

ASSESSMENT INTEGRITY REGULATIONS

APPLICABLE TO ALL STUDENTS

These regulations are approved by the Academic Board

Last updated: July 2026

These regulations replace the “*Regulations on Assessment Offences*”. A summary of the changes can be found [here](#).

These regulations apply to all summative assessments submitted in or after the 2026/27 academic year. They define breaches of assessment integrity, set out the procedures for investigating allegations of such breaches, and establish the penalties that may be imposed where a breach is confirmed.

All allegations for assessments submitted before 2026/27 will be considered under the regulations that were in place at the time the assessment was submitted. These regulations should be read in conjunction with the School's [Ethics Code](#), [Code of Good Conduct and Assessment Integrity Staff Guidance Notes](#).

Preamble

Assessment is the means by which the academic standards that students achieve are made known to the School and beyond. It also provides students with impartial feedback on their performance. Assessment forms a significant part of the process by which the School monitors its own standards of teaching and student support. Students who are found to have breached assessment integrity in any assessment submitted to the School, either by accident or especially if they deliberately cheat, risk severe sanctions from the School which can impact their academic and future careers.

Further, it is now a criminal offence to provide, or arrange for another person to provide, contract cheating services for students enrolled at a higher education provider in England. Students who are found to engage in contract cheating services risk not only severe sanctions under these regulations but the School's [Disciplinary Procedure](#) as well, where it may be determined to refer the matter to the Police.

What is an assessment integrity breach?

1. All work for classes and seminars (which could include, for example, coursework assignments, dissertations/project work, group work, presentations, posters, problem sets, research proposals and any other work submitted to the School) must be the student's own work. Direct quotations from other sources/materials must be placed properly within quotation marks or indented and must be cited fully including reference to correct page numbers. All paraphrased material must be clearly acknowledged as such with appropriate referencing, as above. All references in a foreign language must be translated into English. All weblinks must be working at the time of submission. Infringing these requirements, or passing off the work, content or ideas of others as the student's own work, whether deliberately or not, is plagiarism and may constitute a breach of these regulations.
2. The definition of a student's own work includes work produced by collaboration expressly allowed by the department concerned or, at MPhil/PhD level, allowed under the Regulations for Research Degrees. If the student has not been given permission, such work will be considered to be the product of unauthorised collusion regardless of whether

this is with anyone inside or outside LSE and will be considered as an integrity breach under these regulations.

3. The unauthorised use of Artificial Intelligence software to help with any part of a student's assessment is strictly prohibited. Any use of Artificial Intelligence software must strictly comply with the requirements specified by the department responsible for the assessment.
4. A piece of work may only be submitted for assessment once, either to the LSE or elsewhere. Submitting the same work, or part of that work (either formative or summative) twice, by copying directly or by paraphrasing it, will be regarded as an integrity breach of 'self-plagiarism' and will be considered under these regulations. However, earlier summative or formative work may be used as an element of a larger summative assessment, provided that the amount of earlier work used is acceptable to the department and the work is properly referenced. Students wanting to use earlier work must seek clarification from the relevant department.
5. Students must ensure they submit the correct and final version of their summative work to the School. Normally, the department must treat and mark summative work submitted by the student as a genuine attempt even where a student claims to have submitted the incorrect version. It will be open to the department to run all submissions through text matching software (for example Turnitin). For the avoidance of doubt, all work received in connection with summative assessments is subject to the School's Assessment Integrity regulations.
6. The School's [statement on editorial help for students' written work](#) sets out what the School considers to be and not to be permissible, by way of editorial help with written work. Contravention of the statement, whether deliberately or not, is a breach of assessment integrity.
7. The following list, although not exhaustive, provides examples of what would be considered a breach of exam integrity. See Regulation 11.3 for the definition of "exam" and "script" under these regulations. Any attempt to breach assessment integrity will be considered a breach in itself:
 - 7.1 accessing, attempting to access, possessing books, notes (regardless of where they are written), instruments, digital or wearable devices or other materials however they are stored or transported, which might be used to the student's advantage and are not expressly allowed by the department under Regulation 9, into the exam room or using them during an exam where expressly forbidden from doing so;
 - 7.2 accessing, attempting to access, or possessing a calculator where not expressly permitted or where calculators are permitted, using a model of calculator not expressly permitted by the School;
 - 7.3 any writing in the script without the express permission from the invigilator e.g. writing during "reading time only", writing before the start of the exam or writing after the invigilator has announced the exam has finished;
 - 7.4 communication in any form (e.g. face to face, electronically or by other means) by a student during the exam (or an attempt to do so) to another individual or individuals except where expressly allowed by the department;
 - 7.5 during an exam, copying or reading (or attempting to do so) from the work of another student or from another student's books, notes, instruments, computer files or other materials or aids, unless expressly allowed by the department;
 - 7.6 altering, amending, accessing, submitting or resubmitting exam scripts (or attempting to do so) other than in accordance with the exam conditions,

