



UCL Academic Manual 2023-24

Chapter 6: Student Casework Framework

Section 9: Student Academic Misconduct Procedure

Contents

9	Student Academic Misconduct Procedure	2
9.1	Introduction and Scope of Application.....	2
9.2	Definitions	3
9.3	Adjudication Framework	5
9.4	Penalties	7
9.4.1	List of Agreed Penalties	7
9.4.2	Application of Penalties.....	7
9.5	Procedures.....	8
9.5.1	Poor Academic Practice	8
9.5.2	Academic Misconduct – Module Leader or Exam Board Chair.....	8
9.5.3	Departmental Panel	9
9.5.4	Academic Misconduct Panel	10
9.5.5	Expedited Academic Misconduct Procedure	12
9.6	Appealing an Academic Misconduct Decision	12
9.7	Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education.....	14

Contact: Education Services, Student and Registry Services (academicregulations@ucl.ac.uk)

9 Student Academic Misconduct Procedure

9.1 Introduction and Scope of Application

1. The Student Academic Integrity and Misconduct Procedure sets out how UCL will investigate and remedy any conduct which is considered to breach UCL's assessment regulations, and which is likely to give an unfair advantage to the candidate and/ or affect the security of assessments and/ or affect the integrity of the degrees awarded by UCL.

Scope

2. These procedures apply to all current and former students of UCL, including:
 - a) Undergraduate students
 - b) Postgraduate taught students
 - c) Postgraduate research students
3. The procedures will not normally apply to UCL students studying modules at other institutions who will be subject to the Host institution's procedures. Investigation of alleged misconduct by students visiting from other institutions (such as intercollegiate or affiliate students) will be conducted by UCL, but the application of penalties will normally be handled by the Home institution.
4. The Student Academic Integrity and Misconduct Procedure applies to summative assessments only. Examples of poor academic practice in formative assessments should be followed up by the module leader but will not be subject to formal penalty under this procedure.
5. Research Misconduct will be investigated under UCL's Procedure for Investigating and Resolving Allegations of Misconduct in Academic Research.

Guiding Principles

6. As outlined in Chapter 4, Section 2, module leaders are responsible for providing accurate and up-to-date information to students about their assessments. This includes information about appropriate referencing, clear instructions about collaborative working, and a link to these academic misconduct regulations.
7. A student suspected of committing Academic Misconduct must be given the opportunity to respond to an allegation before a penalty is confirmed.
8. A student suspected of committing Academic Misconduct must always be directed to sources of advice and support, such as the Students' Union Advice service or Student Support and Wellbeing.
9. A student invited to attend a panel meeting must always be informed of their right to bring a "friend" to provide moral support. In addition, the student must always be invited to inform the panel of any reasonable adjustments that will need to be made to enable them to fairly engage with the meeting.
10. In considering allegations of Academic Misconduct adjudicators should apply "on the balance of probabilities" as the standard of proof.
11. A decision about whether academic misconduct has occurred will not take mitigating factors, including extenuating circumstances, into account.
12. A decision about the appropriate penalty for a confirmed case of academic misconduct must take account of contributing and mitigating factors and should be informed by the relative impact on the individual student.
13. Where allegations of suspected Academic Misconduct are being investigated, Departments should, where possible, check all available summative work the student has submitted within the same assessment period.
14. Under no circumstances during any stage of the Academic Misconduct procedure will a student be granted an additional attempt at assessment beyond those normally permitted. However, they may be required to submit a new or revised version of the assessment as a formative exercise to evidence their understanding of academic integrity.

