



“Enabling Students to Accomplish their Academic Goal”

Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy

Address: Sanctuary House, 9 Lymington Avenue, N22 6EA

Email: info@bellmontcollege.co.uk

Tel: + 44 (0) 203 840 9294 + 44 (0) 203 929 7665

Website: www.bellmontcollege.co.uk

February 2024

Contents:

1 Introduction	3
2 Purpose and scope	3
3 Definitions	3
3.1 Academic integrity	3
3.2 Academic Misconduct	3
3.3 Plagiarism	3
3.4 Collusion	3
3.5 Cheating	3
3.6 Commissioning or contract cheating	3
3.7 Duplication or self-plagiarism	4
3.8 Fabrication	4
3.9 Facilitation	4
4 Promoting Academic Integrity	4
4.1 Study support	4
4.2 Online training	4
4.3 English language support	4
4.4 External resources	4
5 Academic Integrity Expectations	4
6 Provision of Information about Academic Integrity	4
7 Academic Integrity Officers (AIO's)	5
8 Procedure for Dealing with Suspected Cases of Academic Misconduct	5
8.1 Stage 1:	5
8.2 Stage 1a: Appeal from the Stage 1 AIO Decision	10
8.3 Stage 2: Academic Misconduct Panel (AMP) adjudication:	10
8.4 Stage 3: Appealing an Academic Misconduct Panel (AMP) decision:	11
8.5 Academic misconduct penalties	12
8.6 Records	13
8.7 Academic Misconduct and Assessment Boards	13
9 Management responsibilities	13

1 Introduction

Bellmont College is firmly committed to promoting and supporting academic integrity and good academic conduct amongst students and staff. This ensures that the academic standards of our institution are upheld. This policy follows guidance from the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA), as well as expectations contained in the QAA Quality Code for Higher Education.

2 Purpose and scope

The purpose of the Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy is to:

- inform students and staff of Belmont College's expectations for academic integrity and the processes used to deal with academic misconduct.
- support Belmont College's teaching staff in promoting academic integrity among learners on the programmes that we offer.
- provide information on support and resources for promoting academic integrity.

3 Definitions

3.1 Academic integrity

Academic Integrity can be defined as "a commitment, even in the face of adversity, to six fundamental values: honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage" (The International Center for Academic Integrity, 2013). By upholding these fundamental values of academic integrity our academic community can flourish.

3.2 Academic Misconduct

Academic misconduct is any action, intentional or unintentional, that can result in creating an unfair academic advantage for oneself, or an unfair academic advantage or disadvantage for any other member(s) of the Belmont College academic community.

Academic misconduct includes behaviours such as plagiarism, collusion, cheating, commissioning or contract-cheating, duplication, or self-plagiarism, fabrication or facilitation, as defined below:

3.3 Plagiarism

This is the passing off of another person's ideas or work as your own, without acknowledging, and appropriately citing and referencing, the real source.

3.4 Collusion

This is collaborating with another person(s) on an assessment, when not specifically directed to do so, and when the work is intended to be wholly your own.

3.5 Cheating

This is using dishonesty or deception to improve your performance or results. This may include accessing hidden notes or using prohibited devices during tests, copying the work of others or gaining unauthorised access to answers.

3.6 Commissioning or Contract Cheating

This is contracting or requesting another person either paid or unpaid, to complete or write an assessment for you which is then submitted as your own work.

3.7 Duplication or Self-Plagiarism

This is submitting the same material more than once, for example reusing part, or all, of an earlier submission, for a marked (summative) assessment that leads to academic credit.

3.8 Fabrication

This primarily refers to the falsification/making up of data, information or citations in assessments.

3.9 Facilitation

This refers to assisting or enabling another student to commit academic misconduct.

4 Promoting Academic Integrity

4.1 Study Support

To support good understanding of academic integrity all new students at Belmont College take part in Study Support sessions run by the Head of Academic and Pastoral Support. These sessions enable students to practice correct citing and referencing and to learn the fundamental values and practice of academic integrity. Student Representatives are also trained in these values and the Head of Academic and Pastoral Support can also give additional 1:1 or small group training and advice as needed.