- including after the exam submission time;
- 7.7 removing or attempting to remove from an exam room any question papers, scripts (blank or completed) or other materials supplied by the School without express permission to do so;
- 7.8 offering or attempting to offer a bribe of any kind to an invigilator, School professional services staff, examiner or other person connected with an assessment;
- 7.9 using, or attempting to use software or information stored electronically in any form that is not expressly allowed by the department;
- 7.10 providing or receiving information about the content of an exam before it takes place (or attempting to do so), except when expressly allowed by the department; impersonating or trying to impersonate a candidate, or attempting to procure a third party to impersonate oneself;
- 7.11 not complying with the reasonable request of an invigilator under these or other regulations and exam procedures;
- 7.12 any conduct intended to secure an unfair advantage for the student through deception or by acting contrary to published rules or regulations;
- 8 Other examples of assessment integrity breaches under these regulations could include but are not limited to:
 - 8.1 “contract cheating” also sometimes known as 'Ghost Writing', or use of 'Essay Mills', or anything that constitutes commissioning (including buying or paying for) another person to complete an assignment, or part of an assignment which is then submitted as the student's own work. Where a student is found to have breached assessment integrity as a result of contract cheating, they may also be referred to the School's [Disciplinary Procedure for Students](#);
 - 8.2 accessing or attempting to access unauthorised material (as defined by the department) during a “live” take home or online assessment (e.g. an assessment with a shared start and finish time) which includes the use of third-party websites which might contain full or partial answers that match LSE assessments;
 - 8.3 falsification of data, e.g. the presentation of any quantitative or qualitative data, based on work purporting to have been carried out by the student, but which has been bought or invented by the student or altered, copied or obtained by unfair means;
 - 8.4 any attempt to solicit answers to an assessment through a third party, which includes Artificial Intelligence software will be deemed as academic misconduct, even where such an attempt is unsuccessful and/or where there is no evidence of the material from such a third party being used in the assessment in question.
- 9. Each department will provide instructions to students on the conventions required for the citation and acknowledgement of sources in its discipline, to what level of communication during the assessment is permitted, if allowed at all and any other specific rules regarding an assessment. The department shall state whether the use of Artificial Intelligence software is permitted and, where permitted, any conditions or limitations on its use. The department shall also specify items such as books, notes, instruments, computer files or other materials or aids that are allowed to be used in conjunction with assessment. The School will confirm which calculators are permissible during an exam. The responsibility for learning the proper forms of citation, assessment rules and permitted materials (including permitted calculators) lies with the individual student.

10. During an exam, or shortly prior to the start, the student must, on request, surrender to the invigilator any books, notes, instruments, calculators, computer files or other materials or aids introduced into an exam room that the invigilator reasonably believes are not allowed under Regulation 9. The invigilator shall pass such articles to the Student Services Centre, which may make copies of them and may retain the original articles and the copies at its absolute discretion.

Procedure under these Regulations

11. In these regulations the following definitions apply:
 - 11.1 The Student Regulations Team will be referred to as the “SRT”;
 - 11.2 “work” means summative work of any kind submitted for assessment or opinion by staff of the School, including material submitted for upgrade to PhD status;
 - 11.3 “exam” means work undertaken in an invigilated exam room, usually undertimed conditions or an online exam format, where the department will set explicit rules around whether or not communication with other people is permitted during the assessment window and what sources/materials may be referred to during the assessment window (e.g. if it is considered an open or closed book exam).
 - 11.4 “script” means a summative assessment written by hand or using a computer, under exam conditions;
 - 11.5 “research student” means a student who is either enrolled in an MPhil/PhD programme, or in the PhD stage of an MRes/PhD programme”
 - 11.6 all allegations relating to MPhil/PhD work should be referred directly to the PhD Academy. The SRT will refer any allegations it receives relating to MPhil/PhD work to the PhD Academy. For allegations relating to MPhil/PhD work all actions described in these regulations as being undertaken by the SRT will be undertaken by the PhD Academy.
 - 11.7 “department” means academic department, faculty, or institute responsible for the assessment in which the allegation is being made;
 - 11.8 “examination board” means the body of examiners that initially considers the work of the student;
 - 11.9 “source” means the published primary and secondary material from any source whatsoever (including websites and/or online material), and includes information and opinions gained directly from other people, including students and teachers/lecturers;
 - 11.10 “year” means the academic session in which a proven breach was committed.
 - 11.11 the Head of the relevant department or institute or their nominated delegate will be referred to as the “departmental representative.”
12. These regulations apply to allegations of plagiarism, assessment integrity breach within an exam room or exam setting or other academic assessment integrity breach by any student. Allegations of breaching assessment integrity can take place in any work, though these regulations cover only alleged integrity breaches in summative assessed work submitted in connection with the requirements for an LSE programme or course. Allegations of academic misconduct against a student that are outside these regulations, for example in formative work or work submitted in connection with external publications, may be considered under the [Disciplinary Procedure for Students](#).