9.2 Definitions

1. References to the “Adjudicator” made throughout these regulations refer to the appropriate decision-making body outlined in the Adjudication Framework in Section 9.3.
2. Academic Integrity refers to all academic practice, by includes undertaking assessments honestly in a responsible manner and acknowledging other’s ideas.
3. Poor Academic Practice refers to low level academic integrity infringements that are clearly judged to be a result of a lack of understanding on the part of the student, normally because of a lack of training in appropriate academic practice. Students will not normally be penalised for poor academic practice but should be supported to learn from their mistake.
4. Material Irregularity refers to an error in the assessment process that has materially disadvantaged a student. Following investigation, it may become apparent that what was originally reported as misconduct was in fact the result of poor assessment design or preparation. In these instances, the material irregularity procedure may be used (Chapter 6, Section 6).
5. Academic Misconduct is defined as any action or attempted action that may result in a student obtaining an unfair academic advantage. For the purposes of this procedure this includes, but will not necessarily be restricted to, the following:
 - a) Plagiarism: defined as the representation of other people’s work or ideas as the student’s own without appropriate referencing or acknowledgement. **This includes the use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) tools that exceeds that permitted in the assessment brief.**
 - b) Collusion: defined as the unauthorised collaboration by two or more students on any assessment.
 - c) Any attempt to gain unauthorised access to the assessed coursework of any other candidate with or without the knowledge of the other candidate.
 - d) Falsification: defined as the fraudulent creation, alteration or misrepresentation of data, or any other information, including visual or audio artefacts. This includes but is not limited to:
 - i. falsification of word count.
 - ii. falsification of supporting evidence for an extenuating circumstances application.
 - iii. use of GenAI tools to create false data sets or references.
 - e) Contract Cheating: defined as commissioning a piece of assessment to be carried out by a third party or knowingly using a commissioned piece of assessment. Students should be aware that it is a criminal offence to advertise or provide Contract Cheating services, and UCL would normally report this to the Police.
 - f) Impersonation (including attempted, solicited or attempts at soliciting impersonation) in any form of assessment.
 - g) Examination Room Misconduct, including:
 - i. The use or possession of unauthorised books, notes, software, electronic devices, paper, or other materials in an examination other than those permitted in Chapter 4, Part B: Student Regulations for Exams and Assessments.
 - ii. The unauthorised marking or annotation of any materials authorised for use in an examination (such as the Candidate Card Printout), or writing notes on hands, or other parts of the body.
 - iii. Reading or writing before the start of the examination (apart from student information on the answer book front cover and examination envelope) or writing after the one-minute allowance has passed.
 - iv. The unauthorised removal of an examination script or stationery in any state from the examination room except by a person with the designated authority.
 - v. Any attempt to confer with or gain access to the script of any other candidate during the period of the examination.
 - vi. Any attempt to gain access to or tamper with examination envelopes, answer books, question papers or other examination stationery before or after submission.

- vii. Removing oneself from the examination room during the period of an examination without permission from a member of staff.
 - viii. Causing a disturbance or disrupting the examination process.
- h) Online Assessment Misconduct, including:
- i. Any use of unauthorised material.
 - ii. Any unauthorised communication or attempted communication with other students or third parties in relation to the assessment.
 - iii. Discussion or sharing of assessment content with other students or third parties.
 - iv. Unauthorised collaboration with other students or third parties.
 - v. Copying or attempting to copy from another student's work.
 - vi. Any attempt to confer with or gain access to the script of any other candidate during the period of the assessment.
- i) Any other conduct that would give an unfair academic advantage to a student.
6. For the purposes of this procedure, the following will not be considered Academic Misconduct:
- a) Language and Writing review: defined as having a third-party or software check areas of academic writing such as structure, fluency, presentation, grammar, spelling, punctuation, and language translation. However, this may be considered Academic Misconduct if substantive changes to content have been made by the reviewer or software or at their recommendation, which would suggest that the reviewer had either produced or determined the substantive content of the submission, or, in cases of language translation, if the student is being assessed on their ability to translate or use a language other than English.
 - b) File Sharing: defined as the sharing of files or data between two or more students as part of authorised collaboration. However, this may be considered Academic Misconduct if File Sharing occurs between students where collaboration is not authorised.
 - c) Use of GenAI tools that does not exceed that permitted in the assessment brief: each module leader is responsible for informing students of the extent to which they are permitted to use GenAI tools in each assessment. Evidence of use where there has not been a clear direction from the module leader will not be penalised.

9.3 Adjudication Framework

1. The following framework indicates who should adjudicate the offence being considered., based on its suspected severity
2. Academic Misconduct will be considered a second offence if a penalty has already been received for any prior offence which has taken place during the degree programme on which the student is registered.
3. “Component” in the framework below refers to a Component as defined in Chapter 7, Part A, Section 3.11: Components.

