UK COLLEGE
OF BUSINESS AND COMPUTING

Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy

Policy no:	ASQ 1.6
Version no. & date:	Version 1.3 - 23 October 2026
Author:	Head of School
Last review date:	23 October 2026
Next review due:	October 2028
Responsible Committee:	Quality of Education Committee
Approved by & date:	Quality of Education Committee – 23 October 2026
External reference points:	UK Quality Code for Higher Education (2024); OfS Conditions of Registration B2, B4, C1, E2; Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) Good Practice Framework
Linked policies:	ASQ 1.5 Academic Appeals Policy and Procedure; ASQ 1.9 Assessment Marking & Feedback Policy; ASQ 1.7 Extensions and Extenuating Circumstances Policy; ASQ 1.10 Digital Learning Policy; SLCC 6.3 Complaints Policy; SLCC 6.4 Student Charter and Disciplinary Policy; GA 3.2 Risk Management Framework
Audience:	Staff and Students

1. Purpose

UK College of Business and Computing (UKCBC) is committed to promoting academic integrity, fairness and transparency in all academic activity. Academic integrity underpins the credibility of qualifications and ensures that students develop the knowledge, skills and understanding associated with their programmes of study.

This policy sets out the principles of academic integrity and provides guidance on expectations for academic conduct. It also explains the types of behaviour that may constitute academic misconduct and outlines how concerns about academic integrity are managed.

UKCBC delivers teaching in partnership with awarding universities. Academic misconduct investigations and associated penalties are therefore governed by the academic regulations of the relevant awarding partner. This policy provides guidance to support students and staff in understanding these expectations and procedures.

The policy aims to:

- promote a culture of honesty and academic responsibility
- support students in developing appropriate academic skills
- ensure that concerns about academic integrity are addressed fairly and consistently
- protect the academic standards of qualifications awarded through partner institutions.

2. Scope

This policy applies to all students enrolled at UK College of Business and Computing and to all members of staff involved in teaching, assessment and academic support.

The policy applies to:

- all programmes delivered by UKCBC
- all forms of assessment including coursework, examinations, presentations, projects and online assessments
- all modes of study including full-time, part-time, blended and online learning.

This policy applies to programmes delivered in partnership with awarding universities including:

- University of West London
- Plymouth Marjon University
- Ravensbourne University London.

2.1 Franchise precedence and partner regulations

UKCBC delivers higher education programmes in partnership with awarding universities. Under these arrangements, awarding partners retain responsibility for the academic regulations governing academic integrity, academic misconduct investigations, penalties and appeals. UKCBC provides teaching, academic support and local academic oversight, but the formal determination of academic misconduct and the application of penalties are governed by the regulations of the relevant awarding partner.

Where any discrepancy exists between this policy and the academic regulations of an awarding partner, the partner regulations take precedence and are authoritative. Students studying on programmes validated by partner institutions should familiarise themselves with the relevant academic regulations governing academic integrity and academic misconduct.

2.1.1 University of West London

UWL Academic Regulations – Academic Offences (Section 12.1–12.7)

https://www.uwl.ac.uk/sites/uwl/files/2025-08/UWL_AcademicRegulations_2025-26.pdf

2.1.2 Plymouth Marjon University

Student Regulations Framework – Academic Misconduct Procedures (Sections 14–15)

https://www.marjon.ac.uk/about-marjon/institutional-documents/student-regulations-framework/SRF-2025-26-complete.pdf

2.1.3 Ravensbourne University London

General Academic Regulations 2026/27 – Academic Misconduct Procedures

https://www.ravensbourne.ac.uk/asset-bucket/prod/2026-09/Final%20Ravensbourne%20University%20General%20Academic%20Regulations%20for%202026-27.pdf

These documents explain how academic misconduct is defined, how investigations are conducted, the penalties that may apply, and the appeal routes available to students.

3. Definitions

The definitions in this section are provided to help students understand common forms of academic misconduct. They are illustrative and educational in purpose.

Formal determinations of academic misconduct, including thresholds and penalties, are governed by the academic regulations of the relevant awarding partner.

3.1 Academic integrity

Academic integrity refers to conducting academic work honestly and responsibly. This includes producing original work, acknowledging sources appropriately, and following assessment instructions.

Academic integrity supports fair assessment and ensures that students demonstrate their own knowledge and understanding.

3.2 Poor academic practice

Poor academic practice refers to mistakes that arise from misunderstanding academic conventions rather than deliberate attempts to gain an unfair advantage.

Examples may include:

- incorrect or incomplete referencing
- weak paraphrasing
- excessive reliance on non-academic sources
- structural or academic writing weaknesses.

Such cases are normally treated as learning issues and may be addressed through academic feedback and support.

3.3 Academic misconduct

Academic misconduct refers to behaviour that breaches academic rules and may provide an unfair academic advantage.

Examples include:

- plagiarism
- collusion
- falsification or fabrication of information
- contract cheating or ghost-writing
- cheating in examinations
- impersonation
- submitting previously assessed work without permission
- submitting AI-generated content without acknowledgement where this is not permitted.

Determinations of academic misconduct are made in accordance with awarding partner regulations.

3.4 Minor academic misconduct

Minor academic misconduct typically involves limited breaches of academic rules that may arise through misunderstanding or inexperience. The scale of the issue is usually small and the learning outcomes may still be achievable.

Outcomes may include academic guidance, resubmission opportunities or mark adjustments as permitted under partner regulations.