13. The department responsible for the assessment in question will normally be responsible for conducting an investigation into any allegations. The department must determine if the allegation is **major** or **minor** and whether it is appropriate to deal with the allegation at a local level or if it must be referred to an Assessment Integrity Panel. The department may consult with other representatives from across the School if appropriate when making such decisions. The student has the right to respond to any allegation and seek impartial advice from the Students' Union Advice Team. In all cases the department must consult the Assessment Integrity guidance before taking any formal action under these regulations.
14. The SRT can issue a warning note to a student to caution their behaviour without the need to refer the matter to the relevant department. Such a warning will only be issued where a student appears to have breached the rules but has seemingly not done so deliberately and/or has not gained a material advantage (e.g. not complying with the instructions from the invigilator). The SRT will flag the issue(s) to the student in order to prevent them from committing a serious breach of these regulations in any future assessment.
15. If a student infringes these regulations they will be liable to action under these regulations or under the Disciplinary Regulations for Students.
16. All action under these regulations, whether by the student or by the School, should be conducted promptly.

Investigating a suspected breach of assessment integrity:

17. Any member of the School (staff or student) or an external examiner may make an allegation to the Head of the department. Where an examiner intends to make an allegation, they should consult any co-examiner(s) of the work concerned before contacting the Head. For exam integrity; students should flag any concerns to an invigilator, an invigilator or other member of the School should normally make an allegation in writing as part of their report on the exam concerned. This report should be passed to the Student Services Centre in the first instance who will ensure any allegation is passed to the relevant department. If a department identifies an allegation of an exam integrity breach when marking a script they should follow and apply the Assessment Integrity guidance.
18. The Head may delegate to a senior member of the department any actions and decisions within this part of the regulations. The representative cannot be the student's Academic Mentor, supervisor or have had any previous involvement with the student outside of the anonymous marking procedure.
19. The departmental representative may consult an external examiner. For allegations relating to MPhil/PhD work the external examiner must not have previously examined the work. The departmental representative will also seek such evidence and advice as they may think necessary, which may include interviewing the student(s) concerned. Where practicable, such interviews should be conducted in the presence of an officer of the [Students' Union Advice Service](#). Where the allegation relates to exam misconduct, a witness may also be invited to attend if deemed appropriate. The department will keep a formal record of the interview which may be referred to by a Panel if one is convened.
20. On the basis of the evidence and any advice collected under Regulation 19, the departmental representative will determine whether there is sufficient cause for the student to be required to answer a formal allegation.
21. Where the departmental representative determines there is no case to answer they may dismiss the allegation, in which case no further reference will be made to it and no information about it will be added to the student's file. It is open to the representative to caution the student if deemed appropriate (e.g. to ensure they have carefully read and

understood the School and departmental assessment rules when submitting future work).

22. Where the departmental representative determines there is a case to answer, they must also determine whether it is a **minor** or **major** allegation. The Assessment Integrity guidance sets out factors relevant to the seriousness of different types of breach and the range of penalties that are likely to be proportionate in each case. Allegations will normally be treated as minor where the guidance indicates that a proportionate penalty can be applied by the department. Allegations will normally be treated as major where the guidance indicates that a proportionate penalty may require consideration by an Assessment Integrity Panel.
23. Before proceeding under any of the regulations set out at 25 to 30 the department must follow and apply the School's published Assessment Integrity guidance on investigating alleged breaches of assessment integrity before deciding whether it is a **major** or **minor** case. Where it is determined the case is minor, the department must also follow and apply this guidance when proposing a penalty to a student, and again when applying the final penalty.
24. The department must report the details of the allegation and outcome to the Student Regulations Team or PhD Academy for research students, once a case has been resolved. The process for doing this will be set out in the guidance.