Module Leader Adjudication		
Description of Offence	Extent of Misconduct	Potential Outcomes following Investigation
First Offence Academic Misconduct (Plagiarism, Falsification, Collusion)	Up to and including 10% of the component consists of offending material	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No case – no further action. 2. Poor Academic Practice: follow 9.5.1. 3. Academic Misconduct within adjudication: follow 9.5.2. 4. Academic Misconduct beyond adjudication, refer to appropriate adjudicator.
Exam Board Chair Adjudication		
First Offence Academic Misconduct (Plagiarism, Falsification, Collusion)	More than 10% and up to and including one third of the component consists of offending material	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No case – no further action. 2. Poor Academic Practice: follow 9.5.1. 3. Academic Misconduct within adjudication: follow 9.5.2. 4. Academic Misconduct beyond adjudication, refer to appropriate adjudicator.
Department Academic Misconduct Panel Adjudication		
First Offence Academic Misconduct (Plagiarism, Falsification, Collusion)	More than one third of the component consists of offending material.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No case – no further action. 2. Poor Academic Practice: follow 9.5.1. 3. Academic Misconduct within adjudication: follow 9.5.3. 4. Academic Misconduct beyond adjudication, refer to appropriate adjudicator.

<p>Second Offence Academic Misconduct (Plagiarism, Falsification, Collusion)</p>	<p>Up to and including one third of the component consists of offending material.</p>	
<p>UCL Academic Misconduct Panel Adjudication</p>		
<p>Second Offence Academic Misconduct (Plagiarism, Falsification, Collusion)</p>	<p>More than one third of the component consists of offending material.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No case – no further action. 2. Poor Academic Practice: follow 9.5.1. 3. Academic Misconduct within adjudication: follow 9.5.4.
<p>Contract Cheating</p> <p>Examination Misconduct or Online Assessment Misconduct</p> <p>Any attempt to gain access to or use the assessed work of another candidate without that candidate's knowledge.</p> <p>Any attempt to tamper with coursework after submission.</p> <p>Impersonation</p> <p>Plagiarism, Collusion, or Falsification by a Research student in work presented for upgrade or final examination.</p>		

9.4 Penalties

9.4.1 List of Agreed Penalties

1. The following penalties are approved for use in confirmed cases of academic misconduct by undergraduate, postgraduate taught and postgraduate research students, and alumni of any programme delivered at these levels:
 - a) Module Leaders may use the following penalties for misconduct within their adjudication:
 - i. The original mark stands, but the student is required to resubmit the assessment with the offending material removed. Failure to submit the revisions will result in a non-submission being recorded (OAB).
 - ii. The original mark stands, but the student is required to submit a new assessment task to evidence their understanding of academic integrity principles. Failure to submit the revisions will result in a non-submission being recorded (OAB).
 - iii. A reduction of marks for the component in which the offence took place by 10 percentage points or one letter grade.
 - b) Exam Board Chairs may use the following penalties for misconduct within their adjudication:
 - iv. Any of the penalties listed above.
 - v. The component in which the offence took place is given a mark capped at the appropriate pass threshold for the level of study.
 - vi. The component in which the offence took place is given a mark within the condonable range for the student's level of study.
 - vii. The component in which the offence took place is given a mark of 0.00%/Grade F.
 - c) Department Panels may use the following penalties for misconduct within their adjudication:
 - viii. Any of the penalties listed above.
 - ix. The module in which the offence took place is given a mark capped at the appropriate pass threshold for the level of study.
 - x. The module in which the offence took place is given a mark within the condonable range for the student's level of study.
 - xi. The module in which the offence took place is given a mark of 0.00%/Grade F.
 - d) The UCL Academic Misconduct Panel may use the following penalties for misconduct within their adjudication:
 - xii. Any of the penalties listed above.
 - xiii. Suspension from UCL for the remainder of the Academic Year.
 - xiv. The student is excluded from UCL and is not permitted to re-enrol on any other programme at UCL. The student may be permitted to receive an interim qualification if eligible.
 - xv. The student is excluded from UCL and is not permitted to re-enrol on any other programme at UCL. The student will not be permitted to receive a qualification, even if eligible.
 - xvi. The student fails the upgrade or final examination but may be permitted to resubmit if they are still permitted a further opportunity within the regulations of their research programme.
2. If an Adjudicator finds that poor academic practice, rather than academic misconduct has occurred, they must follow the procedure at 9.5.1.