4.2 Online Training

The Belmont College Study Support sessions run by the Head of Academic and Pastoral Support are all recorded and available for playback at any time as an additional online resource.

4.3 English Language Support

Students for whom English is not their first language, may benefit from additional language support to aid their academic writing and practice. For support possibilities please speak with the Belmont College Head of Academic and Pastoral Support.

Students should be aware that using external proof-readers or editors may risk academic misconduct; proof-readers may indicate where changes or corrections, etc. are needed but all actual changes should be done by the student him/herself.

4.4 External Resources

Additional guidance on academic integrity can be found on the website of the [International Center for Academic Integrity](#), (ICAI), and in their booklet, [The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity](#). Belmont College uses [Turnitin](#) software to help foster academic integrity.

5 Academic Integrity Expectations

Belmont College students and staff are expected to be fully informed about academic integrity values and to practice them throughout their time at the College. Students are asked to make a statement on all submissions confirming that it is their own work and to submit all summative assessments online via Turnitin software, which can be used to detect plagiarism.

Any students using external proof-reading services must include a statement to this effect on their submitted work.

6 Provision of Information about Academic Integrity

The **Academic Integrity and Misconduct policy** will be introduced to students as part of the Induction/Welcome Week. This includes information on how the policy can be found online on the student intranet and may also be obtained in hard copy in different formats via the Personal Tutor, as needed.

Students, and also staff as part of their induction, will be given explicit guidance on what constitutes good academic practice or academic misconduct and the additional support and information available.

Student Representatives will also cover academic integrity as part of their training and be asked to reinforce it and to guide students with any queries about it to the appropriate sources or resources.

Reminders on academic integrity will be given to students by tutors at the time of each assessment briefing. Staff will be given support on promoting academic integrity during staff development.

7 Academic Integrity Officers (AIO's)

As the College expands, and staff numbers grow, individual tutors (ideally one per programme) will be appointed as Academic Integrity Officers (AIO) to support academic integrity and to take responsibility for investigating suspected cases of academic misconduct.

While the College is in its start-up phase the Head of Quality, will act as the Academic Integrity Officer, supported by the Head of Academic and Pastoral Support and the Head of Academic Programmes, as required with outcomes reviewed and decided by the Quality and Standards Committee (QSC) and referred on to the SMTC or Chief Executive Officer (CEO) as appropriate.

8 Procedure for Dealing with Suspected Cases of Academic Misconduct

Bellmont College's procedure for Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy is as below:

8.1 Stage 1: Academic Integrity Officer (AIO) Investigation:

AIO to make decision based on the evidence available or to escalate the suspected case directly to an Academic Misconduct Panel (AMP)

8.1.1 On identifying a case of suspected academic misconduct, the marking tutor should apply a ZZ grade to the item of assessment. No grade should be provided in Turnitin. The tutor must provide clear, written feedback to the student explaining clearly that a ZZ grade has been applied due to the marking tutor suspecting academic misconduct and informing the student that an email will be sent to them in due course outlining what will happen next to enable them to prepare for the **Stage 1 interview**. The student is entitled at all points during the process to access the assessment in question.

8.1.2 Standard text for including on assessment notes is as follows:

*This assessment has been referred to the Belmont College Academic Integrity Officer (AIO) (the Head of Quality) for further investigation on the basis of suspected academic misconduct. This means that the marking of your work will be delayed until this process has been completed. You will be contacted shortly with further information about the nature of this referral and what happens next. Further details on the nature of the referral will be provided at this time. For more details, please see the **Bellmont College Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy**.*

8.1.3 The tutor refers the matter to the Belmont College's Academic Integrity Officer (AIO) (the Head of Quality) by completing the first part of the **Academic Misconduct Referral**

Form. This referral should normally occur at the same time as the grades and feedback for the assignment are released to students (e.g. generally within 4 working weeks of the assignment due date). If submitted after this date, the AIO has the right to dismiss the case without further investigation.

8.1.4 The referring tutor must include documentary evidence of the grounds for the allegation when making the referral. The report should include firm conclusions reached about the allegation and the manner by which these have been reached (e.g. viva voce, text-matching report, observation, previous academic work or similar, metadata and other linguistic/stylistics analysis). The AIO's decision will normally be based on the evidence provided by the referring tutor – there is no general expectation for AIO's to find the relevant evidence for themselves. Tutors should provide examples of work for all students involved in a suspected case of collusion.