Dealing with minor allegation(s)

25. Where the department representative determines the allegation is minor it can be dealt with at a local level.
 - 25.1 The department must determine whether to deal with the matter as an Acknowledgment of a Breach or apply a penalty.
 - 25.2 The department should not come to a decision about what penalty to apply, although a proposed penalty may be presented with the allegation, until all of the evidence has been established and the student has had the opportunity to consider any appropriate evidence and respond to the allegation.
26. Before proceeding under these regulations the department should take appropriate steps to check whether or not the student has a declared disability and/or any adjustments. Where this is the case the department must check with the Disability and Mental Health Service to determine if there are any appropriate adjustments that must be applied before taking any action under regulations 25 to 30 (e.g. allow the student to request extra time to consider and respond to the allegation).
27. The departmental representative (subject to ratification by the relevant Sub-Board Chair, who may consult with other Sub-Board members), or the Doctoral Programme Director in the case of research students, may take one of the following actions listed below:

Acknowledgment of a Breach

- 27.1 If, in the opinion of the departmental representative, the nature of the formal allegation is such that if proved it would result in no, or a very small, amendment to the decision of the examination board for undergraduate or taught graduate students and there is no other justification for further time being spent on the allegation, then they may invite the student to consent to an Acknowledgment of a Breach.
- 27.2 The departmental representative should present the offer of an Acknowledgment of a Breach formally and in writing to the student. The allegation should be fully explained, specifying the parts of any work thought to be affected and in the case of plagiarism including the suspected sources and any related evidence which will

normally include reports generated by text matching software. The student must be given a time limit of not less than five working days to either accept or decline the Acknowledgment of a Breach.

- 27.3 Where the student chooses to accept this offer they must do so formally and in writing. A note will then be placed on their central file held by the Student Services Centre identifying that the integrity breach was alleged and considered. The Academic Mentor or Supervisor may counsel the student as to their future behaviour. The examination board for undergraduate or taught graduate students will be informed of the decision; if the student's overall mark profile is borderline and they have submitted [exceptional circumstances](#), the board will be entitled to take the allegation into account when deciding whether or not to apply the normal application of the classification scheme.
- 27.4 Normally the affected work should have already been marked and that mark should be submitted to Student Services in the normal way. Where a mark has not yet been agreed, a mark should be determined by excluding any plagiarised material or unauthorised content and assigning a mark only to the non-plagiarised/authorised material. A department will normally use text matching software to determine the plagiarised material to be excluded. A similar approach may be used for a breach of exam integrity, with the examiners excluding any material in the submission that has been identified from unauthorised material used during the exam or unauthorised work that is identified under Regulation 7 above). Once marked by internal examiners the external examiner must be consulted. For the avoidance of doubt, where the work has not yet been marked the student must be informed of the way in which the work will be marked and accept the offer of an Acknowledgment of a Breach before a mark is returned.
- 27.5 If the student does not so consent, the allegation will be considered by an Assessment Integrity Panel.

Presenting an allegation and proposed penalty

- 28. The departmental representative should present the allegation formally and in writing to the student, specifying the parts of any work thought to be affected and where practicable including the suspected sources and any related examples, or relevant excerpts from an invigilator report.
 - 28.1 The departmental representative should include an explanation for why the matter is being treated as minor, and why the penalty that is being proposed is deemed appropriate.
 - 28.2 The departmental representative must provide the student with the opportunity to simply accept the penalty, in which case this process can be concluded as per Regulation 30 or to provide a written statement in response to the allegation, giving a time limit of not less than ten working days for them to respond, and
 - 28.3 The departmental representative should advise the student they can seek advice from the [Students' Union Advice Service](#) and optionally from their Academic Mentor if they are not directly involved in the allegation or (if a research student), from the Supervisor or Doctoral Programme Director.
 - 28.4 Where a statement is received from the student the department must consider all of the evidence, the student's explanation and any exceptional circumstances (provided there is appropriate corroborating evidence) provided by the student. It should also consider whether the level of support and information the School and department has provided about the assessment rules was accurate and appropriate. The department must then determine whether to:
 - dismiss the allegation; or,

uphold the allegation and apply the proposed penalty; or,
uphold the allegation and apply a lesser penalty; or,
decide the case is more serious than first thought and refer it to a Panel

- 28.5 Where the department determines there is no case to answer they may dismiss the allegation, in which case no further reference will be made to it and no information about it will be added to the student's file.
- 28.6 Where the department determines a penalty must be applied, it must follow and apply the relevant Assessment Integrity guidance to determine the most appropriate penalty to apply listed under the Penalties section below; either to confirm the provisional penalty or apply a less severe penalty. Each penalty will be subject to the further application of the degree regulations and relevant General Academic Regulations.