Misconduct committed by UCL graduates

3. Where a case of academic misconduct is upheld against a graduate, UCL reserves the right to revoke the award and apply the appropriate penalty. This may include the decision not to reissue the award in cases of serious academic misconduct.

9.4.2 Application of Penalties

1. In considering the application of a penalty, an Adjudicator must consider any factors that may contribute to or detract from its suitability to the circumstances of the case at hand.

2. The Adjudicator must also consider why less severe penalties would be inappropriate, and provide a clear rationale for that decision, referring to the factors as outlined above.

Guidance on the Application of Penalties

3. Students should have the opportunity to present any mitigating circumstances or factors that they believe should be considered. Those factors are not relevant to deciding whether a student has committed an offence, but they should normally be considered when deciding on the appropriate penalty. Mitigating factors might include:
 - i. It is a first offence.
 - ii. The student admitted the offence at the earliest opportunity.
 - iii. The student has provided an account of the relevant circumstances that provide appropriate context for their case.
 - iv. There is evidence that the student did not intend their actions to lead to an unfair academic advantage.
 - v. The student has compelling personal circumstances that affected their judgment.
4. A penalty for a disciplinary offence may have more serious implications for particular students. For example, a penalty limiting a student's progression may have an unintended impact on a student with a deteriorating health condition or an international student's visa status.
5. Adjudicators should explain how they have taken these implications into account, as well as the student's extenuating circumstances and other mitigating factors when communicating their decisions.

9.5 Procedures

9.5.1 Poor Academic Practice

1. Where the Adjudicator is presented with evidence of the representation of work or ideas as the student's own without appropriate referencing or acknowledgement, they must determine whether this amounts to Plagiarism or Poor Academic Practice with reference to 9.2.3 above.
2. Where the Adjudicator deems the evidence to amount to Poor Academic Practice, they must:
 - i. Require the student to undertake UCL's Understanding Academic Integrity course; and
 - ii. Require the student to meet with the Departmental Tutor, Departmental Graduate Tutor, or Programme Leader to discuss the Poor Academic Practice and receive warning that any further instances of Poor Academic Practice would be deemed to amount to Academic Misconduct and penalised as outlined in 9.3; and
 - iii. Support the student to present the work in question with corrections to address all the Poor Academic Practice. Presenting the corrected work will not count as another assessment 'attempt'. The original mark awarded to the work prior to the corrections being made will stand but will only be entered formally on the record once the corrected version of the work has been presented.

9.5.2 Academic Misconduct – Module Leader or Exam Board Chair

1. Where an allegation of Academic Misconduct is initially made, the relevant Module Leader or Exam Board Chair as appropriate will conduct investigations. If Academic Misconduct is found to have been committed, an appropriate penalty will be decided, considering any contributing or mitigating factors that have become apparent through the relevant proceedings in line with 9.4.
2. A Module Leader, in discussion with their Exam Board Chair, may decide to resolve a case at a lower level where the extent of misconduct exceeds their jurisdiction where that is felt appropriate to the severity of the actual misconduct committed.
3. Where a case needs to be referred, based on the adjudication framework above, the Module Leader must send the following:
 - i. A completed Student Academic Misconduct Report Form (see annex 6.9.1).
 - ii. A copy of the affected assessment, where applicable annotated or highlighted to identify the extent of the Academic Misconduct.
 - iii. Any other evidence relevant to the case.

4. The Adjudicator should formally notify the student of their decision, or that the case has been referred to a higher decision-making body, within 10 working days of the allegation being made.
5. Where a penalty is applied, the Adjudicator must ensure that this is recorded by adding a minute to the relevant module(s) in Portico.
6. Students may appeal against the decision under the procedures outlined under 9.6 Appeals Process.