8.1.5 An exception to the above may occur with complex cases e.g. those involving suspected contract-cheating, commissioning, facilitation or ghost-writing, where a considerable body of evidence may be required, that itself requires particular expertise to assemble. In such cases the AIO is expected to review the evidence provided by the referring tutor and determine whether the referral should **proceed to Stage 2 or be returned to the tutor for the provision of additional evidence.**

8.1.6 Where it is suspected that the misconduct involves another Belmont College student, either the initial referring tutor or the AIO, may refer and investigate that other student under the provisions of this policy.

8.1.7 Where the referring tutor is of the opinion that there is academic misconduct but there is insufficient evidence to support the referral (typically for cases of suspected contract-cheating or commissioning), the tutor can invite the student for a viva, on an exceptional basis. The purpose of this viva is to gather additional evidence to assist the tutor in determining whether there are sufficient grounds for the making of an academic misconduct referral in line with the requirements of this policy.

8.1.8 Guidance for students on how to prepare for this viva is [available online](#).

8.1.9 Examples of assignment features that may trigger an academic misconduct viva include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a) Changes in writing style throughout the assignment;
- b) Inconsistent student 'voice' in comparison to previous work or other available evidence from the student;
- c) Document owned by someone other than the student (not conclusive in and of itself);
- d) Resources listed but not cited or cited, but not listed;
- e) References to published work that are incorrect i.e. the published work does not actually say what the assignment attributes to it; or
- f) An anomalously low Turnitin originality score (e.g. a score of 'zero').

8.1.10 The following process must be followed when holding a viva as per the above:

- The referring tutor will invite the student to attend a viva as soon as possible after the issue has been identified, ideally **within the 4 working-week marking period.**
- The invitation to the student must contain the following information:

- a) the nature of the allegation, including the specific nature of the suspected misconduct;
- b) guidance on how to prepare for the viva.

If this information is not provided, the student is entitled to request this information from the referring tutor.

- The student must be given a **minimum of 3 working days** in which to prepare for the viva from when all aspects of **(8.1.9)** have been met.
- The viva will be undertaken by the referring tutor with the student present. The student is not entitled to bring anyone else along to the viva, nor to make a recording of the meeting. Unauthorised recordings will not be allowed as evidence.
- The student is expected to bring supporting evidence to the viva. This can include, but is not limited to: assignment drafts, research notes, work in progress from start to finish.
- The viva will review the student submission against the following pre-set criteria that will be circulated to the student as part of the invitation to attend the viva:
 - (a) Can the student talk to the content?
 - (b) Can the student remember the essence of the argument?
 - (c) Can the student show how the argument develops?
 - (d) Can the student discuss the work and the resources cited?
 - (e) Can the student demonstrate that they authored the work? (e.g., through production of draft work)
- The student is entitled to take notes of the meeting for future use should a referral for misconduct follow.
- The process will be managed by the referring tutor until the tutor determines that there is a case to answer, no 'official' record will be created.

8.1.11 The tutor will determine whether sufficient evidence has been generated by the viva to support a referral to an AIO

- If there is no referral, the student submission is marked on the basis of academic worth only (i.e. marked on academic merits). The viva cannot be used to determine the mark awarded.
- If the tutor decides that there are sufficient grounds for an academic misconduct referral, the evidence generated as part of the viva will become part of the evidence base to be submitted by the referring tutor for consideration by the AIO as part of the referral.
- Relevant evidence to support the referral includes, but is not limited to:
 - a) The original student submission allowing access to the document metadata together with a screenshot of the metadata (but not a screenshot in isolation).
 - b) The accompanying Turnitin report with tutor annotations showing where the issues lie.
 - c) Examples of other work by the same student (if available, to show their level of academic English or work that shows the 'known student voice').

- It is appropriate for concurrent referrals (i.e. those made within a few days of each other for different assessments) to be dealt with as one referral, by one AIO.