3.5 Major academic misconduct

Major academic misconduct involves serious or deliberate attempts to gain an unfair academic advantage. Examples may include contract cheating, impersonation, significant plagiarism, falsification of evidence or cheating in examinations.

Outcomes for major academic misconduct are determined under awarding partner regulations and may include significant academic penalties.

4. Use of artificial intelligence tools

Artificial intelligence (AI) tools are increasingly used as study support tools. Their use must comply with module guidance and awarding partner regulations. Students must ensure that submitted work reflects their own understanding and that any use of AI-generated material is appropriately acknowledged where required. Students should not use AI tools to generate assessment submissions where this is not permitted by assessment guidance. Students should also avoid uploading personal data, confidential material or assessment content into AI systems unless explicitly authorised.

Unauthorised or undeclared use of AI tools may constitute academic misconduct.

5. Detection and reporting of academic misconduct

Concerns about academic integrity may arise through a range of mechanisms including similarity detection software, academic judgement, assessment review processes or examination monitoring procedures. Where concerns arise, academic staff should review the assessment submission and available evidence before determining whether the matter may involve poor academic practice or potential academic misconduct.

5.1 Staff responsibilities where concerns arise

If a member of academic staff suspects poor academic practice or academic misconduct, the following steps should normally be followed.

5.1.1 Initial review of the assessment

The lecturer or module tutor should review the assessment submission and identify the nature of the concern. This may include reviewing similarity reports, drafts or other relevant evidence associated with the assessment.

5.1.2 Consultation with the Head of School

Where concerns remain, the matter should be referred to the relevant Head of School or Senior Lecturer for preliminary review.

5.1.3 Classification of the issue

The Head of School will determine whether the issue appears to involve poor academic practice that may be addressed through academic guidance, or potential academic misconduct requiring formal investigation.

5.1.4 Referral to partner procedures

Where potential academic misconduct is identified, the case will be referred through the procedures established by the relevant awarding partner.

5.1.5 Student notification

Where a case proceeds to investigation, the student will normally be informed that their assessment is subject to review and will receive information about the applicable procedures.

5.1.6 Evidence management

All relevant evidence must be retained and handled in accordance with institutional data protection and record-keeping requirements. Academic staff should not impose penalties independently unless permitted by awarding partner regulations.

All referrals of potential academic misconduct are made using the standard referral form and recorded in a central case log maintained by Academic Registry. The Quality of Education Committee periodically reviews the case log to confirm that concerns are identified, reported and handled consistently, in accordance with this policy and the regulations of the relevant awarding partner.

6. Investigation procedures

Suspected cases of academic misconduct are investigated in accordance with the academic regulations of the relevant awarding partner.

UKCBC may assist the investigation process by:

- reviewing assessment submissions
- gathering supporting documentation
- providing information to partner institutions
- arranging meetings with students where required.

Formal decisions regarding academic misconduct and associated penalties are determined by the relevant awarding partner.

7. Awarding partner regulations

Students must familiarise themselves with the academic misconduct regulations of their awarding partner. These regulations define misconduct categories, outline investigative procedures, specify penalties and describe the appeal routes available. The relevant regulations for UKCBC programmes

include those published by the University of West London, Plymouth Marjon University and Ravensbourne University London.

8. Appeals

Appeals relating to academic misconduct decisions are managed under the regulations of the relevant awarding partner. Students should consult their partner institution's regulations to understand how to submit an appeal. Where all internal procedures have been exhausted, students may have the right to escalate their complaint to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education.

Further information is available at:

https://www.oiahe.org.uk

9. Roles and responsibilities

9.1 Students

Students are responsible for completing academic work honestly, following assessment guidance and acknowledging sources appropriately. Students should seek academic support where they are unsure about referencing or academic conventions.

9.2 Academic staff

Academic staff are responsible for promoting academic integrity through teaching and assessment design. They should identify and report potential academic misconduct and support students in developing appropriate academic skills.

9.3 Head of School

The Head of School is responsible for overseeing academic integrity within their programmes, reviewing suspected cases and ensuring that appropriate procedures are followed. The Head of School is also responsible for ensuring that the arrangements used to identify potential academic misconduct, including similarity detection and assessment review, are sufficient and applied consistently across all programmes.

9.4 Academic registry

Academic Registry supports the administration of academic misconduct procedures and maintains relevant records where required. Academic Registry records the outcomes of concluded cases and maintains the central academic misconduct case log.

10. Monitoring and review

The operation of this policy will be monitored to ensure that academic integrity is promoted consistently across programmes and that suspected cases of misconduct are managed appropriately.

Monitoring activities may include:

- analysis of academic misconduct cases and outcomes
- identification of trends in poor academic practice
- evaluation of academic integrity guidance and support
- review of appeals and case outcomes.

The Head of School presents an annual academic integrity report to the Quality of Education Committee, covering cases, trends and outcomes, with summary reporting to the College Management Team.

Risks relating to academic misconduct, including systemic or emerging risks such as contract cheating, are escalated through the Quality of Education Committee to Academic Board and, where appropriate, managed under the GA 3.2 Risk Management Framework.

This policy will normally be reviewed every two years, or earlier where required due to changes in partner regulations, regulatory requirements or institutional review.

Version History

Version	Date	Author	Summary of changes	Approved by
1.3	23 October 2026	Head of School	Role titles updated following organisational restructure, and internal consistency corrections; front sheet, footer and cross references updated for approval.	Quality of Education Committee