9.5.3 Departmental Panel

The Departmental Panel investigates cases of significant academic misconduct that have been escalated by the Exam Board Chair, when it is concerned that it could be appropriate to apply a higher order penalty. It is responsible for assessing the grounds on which an allegation of misconduct has been made; providing the student with an opportunity to explain what may have contributed to the conduct being investigated and deciding on the balance of probabilities, whether Academic Misconduct has occurred and, if so, the appropriate penalty in line with 9.4.

1. Where a case of Academic Misconduct is referred to a Departmental Panel, the Chair of the Board of Examiners for the module concerned should appoint a secretary from the same Department, who will be responsible for all communications, completion of the Student Academic Misconduct Report Form, circulation of documentary evidence, organisation of the panel, and completion of the Student Academic Misconduct Outcome Form.
2. The Secretary must provide the student with the following within ten working days of the referral:
 - i. Confirmation that they are suspected of committing Academic Misconduct, and the specific details of the allegation.
 - ii. A copy of all documentary evidence relating to the case.
 - iii. A completed Student Academic Misconduct Report Form.
 - iv. A link to these Student Academic Misconduct Procedures.
 - v. An invitation to the Departmental Panel, outlining the date, time, and location.
 - vi. A request to the student to submit a statement, which must be received no later than two working days before the Departmental Panel.
 - vii. A statement confirming that the student may bring a 'friend' who must be a member of staff at UCL, a Students' Union Advisor or student representative, or a student currently registered at UCL. The person may be legally qualified, but they will not be acting in a legal capacity. The person must not be a member of the Academic Misconduct decision or panel procedure.
3. A Departmental Panel should be organised within four working weeks of the student being informed of the alleged Academic Misconduct, unless either of the following applies:
 - i. There are reasonable circumstances that make this impractical, in which case the student must be kept informed of this; or
 - ii. The student has reasonable grounds to request a postponement of the panel hearing to a later date; or
 - iii. It has been agreed that the offence will be handled via the expedited procedure.
4. The Departmental Panel should be constituted as follows:
 - i. Chair of the Board of Examiners owning the affected module, or appropriate nominee where they are the Module Leader (acting as Chair).
 - ii. At least two other members of staff from the Department not directly involved in the teaching of the affected module(s).
 - iii. Where deemed necessary, due to the severity or the complexity of the case, the Faculty Tutor, the Faculty Graduate Tutor, or their nominee, may be invited to attend in an advisory capacity.
 - iv. Where determined by the Chair that the disciplinary expertise is required on the panel a member of staff from the Department directly involved in the teaching of the affected module(s) may join in an advisory capacity.
 - v. Where the affected module is delivered by a Department other than the student's own, the Chair of the Board of Examiners for the student's Home Department or their nominee.
5. The quorum for the Departmental Panel must be three including the Chair.

6. The Secretary must provide to the panel all documentary evidence and statements relating to the case.
7. There must be no communication in relation to the allegations, either written or oral, between the Departmental Panel and either the student or the member(s) of staff involved in the affected module.
8. The decision of the Departmental Panel will be by majority vote, and in the case of a tie, the Chair of the Departmental Panel will have the casting vote.
9. Where it is agreed that the student has committed Academic Misconduct, the Panel must ask the student to:
 - i. Undertake UCL's Understanding Academic Integrity course; and
 - ii. Meet with the Departmental Tutor, Departmental Graduate Tutor, or Programme Leader, to discuss the specifics of the misconduct, the steps they should take to avoid repeating this in future and to receive warning that any further instances of Academic Misconduct may have severe consequences as outlined in 9.4.
10. The Secretary should inform the student of the Departmental Panel decision informally within one working day of the hearing, send formal notification using the Student Academic Misconduct Outcome form (Annex 6.9.5) within one working week and record this on the module minutes in Portico.
11. Students may appeal against the decision of the Departmental Panel under the procedures outlined under 9.6 Appeals Process.