Penalties for minor assessment integrity breaches

29. The following penalties may be applied by the department:

- 29.1 (For all students taking taught courses) That a new mark be determined for the work by excluding the unauthorised content/plagiarised material and assigning marks only to the non-plagiarised/authorised material in accordance with normal assessment criteria. A department will normally use text matching software and/or their academic judgement to determine the plagiarised material to be excluded. Once marked by internal examiners the external examiner should normally be consulted. An agreed mark should be released to the student within an appropriate timescale; or,
- 29.2 (For all students taking taught courses) That the student's be deducted either five, ten or fifteen marks from the assessment in question; or,
- 29.3 (For all students taking taught courses) That the student's mark in the assessment in question is capped at the pass mark of 40 for undergraduate students or 50 for taught graduate students; or,
- 29.4 (For all students taking taught courses) That the student's overall mark and grade in the course in which the assessment takes place, be capped at the relevant Pass mark; or,
- 29.5 (For all students taking taught courses) That the student be required to replace the assessment in question with a new submission (without using a further attempt opportunity) that will be capped at the pass mark of 40 for undergraduate students or 50 for taught graduate students; or,
- 29.6 (For all students taking taught courses) That the student be awarded a zero mark for the assessed work only, which can include an assessment worth up to 100% of a half or full unit course. The student will have the right to re-submit the work provided they have not run out of attempts to do so and only where this penalty (or their other marks) results in them not being awarded the degree.
- 29.7 (For research students only) Where an assessment integrity breach has occurred in material submitted for progress review, the progress review panel will determine the outcome of the progress review on the basis of the non-plagiarised material."
- 29.8 (For research students only) Where a minor assessment integrity breach has occurred in material submitted for upgrade, the student can either revise the work and resubmit for a second attempt at the upgrade (where a second attempt remains), or where the second attempt has already been taken, the Upgrade

Panel should determine on the basis of the non-plagiarised material whether or not the student can be upgraded in accordance with the School's regulations.

- 29.9 (For research students only) Where a minor assessment integrity breach has occurred in the final thesis, the examiners should be made aware of the plagiarised material within the thesis, but the student can be examined in accordance with the School's regulations.

Confirming the penalty to be applied

30. The departmental representative must present to the student in writing the penalty to be applied, provide an explanation for this decision and advise them that they may seek impartial advice from the [Students' Union Advice Service](#). The student must be offered the opportunity to either accept the penalty or to request that this matter proceed to an Assessment Integrity Panel which will consider the matter afresh. The student must be allowed at least five working days to respond. The student should be informed that an Assessment Integrity Panel has the authority to dismiss an allegation but that it may apply the same penalties available to the department or more severe sanctions as set out under Regulation 53. The student's results cannot be released until the matter is resolved. Therefore, the department should act swiftly to prevent any possible delay to progression or an award where practically possible.
- 30.1 If the student formally accepts the penalty in writing, a note will be placed on their central file held by the Student Services Centre identifying the allegation, outcome and that the matter was resolved under these regulations. Where the student does not respond by the deadline, they may be provided one further opportunity to respond or explain why they need more time. If they do not respond after this, the proposed penalty will automatically be applied.
- 30.2 Where a student does not respond within the deadline, it will be open to them to appeal against the penalty up to one calendar month after the department have informed them of this decision. The appeal can only be made on the basis that the student believes they can present a good reason and evidence to show they were unable to engage with the department at the time. In order to appeal the student must email the Student Regulations Team via ssc.plagiarism@lse.ac.uk within one calendar month of the department's last correspondence confirming the penalty. The student should clearly explain why they were unable to engage and provide contemporaneous supporting evidence. The Head of the Student Regulations Team or their delegated representative will determine whether or not the appeal is valid. Where it is valid the student will be permitted to formally respond to the allegation and proposed penalty. Where it is determined the appeal is not valid the penalty will stand and this is the end of the matter.
- 30.3 Where a student requests the allegation to be considered by an Assessment Integrity Panel, the department representative will follow the instructions at Regulation 31. Whilst every effort will be made to arrange a Panel as soon as possible, it is likely that opting for a Panel hearing will delay graduation, prevent a student from utilising an in-year resit period and/or could possibly delay progression.

Dealing with major allegations

31. Subject to Regulation 40, all major allegations must be considered by an Assessment Integrity Panel. The student will have the right to be presented with the allegation and formally respond in writing before the Panel convenes and at the Panel meeting itself. At least one departmental representative must attend this meeting to present the allegation to the Panel.
- 31.1 Before an allegation can be considered by a Panel the departmental representative must present the allegation formally and in writing to the student, specifying the parts of any work thought to be affected and where practicable including the

suspected sources and any related examples and evidence which may include an invigilator report or reports generated by text matching software. The departmental representative should advise the student that a member of the SRT will contact them separately to inform them about the procedure.

- 31.2 The departmental representative must pass a copy of all of the case papers to the SRT. The SRT will request a statement from the student and advise them of the procedure.
- 31.3 All students presented with a major allegation will have their results withheld until the allegation has been formally concluded under these regulations. This may mean the student will not be permitted to attend the graduation ceremony if this matter has not been fully concluded when the ceremony takes place.
- 32. Regulation 40 sets out the basis on which a major allegation may be considered by the Panel Chair or for MPhil/PhD level cases the Chair of the Research Degrees Sub-Committee, as appropriate, without the need to convene a full Panel.

