authority, or must be referred to an Academic Integrity Panel or validating-university body.

8.5 The investigator's report will explain the allegation, evidence considered, your response, findings of fact, the relevant validator rule, reasons for the conclusion, any permitted previous findings, the recommended category and any recommended academic consequence or referral route.

8.6 If your validating university requires a Board or central university process to make the finding or decide the penalty, the investigator's conclusion is only a recommendation. Your letter must make this clear.

9. Stage 3: Academic Integrity Panel

9.1 An Academic Integrity Panel will normally consider serious, gross, complex, repeated, organised or disputed cases. It may also consider cases involving a graduate or award, cases that could lead to suspension, termination or removal of credit or an award, and any case referred under the rules of your validating university.

9.2 The panel will normally have an independent academic Chair and two independent academic members. A Quality Office or Academic Services adviser and a clerk may attend. They do not vote unless the approved terms of reference say otherwise.

9.3 At least seven calendar days before the hearing, you must receive the allegation, all evidence, the panel membership, possible outcomes, attendance arrangements and information about your right to be accompanied. A longer notice period will be used if your validating university requires it.

9.4 You may attend in person or online and may provide a written statement. The panel may continue without you if you received proper notice and do not provide an adequate reason for being absent.

9.5 The panel will hear the case, allow questions through the Chair, consider your response, make its decision in private and record its reasons. It will decide first whether misconduct is proven and then consider any penalty separately.

9.6 If the panel does not have authority to make the final decision, it will send a recommendation to the correct Roehampton or Bradford body. UHE(UK) will not describe a recommendation as a final outcome.

10. Validator-specific authority and academic consequences

Matter	ROEHAMPTON ROUTE	BRADFORD ROUTE	What UHE(UK) will do
Applicable misconduct rules	The Roehampton academic-integrity or misconduct rules that apply to your cohort and programme.	The Bradford academic-integrity or misconduct rules and approved partnership arrangements that apply to your cohort and programme.	The Academic Services Team will confirm the correct source and record it in your case file.
Mark and pass threshold	Any mark or module consequence must use the Roehampton pass mark for your level, including a pass mark of 50 at Level 7 where applicable.	Any mark or module consequence must use the Bradford pass mark, normally 40 unless an approved programme requirement says otherwise.	We will check your validator and level before stating any pass mark.

Matter	ROEHAMPTON ROUTE	BRADFORD ROUTE	What UHE(UK) will do
Reassessment consequence	Roehampton rules on resits, retakes, attempts, caps and Board authority apply.	Bradford rules on reassessment, third attempts, restudy, caps and Board authority apply.	Your outcome must state which attempt is affected and which Board has authority.
Condonation	A result affected by misconduct is considered under Roehampton rules. Condonation may apply only where Roehampton rules expressly allow it and the correct Board decides.	Roehampton condonation cannot be used. Bradford rules on passed credit and reassessment apply unless an approved programme variation says otherwise.	Academic Services will flag any outcome that could affect condonation, progression or continuation.
Continuation / termination	The Roehampton Awards and Progression Board, or another authorised body, makes any reserved progression or termination decision.	The Bradford Continuation and Award Board makes reserved decisions about continuation, reassessment, restudy, withdrawal or an award.	UHE(UK) will prepare the evidence and implement only a confirmed decision.
Award or credit rescission	Credit or an award can be removed only through the authorised Roehampton route.	Credit or an award can be removed only through the authorised Bradford route.	UHE(UK) may provide evidence and make a recommendation, but cannot remove an external award on its own.
Important: penalties cannot be transferred between validators A Roehampton penalty must never be applied to a Bradford student, and a Bradford penalty must never be applied to a Roehampton student. This includes pass marks, condonation, reassessment, continuation, Board powers and appeal stages.			

11. Penalty principles

11.1 Any penalty must be allowed by your validating university, proportionate to the case, applied consistently, explained clearly and capable of being implemented under the relevant assessment rules.

11.2 When deciding a penalty, the authorised decision-maker may consider the seriousness and extent of the misconduct, whether it was intentional, your level of study, the value and weighting of the assessment, the impact on others or assessment security, any permitted previous findings, whether you admitted the

concern, your cooperation and understanding, your support needs and any relevant exceptional circumstances.