Investigatory Viva (Contract Cheating, Collusion, or unauthorised use of GenAI)

12. Where there is suspicion of Contract Cheating, Collusion, or unsanctioned or unacknowledged use of Generative Artificial Intelligence tools (GenAI), the Exam Board Chair may, in the first instance, initiate an investigatory viva, making reference to the guidance provided at Annex 6.9.6: Guidance on Conducting an Investigatory Viva.
13. The purpose of the viva will be to assess whether, on the balance of probabilities, there is prima facie evidence that would support the conclusion that the work, or sections of it, were not authored by the student.
14. The viva should be conducted by the Chair of the Departmental Panel and at least one colleague who is competent to assess the student's knowledge and understanding of the content of the work that is being investigated (normally the module leader).
15. For cases of Contract Cheating, if prima facie evidence of lack of authorship is found to exist, the team conducting the viva panel must forward the outcome (see annex 6.9.2) and all the relevant documentation to the Secretary of the Academic Misconduct Panel to be considered under the Academic Misconduct Panel procedures (see 9.5.4 below).
16. For cases of Collusion, or the unsanctioned use of GenAI the Departmental Panel must forward the outcome of the Investigatory Viva (see annex 6.9.2) and all the relevant documentation to the appropriate Adjudicator outlined in the Adjudication Framework (see 9.3 above).
17. The Adjudicator is responsible for informing the student of the outcome of the Investigatory Viva within five working days and, in cases where the viva panel believes there is evidence of academic misconduct, for informing the student of that fact and the relevant next steps. At that point, the student may choose to initiate the expedited procedure outlined in 9.5.5.

9.5.4 Academic Misconduct Panel

The Academic Misconduct Panel investigates the most serious cases of academic misconduct and/or repeat offences. It is responsible for assessing the grounds on which an allegation of misconduct has been made; providing the student with an opportunity to explain what may have contributed to the conduct being investigated and deciding on the balance of probabilities, whether Academic Misconduct has occurred and, if so, the appropriate penalty in line with 9.4.

1. Where a case of Academic Misconduct is referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel, the Secretary of the Academic Misconduct Panel (appointed by the Registrar, Student & Registry

Services) will be responsible for all communications, circulation of documentary evidence, and organisation of the panel.

2. The Secretary must provide the student with the following:
 - i. A copy of all documentary evidence relating to the case.
 - ii. Where applicable, a completed Student Academic Misconduct Report Form.
 - iii. A link to these Student Academic Misconduct Procedures.
 - iv. An invitation to the Academic Misconduct Panel, outlining the date, time, and location.
 - v. A request to submit a statement, which must be received no later than two working days before the Academic Misconduct Panel.
 - vi. A statement confirming that the student may bring a 'friend' who must be a member of staff at UCL, Students' Union Advisor or student representative, or a student currently registered at UCL. The person may be legally qualified, but they will not be acting in a legal capacity. The person must not be a member of the Academic Misconduct decision or panel procedure.
3. The student's statement, with any other information provided by the student, will be sent to the Chair of the Board of Examiners for the module concerned, who will be invited to reply to any points raised in the statement which have not been covered in the information so far received by the Secretary.
4. An Academic Misconduct Panel should be organised within four working weeks of the student being informed of the alleged Academic Misconduct, unless either of the following applies:
 - i. There are reasonable circumstances that make this impractical, in which case the student must be kept informed of this; or
 - ii. The student has reasonable grounds to request a postponement of the panel hearing to a later date.
5. The Academic Misconduct Panel should be constituted as follows:
 - i. One Pro-Vice-Provost (Education & Student Experience), Faculty Tutor or Vice Dean Education or, in the case of Research Students, the Pro Vice-Provost (Doctoral School and Early Career Researchers) who shall be Chair of the Panel. The Chair may delegate to a nominee; and
 - ii. An Exam Board Chair nominated by the Chair of the Panel who should neither be from any Department involved nor Chair of any Board of Examiners involved, unless it is determined that the disciplinary expertise is required on the panel or a Faculty Graduate Tutor in the case of Research students; and
 - iii. A Sabbatical Officer of the Students' Union UCL; and
 - iv. The Director of Education Services or his/her nominee.
6. The quorum for the Academic Misconduct Panel must be three including the Chair.
7. The Secretary must provide to the panel all documentary evidence relating to the case.
8. There must be no communication in relation to the allegations, either written or oral, between the Academic Misconduct Panel and either the student or the member(s) of staff involved in the affected module. Any such communication by any party directly with members of the Academic Misconduct Panel will not be admitted as part of the case documentation.
9. An audio recording of the hearing will be taken for the purpose of providing a factual record in the event of the hearing going to appeal.
10. The decision of the Academic Misconduct Panel will be by majority vote, and, in the case of a tie, the Chair of Academic Misconduct Panel will have the casting vote.
11. Where a penalty other than expulsion is imposed on a student, the following action must also be taken:
 - i. Require the student to undertake UCL's Understanding Academic Integrity course; and
 - ii. Require the student to meet with the Departmental Tutor, Departmental Graduate Tutor, or Programme Leader, to discuss the specifics of the misconduct, the steps they should take to avoid repeating this in future and to receive warning that any further instances of Academic Misconduct may have severe consequences as outlined in 9.4.
12. The Secretary should inform the student of the Academic Misconduct Panel decision informally within one working day of the hearing, send formal notification using the Student