The Assessment Integrity Panel

- 33. An Assessment Integrity Panel will normally comprise three members. The Assessment Integrity Panel Chair or for MPhil/PhD level cases the Chair of the Research Degrees Sub-Committee, as appropriate, will normally chair the Panel unless excluded from membership because of previous connection with the assessment in question or with the allegation, in which case a deputy Chair will chair it. Two academic members from the Undergraduate Studies Sub-Committee (USSC) and/or the Graduate Studies and/or a sabbatical officer of the Students' Union will also serve on the Panel as members.
 - 33.1 No person directly involved with the assessment in question or connected in any way with the allegation, investigation or the student will serve as a member when the Panel considers a case. This means a member belonging to the same faculty of the student or assessment in question will normally be excluded from being on the Panel. A member of the SRT will act as secretary to the Panel. All relevant documentation will be placed before the Panel.
- 34. The role of the Panel is:
 - 34.1 to decide whether the allegation(s) as determined by regulations 1-7 above, has been proved to the satisfaction of a majority of Panel members, on the balance of the evidence presented to them, and
 - 34.2 where the allegation is found proved, to apply a penalty from the list set out at Regulation 27, 29 or 53.
- 35. All three Panel members including a designated Chair must be in attendance to ensure the meeting is quorate.

Preparation for an Assessment Integrity Panel hearing

- 36. Any actions that might involve informing the student of the allegation, will normally be delayed if the student is undergoing assessments during any of the School's main assessment periods. In such cases the allegation will normally be delayed until after their last assessment in this period. This Regulation does not exclude the possibility of interviewing a student at this time or treating this matter as an Acknowledgment of a Breach.
 - 36.1 A student may be notified of the allegation within this time frame if it is deemed to be in their best interests to know about the allegation (e.g. to prevent them from committing any further possible misconduct in their future work). The Panel hearing

itself will normally be held in abeyance until after the exam or essay has been submitted. The student retains the right to request the Panel meeting as soon as possible.

37. The secretary to the Panel will:

- 37.1 send the student a copy of the allegation and any relevant documents that provide evidence in support of it, a copy of these procedures and a proposed timetable for progressing the matter, and
- 37.2 invite the student to state whether the allegation is true or false and to provide a statement and/or any evidence or information about their circumstances relevant to the case, giving a time limit of not less than ten working days for them to respond, and
- 37.3 advise the student to seek advice from the Students' Union Advice Team and optionally from their Academic Mentor if they are not directly involved in the allegation or, if a research student, from the Supervisor or Doctoral Programme Director.

The secretary to the Panel will pass the student's submissions to the departmental representative who may provide a written response within five working days for consideration by the Panel.

38. All submissions received within the time frames set out above will be made available to the Panel.

39. A meeting of the Panel will normally be called to consider the allegation. Exceptionally, the secretary may determine that a matter is suitable for consideration by Chair's Action rather than by a Panel, having regard to the circumstances of the case and any relevant guidance.

39.1 In determining whether a matter is suitable for consideration by Chair's Action, the secretary may take into account factors including, but not limited to:

- (a) whether the student has accepted the allegation and all material evidence relied upon by the department;
- (b) whether there are any material facts in dispute;
- (c) whether the student has agreed that the matter may be determined without a hearing;
- (d) whether participation in a hearing would be detrimental to the student's health or wellbeing, having regard to any supporting evidence;
- (e) whether, in the secretary's judgement, a hearing would assist in the fair and proper determination of the matter.

39.2 A student shall have no entitlement to have a matter determined by Chair's Action.

40. Where the student agrees to determination by Chair's Action, the Chair may determine the case without convening a Panel and may impose any penalty that would have been available to the Panel at Regulation 27, 29 and 53, except for expulsion.

40.1 Where a case is determined by Chair's Action, the Chair shall consider the evidence provided by the department, the student's response, and any relevant mitigating or aggravating factors.

40.2 The Chair must apply the Assessment Integrity Guidance when determining the appropriate penalty and must be satisfied that the penalty is proportionate.

40.3 At the time they are informed of the Chair's Action decision, the student will also be informed of their right to appeal this decision in accordance with the appeal procedure set out at Regulation 57.