8.1.12 On receiving a referral, if the AIO considers that there is sufficient evidence available to support the allegation, s/he will make arrangements for a formal interview and will pass these details, along with the Academic Misconduct Referral Form, to Senior Management Team (SMT)

8.1.13 The AIO will invite the student to attend the interview and ensure that the student has access to the evidence and understands the basis for the referral. The student will have an opportunity to discuss and respond to the evidence.

8.1.14 The student will be given advance notice (normally **a minimum of five working days** from date on email/letter) and will be notified of the right to bring a friend or relative for support. The student cannot be represented by a third party and in the case of non-attendance, the case will normally be considered in the student's absence. The friend or relative will normally have a purely supportive role and will not speak on behalf of the student.

8.1.15 All communications will typically be by email, using the student's Belmont College email address or via other contact details provided by the student to the College. It is the student's responsibility to ensure that their Belmont College email is accessed and that the College has their accurate, up-to-date contact details.

8.1.16 Normally, the interview will take place in person. If this is not logistically possible, at the AIO's discretion, it may be arranged to take place online via appropriate webinar technology such as Skype or Zoom.

Guidance for students on how to prepare for the interview is available online.

- a) The AIO may be accompanied by another member of staff at the interview with the student, if appropriate and if the student is advised accordingly.
- b) Students are expected to bring to the interview all relevant evidence (as outlined in **Section 8.1.10** above) to support their authorship of the assessment in question.
- c) Following the interview, the AIO will determine an outcome for Stage 1 of the case by deciding that:
 - There is no validity to the allegation.
 - A minor offence has taken place and a penalty will be applied for minor cases.
 - The case should be a referral to Stage 2, because of either a serious offence, or a minor offence with a record of previous academic misconduct, or the case has complicating factors.
 - The case must be referred to Stage 2 because of suspected contract-cheating or commissioning.
- d) The relevance of any previous misconduct will only be taken into account when determining the severity of any penalty to be applied in the particular case. There is an expectation that the penalty for second and subsequent findings of misconduct will increase unless there is a clear reason not to do so.
- e) In the event of non-attendance by the student, the AIO can make a decision on the evidence presented.

- f) In determining the validity of the allegation, the AIO will exercise a judgement on the balance of probability, that is whether, on the weight of the evidence presented, the student was more likely than not to have committed academic misconduct. Extenuating circumstances will not be considered in determining culpability but may be considered in determining the penalty imposed.
- g) Once a decision has been made, the AIO will refer it to the Quality Standards Committee (QSC) for ratification (this may be done by email or via a special face-to-face meeting if the QSC is not due to meet for more than two weeks beyond the date of the interview). The outcome will then be communicated to the student (via email) and the completed Academic Misconduct Referral Form (part 2: AIO Interview record form) passed on to the Senior Management Team, who will log the outcome, and place the paperwork (referral form and evidence) on the student's file. A copy of the outcome email will also be sent to the referring Belmont College tutor who will update the assessment records with the final grade awarded.
- h) If the student wishes to appeal against the decision of the Belmont College AIO and QSC this must be done using the: Belmont College Academic Misconduct Appeal Form and emailed to: quality@bellmontcollege.co.uk, **within five working days of the date of the AIO outcome email.**

There are only 2 possible grounds for appeal:

- i. the decision arrived at by the AIO is wrong in fact (i.e. academic misconduct has not occurred)
- or**
- ii. the requirements of the Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy have not been followed.

In both cases, students choosing to appeal the AIO decision must provide evidence to support the appeal. This evidence must be provided at the same time as the appeal is submitted. Appellants will not be permitted to introduce new evidence during any appeal hearing.

- i. Appeals will be considered by Belmont College's SMT, to determine if the appeal criteria have been met. Appeals can be rejected if they do not meet either of the grounds listed in **Section 8.1.16 (h)** above. In these cases, Belmont College will clearly indicate the basis for the refusal of the appeal. The student will be provided with a Completion of Procedures email.
- ii. If a student has an outstanding resit opportunity, this should be taken regardless of any decision to appeal the AIO decision. The consequences of not completing the resit should be made clear to the student. Students are normally entitled to **4 working weeks** between receiving an academic misconduct outcome from the AIO and the submission date for the resit assessment to allow sufficient time to complete the assessment and obtain academic skills support. Provision of feedback and standard resit dates for other members of the student cohort are unaffected by this clause.
- iii. Where a formal warning has been given, students are normally entitled to 4 working weeks between receiving the grade for the marked work and the submission date for the resit assessment to allow sufficient time to complete the assessment and obtain academic skills support.