11.3 Personal circumstances do not normally decide whether misconduct occurred. They may be considered when deciding a penalty if your validating university allows this. They must not be used to assume that misconduct occurred or to excuse it automatically.

11.4 Depending on your validating university's rules, possible outcomes may include developmental support, a formal finding, a mark or credit consequence, reassessment, loss of an attempt, repeat study, suspension, termination, withdrawal, a transcript change, or referral for review of credit or an award.

11.5 Your outcome letter must describe the exact authorised consequence. General phrases such as “zero”, “capped at the pass mark”, “credit only” or “no reassessment” must not be used without explaining precisely what they mean for your assessment, attempt and programme.

12. Precautionary action

12.1 Precautionary action is a temporary protective step, not a penalty, and does not mean that misconduct has been proven. It may be used only where necessary and proportionate to protect people, assessment security, evidence or the fairness of the process.

12.2 UHE(UK) may temporarily restrict access to a particular assessment, system, room or activity where it has authority to do so. Suspension from registration, exclusion from study or another change to your student status must follow the correct UHE(UK) or validating-university procedure.

12.3 We will tell you in writing why precautionary action is being taken, what it covers, how long it is expected to last, when it will be reviewed, what support is available and how to request a review. It must be reviewed regularly and removed when it is no longer needed.

12.4 The Campus Director may use only the academic powers formally delegated by Academic Board or the validating university. A local restriction must not be described as a Roehampton- or Bradford-approved suspension or termination unless it has been authorised through that route.

13. Outcomes, records and Board action

13.1 You will receive a written outcome explaining your validating-university route, the finding, the balance-of-probabilities standard, the reasons, the evidence relied on, any penalty or recommendation, what this means for your assessment and attempt, any Board action still required, what record will be kept and how to appeal.

13.2 If a Board must approve or implement the academic consequence, Academic Services will send the recommendation and evidence to the correct body: the relevant Roehampton Module Assessment Board and/or Awards and Progression Board, or the Bradford Continuation and Award Board and related monitoring body.

13.3 Your mark remains provisional until the authorised Board confirms the academic consequence. Your student record must show the difference between the misconduct finding and the final assessment outcome approved by the Board.

13.4 The case record, including evidence, correspondence, hearing records, decisions and Board action, will be stored securely in line with data-protection law and the relevant retention requirements.

13.5 A previous finding may be considered only where this is relevant and permitted. You must not be treated as having a previous offence if an earlier concern was not formally upheld.

14. Appeals and reviews

14.1 Your outcome letter must clearly say whether you are using the ROEHAMPTON ROUTE or BRADFORD ROUTE. It must give you the correct appeal grounds, form, recipient and deadline. Always follow the deadline in your letter.

14.2 ROEHAMPTON ROUTE: your appeal must follow the Roehampton academic-integrity or academic-appeal route that applies to your decision and cohort. Where the decision is treated as an academic decision under the UHE(UK) Academic Regulations, the normal deadline is 10 working days from the date of formal notice.

14.3 BRADFORD ROUTE: your appeal or review must follow the Bradford misconduct and/or Regulation 6 route that applies to your decision. Where Regulation 6 applies, a formal appeal is normally due within three weeks of the ratified decision and a review request is normally due within two weeks of the formal-stage outcome.

14.4 The Quality Office acts as the UHE(UK) Appeals Office. It will identify the correct route, check that your submission is complete where authorised, provide the relevant records and implement authorised outcomes. It cannot decide an appeal that must be determined by Roehampton or Bradford.

14.5 The original decision normally remains in effect while an appeal is considered. The authorised body may allow a temporary arrangement or suspend the effect of the penalty. Any temporary arrangement must be recorded and must not disadvantage your appeal.

14.6 When the validating university's internal process is complete, an eligible student may take the matter to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator. The usual deadline is 12 months from the date of the Completion of Procedures Letter.

15. Cases involving other procedures

15.1 The same conduct may also raise concerns under another procedure, such as student discipline, fitness to study, fitness to practise, safeguarding, fraud, criminal matters or research ethics. UHE(UK) will coordinate the procedures to avoid inconsistent findings or duplicate penalties.