Academic Misconduct Outcome form (Annex 6.9.5) within one working week and record this on the module minutes in Portico.

13. Students may appeal against the decision of the Academic Misconduct Panel under the procedures outlined under 9.6 Appeals Process.
14. The Secretary of the Academic Misconduct Panel will submit an annual report to the Education Committee outlining the decisions made across UCL at all levels.

Academic Misconduct Panel – In-Person Examination Misconduct special procedure

15. Where an allegation of Examination Misconduct is made, UCL Examinations or the Department organising the examination must provide the Academic Misconduct Panel Secretary with the following:
 - i. For centrally organised examinations, the Supervisor Report Form.
 - ii. For Departmentally organised examinations, a completed Student Academic Misconduct Report Form (see annex 6.9.1).
 - iii. A student statement, taken at the time the misconduct is found.
 - iv. A supervisor statement, taken at the time the misconduct is found.
 - v. Any other evidence relevant to the case.
16. In consultation with the Director of Education Services, some cases of Examination Misconduct may be of a minor or technical nature, and under those circumstances will not be considered under the Academic Misconduct Panel Procedures.
17. The Academic Misconduct Panel Secretary will inform the student of this and remind the student they must strictly to observe the examination regulations.

9.5.5 Expedited Academic Misconduct Procedure

1. When Academic Misconduct is detected, the appropriate adjudicator in 9.3 Adjudication Framework can provide the student with the evidence, and an appropriate recommended penalty as outlined in 9.4 Penalties, that assumes the early admission of guilt.
2. Under these circumstances, the following criteria must be met:
 - a) That the student does not dispute the case of Academic Misconduct.
 - b) That there is no additional evidence to be provided by the student.
 - c) That the student is informed of the penalty that would be applied.
 - d) That the student indicates that they do not wish their case to be heard at a formal panel.
3. If all the criteria are met, the agreed penalty can be applied subject to Faculty approval.
4. If the student does not respond within 15 working days, they will be deemed to have accepted the allegation, and the agreed penalty can be applied subject to Faculty approval.
5. If all the criteria are not met, the case must be considered via the standard procedures set out in 9.5 Procedures.

9.6 Appealing an Academic Misconduct Decision

1. An appeal against an Academic Misconduct decision will only be heard if it is based on one or more of the following grounds:
 - i. The decision or panel process was not conducted in accordance with the procedures.
 - ii. Fresh evidence has become available which was not available and could not reasonably be available for consideration during the decision or panel process.
 - iii. The judgement of misconduct was not reasonable given the circumstances of the case.
 - iv. The penalty will have a significant impact on the student given their specific circumstances (this applies to decisions that lead to non-progression or suspension/termination of studies).
2. Students must, within 10 working days of receiving formal notification of the decision, submit via the 'UCL Student Academic Misconduct Procedure - Appeal Form' to the Casework Team, providing all documentation regarding the appeal, any statements they wish to make, and the grounds on which the appeal is being made.