8.2. Stage 1a: Appeal from the Stage 1 AIO Decision

8.2.1 Appeals against an AIO decision will be heard by a panel of the Senior Management Team of Belmont College appointed by the Head of Quality. The purpose of the Stage 1b appeal is to, review the soundness of the Stage 1 decision, not to re-investigate the Stage case. It is accepted that in doing this, some re-investigation may be required. In reviewing the Stage 1 AIO's decision, the AIO Panel has the authority to increase or decrease the penalty.

8.2.2 The Stage 1b AIO Panel will comprise 2 senior AIOs, one of whom will be the nominated chair. If necessary, a third AIO can be asked to participate. This will typically be in cases where the first 2 AIOs cannot reach an agreement.

8.2.3 The panel will normally meet virtually, with the ability to hold a face-to-face hearing required. The student will not normally have the right to attend this hearing.

8.2.4 Appeals must be made in line with the process outlined in Section 8.1.16 (h) and using the official Belmont College Appeals form.

8.2.5 The expectation is that these cases will be determined within a week of the panel receiving the documentation.

8.3. Stage 2: Academic Misconduct Panel (AMP) Adjudication

AMP to adjudicate a case that has been escalated by the AIO due to the nature of the suspected offence

8.3.1 All cases referred to Stage 2 will be carefully considered by the SMT to ensure the referral warrants a Stage 2 hearing.

8.3.2 Cases that are not considered to warrant a Stage 2 hearing (i.e. imposition of a module level penalty or termination of studies) or where penalties are still available at assignment (as opposed to module) level, will be returned to the original AIO to determine an outcome in line with Stage 1 or to provide further evidence to warrant a Stage 2 hearing.

8.3.3 Cases that are heard by an Academic Misconduct Panel (AMP) will comprise of:

- a) an experienced AIO as Chair;
- b) at least two other AIOs who have had no previous involvement with the cases examined and are not involved with the student's programme of study;
- c) an Officer appointed by the Head of Quality

8.3.4 In all cases, the Officer to the Panel or the Panel Chair reserve(s) the right to call or contact the Stage 1 AIO (or nominee) to the Stage 2 Panel hearing to present the case and any associated evidence or provide any necessary clarification.

8.3.5 In all cases, the student will be invited to attend the panel hearing. The student will be given advance notice, will be provided with the documentation that the panel will consider and will be entitled to bring a friend or relative for support. Legal representation is not permitted.

8.3.6 After hearing the case and considering all the evidence, the panel will decide that:

- there is no validity to the allegation;
- or**
- a minor offence has taken place and a penalty will be applied in accordance

- serious academic misconduct has occurred

8.3.7 It is expected that findings of contract-cheating or commissioning will normally result in the application of a module level penalty or termination of study at Belmont College.

8.3.8 In determining the validity of the allegation, the panel will exercise a judgement on the balance of probability, that is whether, on the weight of the evidence presented, the student was more likely than not to have committed academic misconduct. Extenuating circumstances will not be considered in determining culpability but may be considered in determining the penalty imposed.

8.3.9 Where serious academic misconduct has occurred, the panel must determine the penalty in accordance with the Belmont College tariff for serious offences. The panel may, at this stage, take account of any previous offences and there is an expectation that the penalty applied will be an increase on any previous penalties, unless there is a clear reason for this not to be the case.

8.3.10 If the panel determines that programme termination should be applied, it must make a suitable recommendation for consideration by the Head of Quality (or nominee).

8.3.11 The Officer (or nominee) will advise the student of the panel's decision in writing within five working days. This email should also be forwarded to the referring tutor who is required to update the assessment records with the final grade outcome.

8.3.12 If the AMP hearing is held to consider an appeal against an AIO decision, there is no internal appeal against the decision of the Academic Misconduct Panel.

8.3.13 The written outcome will include a 'Completion of Procedure' letter (sent via email), which details the appellant's right to apply for a review to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education.