41. Where a case is proceeding for consideration by a Panel the secretary to the Panel will:

- 41.1 inform the student of the date on which the hearing is to take place at least five working days beforehand (though the student is entitled to waive this period of

- notice), of the membership of the Panel, the department representative(s) who will attend and of any witnesses who will attend, and of their right to call witnesses;
- 41.2 provide the student with a copy of any response received under Regulation 38 and any other material that the Panel will consider;
 - 41.3 invite the student to attend the hearing of the allegation and to make representations, present evidence and question any witnesses;
 - 41.4 inform the student that they may be accompanied or represented according to the conditions set out in Regulation 44; and
 - 41.5 inform the student that they may submit additional written submissions and other forms of evidence to the Panel as long as these are received by the secretary at least two working days before the Panel hearing. Evidence submitted later will only be considered by agreement of the Panel Chair.
 - 41.6 The meeting may take place in person, virtually or by hybrid. The Panel recognises that students may not be located in the UK at the time of the hearing and it will not draw any inferences if a student cannot participate in person.

Assessment Integrity Panel hearings

- 42. The departmental representative is normally responsible for attending the hearing and presenting the case against the student. They will have the right to submit documents and other forms of evidence to the Panel (subject to the timeframe and terms set out in Regulation 42), to see or to listen to, as appropriate, all evidence given, to question the student and other witnesses appearing before the Panel, and to challenge evidence submitted by the student.
- 43. The student may be accompanied by a representative. This should normally be an officer of the Students' Union Advice Team. If not a member of the Students' Union Advice Team, the student must inform the secretary to the Panel of the background and professional qualifications of the representative at least five working days before the date set for the hearing. The student is expected to answer questions directly. The representative may speak only to clarify something the student may have said or to ask a question/clarification if they think the student has not understood a question.
- 44. Where the student has indicated that they will be accompanied by a legal representative the School reserves the right to recruit a legal representative to assist with the case.
- 45. If the student has a declared disability with the School then they may be entitled to adjustments (e.g. rest breaks during the Panel meeting). It is the student's responsibility to request adjustments at least five working days in advance of the hearing if they think they are eligible. The secretary will discuss all requests with the Disability and Wellbeing Service.
- 46. The student will have the right to submit documents and other forms of evidence to the Panel (subject to Regulation 42), to see or to listen to, as appropriate, all evidence given, to question the person presenting the case and other witnesses appearing before the Panel, and to challenge evidence. The student's friend or representative may attend the meeting to accompany the student, but the student is expected to respond to the allegation directly in the first instance.
- 47. In exceptional circumstances, the Panel may adjourn the hearing to seek other evidence to help it in reaching its decision. Independent expert evidence may be obtained and introduced by either party, as long as it is received by the secretary at least five working days before the Panel reconvenes. Any evidence requested by the Panel will be disclosed to the student and their representative as well as the departmental representative, who will each be given the opportunity to comment upon it. Where a hearing has reconvened, its

membership will be as originally appointed; no replacements will be allowed except in exceptional circumstances.

48. Any person who attended the initial hearing is entitled to attend the reconvened hearing. The student and the departmental representative are also entitled to serve further evidence and/or written submissions in response to any new evidence to be considered by the Panel, as long as these are received by the secretary at least two working days before the re-start of the hearing.
49. The validity of the proceedings of the Panel will not be affected by the unwillingness of the student, or other person acting with or for them, to reply to questions, orally or in writing, or to appear before the Panel.
 - 49.1 Before considering an allegation in the absence of the student, the Panel must satisfy itself that the secretary to the Panel has fulfilled regulations 37 to 41 and that the student has had a reasonable opportunity to respond. Where the Panel concludes that the student is unwilling to reply to a question or questions, it may draw reasonable inferences from that refusal.
 - 49.2 If the student cannot attend because of a disability, they must inform the secretary straight away. The secretary may be able to arrange adjustments in accordance with Regulation 46.
50. The Panel may meet in private, with its secretary in attendance, when it wishes, provided that in such meetings it does not hear evidence. When all evidence has been heard the Panel will meet in private, with its secretary in attendance, to make its decision. The Panel will then determine what penalty listed at either Regulation 27, 29 or 53 it is appropriate to apply. The Panel may seek advice from the secretary regarding the School regulations, procedures and case precedent.

The Assessment Integrity Panel's decision and subsequent action

51. Having conducted the hearing:
 - 51.1 if the Panel decides that the allegation has not been proved, it will direct that no further action be taken, and no record of the allegation or the proceedings be included on the student's record. It is open to the Panel to refer the student to their Academic Mentor to ensure they do not make the same mistakes in future work. The secretary will confirm the decision to dismiss the allegation and any informal caution in writing;
 - 51.2 if the Panel decides that an assessment integrity breach has been committed by the student, it will apply one of the penalties listed at Regulation 27, 29 or 53, with a formal admonition to the student and a note being placed on their record. In doing so, it will seek to reflect the seriousness of the breach and may take into account any previous breaches committed by the student. In reaching its decision the Panel will be mindful of the need of the School to assure the highest standards among its students.
52. The penalties available to the Panel are any of those listed at Regulation 27, 29 or as set out below:
 - 52.1 (for all students taking taught courses) that, despite the allegation being upheld, a mark be returned for the work in question. A new mark should be determined according to Regulation 29.1, or
 - 52.2 (For research students only) where the assessment integrity breach has occurred in work submitted for an upgrade, the Upgrade Panel should determine whether or not the student should be upgraded in accordance with the School's regulations, or