15.2 Any academic consequence must still follow the rules and Board route of your validating university, even if another procedure has established related facts.

15.3 If there is a criminal investigation, UHE(UK) may continue, pause or adapt its process after considering fairness, safety and the risk to evidence. UHE(UK)'s process will continue to use the balance-of-probabilities standard.

16. Monitoring, reporting and training

16.1 The Quality Office will keep a central record of cases, routes, categories, outcomes, penalties, appeals, timescales, protected characteristics and repeat findings, in line with data-protection requirements.

16.2 The Quality and Standards Committee will receive anonymised annual reports about trends, consistency, differences in outcomes, routing errors, panel decisions, appeals and improvement actions. Significant risks will be reported to Academic Board.

16.3 Investigators, panel members, Programme Leads, markers and Academic Services staff must be trained in evidence, fairness, generative AI, bias, reasonable adjustments, validator-specific penalties and Board authority before they take part in a case.

16.4 Before this policy is published, UHE(UK) must confirm the final 2026/27 Roehampton and Bradford misconduct regulations, operations manuals, delegated powers, penalty schedules, appeal routes and record-retention requirements.

Appendix 1 - Mandatory staff validator checklist

- Confirm the student's validating university from the authoritative record.
- Confirm the cohort regulation, programme, level or stage and approved variations.
- Confirm the assessment, component weighting and attempt number.
- Use the validator's formal misconduct definitions and categories.
- Check whether UHE(UK) is deciding, recommending or only investigating.
- Identify the competent Roehampton or Bradford Board or central body.
- Check the applicable pass mark before drafting any mark or reassessment consequence.
- Check validator-specific resit, retake, third-attempt, restudy and condonation rules.
- Confirm previous findings are final, relevant and lawfully available.
- Provide the allegation, evidence and adequate response time to the student.
- Consider reasonable adjustments and accompaniment rights.
- Separate the finding of misconduct from the selection of penalty.
- Draft precise, implementable penalty wording and obtain regulatory assurance.
- Ensure the formal letter states validator, reasons, Board status and appeal route.
- Do not amend the student record until authorised Board or validator action is received.

Appendix 2 - Student route summary

Question	ROEHAMPTON student	BRADFORD student
How do I know my route?	Check your offer, registration record and formal case letter. They will state the University of Roehampton.	Check your offer, registration record and formal case letter. They will state the University of Bradford.
Who investigates?	UHE(UK) may investigate the concern, but must follow Roehampton rules and any limits on its authority.	UHE(UK) may investigate the concern, but must follow Bradford rules and any limits on its authority.
Who decides my mark or progression?	The authorised Roehampton Board or body makes any decision reserved to it.	The Bradford Continuation and Award Board or another authorised body makes any decision reserved to it.
Which pass mark is used?	The Roehampton pass mark for your level applies, including normally 50 at Level 7.	The Bradford pass mark applies, normally 40 unless your approved programme states otherwise.
Can condonation apply?	Only where Roehampton rules allow it and the correct Board agrees.	Roehampton condonation cannot apply to a Bradford award. Bradford rules will be used.

Question	ROEHAMPTON student	BRADFORD student
How do I appeal?	Use the Roehampton form, grounds, recipient and deadline stated in your outcome letter.	Use the Bradford form, grounds, recipient and deadline stated in your outcome letter.

Appendix 3 - Decision-routing matrix

Action	What UHE(UK) does	Who has final authority
Initial concern and evidence preservation	The Module or Programme Team records the concern and preserves the evidence.	This is not yet a formal misconduct decision.
Investigation and factual findings	An independent investigator or panel considers the facts within its approved authority.	Your validator's rules decide whether the outcome is final or only a recommendation.
Component or module consequence	Academic Services translates the authorised penalty into a clear assessment outcome and prepares the record.	The correct Roehampton or Bradford Board or body.
Progression, continuation or termination	UHE(UK) prepares your academic profile and any recommendation.	The Roehampton Awards and Progression Board or Bradford Continuation and Award Board, as applicable.
Credit or award rescission	UHE(UK) gathers the evidence and coordinates the referral.	The validating university acting under its formal powers.
Appeal	The Quality Office identifies the correct route and provides the case record.	The relevant Roehampton or Bradford appeal body.