3. No further communications will be accepted for consideration under an appeal after 10 working days of the contested decision being made, unless the student can evidence that the delay was due to significant poor health.
4. Upon receipt of the appeal the Casework Team will approach the student's Department and make a request for documentation relating to the allegation of Academic Misconduct. Once this documentation has been obtained it should be presented to the Chair of the Academic Misconduct Appeals Panel who will review the casefile. The student making the appeal should also receive the documentation obtained from the Department.
5. The Chair of the Academic Misconduct Appeals Panel will determine whether a decision on the appeal can be reached based on the written material. In cases where a decision can be taken, the student will normally be notified within ten UCL working days of the date the Chair received the appeal. The Chair of the Appeals Panel may decide either to uphold the existing penalty or to overturn or modify the penalty in any way the Chair sees fit. The student will be issued with a Completion of Procedures Letter explaining the reasons for the decision.
6. For allegations of Academic Misconduct considered by a Chair of a Board of Examiners or a Module Leader, the Chair of the Appeals Panel may refer an allegation of Academic Misconduct to 9.5.3. of this Procedure, if it is felt that an allegation of Academic Misconduct requires further consideration by a Departmental Panel.
7. Where the appeal is being made against a Departmental Panel decision or Academic Misconduct Panel decision, the Chair of the Appeals Panel may decide to hold an Academic Misconduct Appeals Panel Hearing if further consideration is deemed necessary. The Casework Team will inform the student and make the necessary arrangements for the Academic Misconduct Appeals Panel Hearing to be held as early as possible, and in any case within three calendar months of receipt of the notification of intention to appeal. The student will be notified of the date of the appeal and will be invited to attend, accompanied by a 'friend' (see paragraph 9.5.4.2 above).
8. The constitution of an Appeals Panel should be as follows:
 - i. the Chair of the UCL Education Committee, or their nominee, who should be Chair of the Appeals Panel; and
 - ii. two members of academic staff to be nominated by the Chair of Academic Board; and
 - iii. a Students' Union UCL Sabbatical Officer or nominee.
9. Members of the Appeals Panel must not have been involved in the decision or panel process against whose decision the appeal is made, nor a member of any Department involved, nor have assisted the student in any way with the presentation of their case at any stage.
10. The Chair of the Appeals Panel must be different to the Chair of the original decision or panel process under consideration.
11. The quorum for the Appeals Panel is three including the Chair.
12. The Secretary of the Appeals Panel will be appointed by the Registrar, Student & Registry Services, and must not have acted in any decision or panel process being appealed.
13. The Registrar, Student & Registry Services, may also appoint a representative to act as an observer during the proceedings of the Appeals Panel and to provide the Panel with all relevant information relating to the student's academic position.
14. The Chair of the original Panel or their nominee will also be invited to attend the Appeal hearing as a witness.
15. The Appeals Panel and all other parties should receive a statement of the grounds for appeal and a copy of the Report of the original proceedings and any other evidence relevant to the allegations in question as is considered appropriate.
16. A sound recording will be made by UCL of each hearing for the purpose of providing a factual record in the event of the matter going to further appeal with the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA).
17. An Appeals Panel has the power to reverse or modify the decision appealed in any way that it thinks fit.
18. In reaching its decision an Appeals Panel should take into consideration the evidence provided.

19. The decision of an Appeals Panel must be reached by a majority vote of the members of the Panel and announced as the decision of the Panel.
20. The votes of individual Panel members must always be treated as confidential and there must be no disclosure either of individual votes or of information showing whether the decision was reached by a unanimous or a majority vote.
21. The Panel may adjourn for a period not exceeding seven days for the purpose of deciding upon the appropriate action to be taken upon the appeal.
22. Within 10 working days of the conclusion of the hearing the Appeals Panel should notify the Casework Team, in writing, of the outcome of the appeal. The Casework Team will in turn notify all parties of the decision of the Appeals Panel and the decision will be included in an annual report on its proceedings submitted to UCL Education Committee.
23. A decision of an Appeals Panel will be final as far as internal UCL procedures are concerned.

9.7 Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education

1. When a student has received a Completion of Procedures letter confirming that the internal procedures of UCL have concluded, they have the right to submit a complaint for review to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA) if they are dissatisfied with UCL's decision.

A student choosing to do this must do so no later than twelve months from the date that a Completion of Procedures letter is issued, using the OIA's Scheme Application form. Students making a complaint to the OIA can seek advice and support from the Students' Union Advice Service.