- 52.3 (For research students only) where the assessment integrity breach has occurred in a final thesis, the examiners will examine the student in accordance with the School's regulations, or
- 52.4 (For all students taking taught courses) that the student be awarded a zero mark, either for the assessed work or for the course as a whole. The student will have the right to re-submit the work at the next available opportunity provided they have not run out of attempts to do so and only where this penalty (or their other marks) results in them not being awarded the degree, or (for research students only) results in them not being allowed to progress or be upgraded. Or
- 52.5 (For all students taking taught courses) that the student be awarded a zero mark for the work or course as a whole and in addition, a zero mark for one or more other pieces of assessed work or whole courses taken that year. The Panel will use its academic judgement to determine which other work and/or courses should be penalised. The student will have the right to re-submit the work or courses at the next available opportunity provided they have not run out of attempts to do so and only where this penalty (or their other marks) results in them not being awarded the degree, or (for research students only) results in them not being allowed to progress or be upgraded. Or
- 52.6 (For all students taking taught courses) except where it may result in a taught graduate student receiving a Bad Fail mark, they be awarded a zero mark either for the assessed work or for the course as a whole and be denied the right to re-sit it or an equivalent course;
- 52.7 (For all students taking taught courses) that the student be awarded a zero mark for all courses taken that year, or for all courses taken that year and all previous years, and also be expelled from the School, or
- 52.8 (For all students taking taught courses) that the student's overall award classification shall drop one class. This penalty will be applied at the point the overall award classification is known. The classification will remain unchanged in the event the student can only achieve a Pass degree on the basis of their non penalised results. This penalty can be applied in its own right or in addition to the penalties listed above.
- 52.9 (PhD students only) that the student only be examined for an MPhil award in accordance with the School's regulations.
- 52.10 (For research students only) that the student not be awarded any degree, and that they be denied the right of resubmission or right of appeal under these regulations, and that they also be expelled from the School.
- 53. Any penalty applied by the Panel will be subject to the further application of the relevant classification scheme and relevant General Academic Regulations.
- 54. If suspicion of an assessment integrity breach is discovered after graduation, the student will be subject to the procedure set out in these regulations which, if a breach is confirmed could result in the overall degree classification being lowered or the award being revoked.
- 55. Where practicable the decisions of the Panel will be given to the student orally by the Chair of the Panel and will be conveyed to the student in writing by the secretary to the Panel. The secretary to the Panel will also send the student a formal record of the hearing.
- 56. Where a Panel has decided that a student has breached these regulations, the student will have the right to appeal against that decision on one or more of the following grounds:

- 56.1 that the Panel was constituted in such a way that it was not impartial.
- 56.2 that there has been a material breach of these procedures that affected the fairness of the Panel's decision.
- 56.3 that relevant fresh evidence has been received that might have caused a different decision to have been made, provided the student can demonstrate that there was a valid reason why the evidence was not presented to the Panel before its decision.
- 56.4 Any such appeal must be received by the secretary within ten working days of the date of the written confirmation of the Panel's decision sent under Regulation 56.
- 57. A Pro-Director or their delegated representative will have the sole right of determining whether the student has presented sufficient grounds to warrant reopening the hearing. It will be open to a Pro-Director considering an appeal to consult the Panel Chair who heard the case in question. It will be open to the Pro Director (or representative) either:
 - 57.1 to change the penalty decided by the Panel to one which in their opinion is less serious, or to direct a rehearing by a different Panel, or
 - 57.2 to reject the appeal on the basis that the student has not presented sufficient grounds to warrant reopening the hearing, which can include dismissing the submission of new evidence.
- 58. If the student does not appeal, they will receive final confirmation of the penalty and an explanation about its impact on their status with the School from the secretary.
- 59. The consideration and conclusion of an appeal against the decision of a Panel under these Regulations will complete the procedures open to the student within the School. The appeal outcome will be confirmed in writing in a completion of procedures letter issued on behalf of the Academic Registrar. This letter will inform the student of their right to make a complaint to the [Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education](#).
- 60. Upon the conclusion of a misconduct case the student's results will be released, subject to ratification from the relevant examination boards and subject to any outstanding debts to the School.

See the [Calendar](#) for further information about Programme Regulations, Course Guides, School and academic Regulations.