8.4 Stage 3: Appealing an Academic Misconduct Panel (AMP) Decision

(This stage is only available when the original case was escalated to the AMP by the AIO, rather than dealt with by the AIO in the first instance).

8.4.1 If the AMP hearing is held because of a direct referral by an AIO (i.e. the AIO considers that a serious offence has occurred, or the case has complicating factors) then an appeal against an outcome may be made to the Head of Quality (or nominee). This appeal must be made using the Academic Misconduct Appeal Form and must be received within five working days of the notification of the AMP outcome.

8.4.2 Students choosing to appeal the AIO decision must provide evidence to support the appeal. This evidence must be provided at the same time as the appeal is submitted. Appellants will not be permitted to introduce new evidence during any appeal hearing.

8.4.3 The Head of Quality (or nominee) will determine whether the appeal presents credible grounds for the case to be reopened based on the criteria in Section 8.1.16 (h).

8.4.4 If, in the opinion of the Head of Quality (or nominee) the appeal has no merit, then the outcome will be confirmed as in Section 8.1.16 (i).

8.4.5 Where an appeal includes credible evidence which the Head of Quality determines should be reconsidered, the case will be returned for consideration by the next AMP hearing. While the full Stage 2 process (above) will be repeated, the purpose of the appeal is to review the soundness of the Stage 2 decision, not to re-investigate the Stage 2 case. It is accepted that in doing this, some re-investigation may be required.

8.4.6 Where an AMP is reviewing a decision made by a previous panel, the second panel has the authority to increase or decrease the penalty previously imposed.

8.5 Academic Misconduct Penalties

8.5.1 Table 1 shows the possible penalties for Academic Misconduct and by whom these penalties can be applied. Any of these penalties can be applied as this is not a cumulative scale; however, there is an expectation that the penalty will increase in severity for subsequent acts of misconduct. Ultimately, the decision as to the severity of the penalty is the responsibility of Belmont College to determine.

Table 1: Tariff for Academic Misconduct

	Penalties	Decision Maker
Penalty at assignment level:	Formal warning ¹	AIO
	Grade for assignment reduced to bare pass	AIO
	Grade for assignment reduced to fail (F+, F, F-, AG*).	AIO
Penalty at module level:	Final written warning ²	AMP
	Grade for assignment reduced to fail (F+, F, F-, AG*). Resit rights removed.	AMP
	Grade for module reduced to fail (F+, F, F-)	AMP
	Grade for module reduced to AG*.	AMP
	Grade for module reduced to AG ³ repeat module grade capped at bare pass	AMP
	Grade for module reduced to AG ² . Right to repeat module withdrawn.	AMP
	Grade for module reduced to AG ² . Right to repeat equivalent credits withdrawn.	AMP
	Termination of studies	AMP

8.5.2 When determining the appropriate penalty for the misconduct, the following factors should be taken into account:

- extent and seriousness of the misconduct.
- stage of student study (e.g. term 1, year 1 as compared to final year dissertation).
- whether it is poor academic practice or intentional misconduct.
- a student's previous history of misconduct.
- is it a concurrent referral with no time for the student to have benefited from developmental opportunities.
- the credit rating of the work.

8.5.3 The Final Written Warning must be attached to any of the module level penalties awarded by the AMP in line with the tariff (Table 1). This includes:

¹This penalty will normally be reserved for a first referral where there is evidence of more than unintentional poor scholarship but not enough for a capped bare-pass or harsher penalty.

²See further, Sections 8.5.3 and 8.5.4 on next page.

³AG stands for a G grade awarded on the basis of academic misconduct.

- Cases where a student has had multiple previous findings of academic misconduct and has had time to engage with additional support e.g. from Belmont College Student Support Team but where there is no evidence of improvement to their academic practice.
- Where a student has been referred for ghost-writing or otherwise facilitating academic misconduct but has not actually submitted any work for summative credit. In these cases, the warning will be given in isolation from any other penalty.
- Where a student is found to have engaged in contract-cheating or commissioning.

8.5.4 The final written warning will state that ‘Any further findings of academic misconduct, for any reason, are liable to result in termination of studies.’

8.6 Records

8.6.1 A copy of the records of all academic misconduct cases will be placed on the relevant student file. Where a case is dismissed, all documentation will be removed and shredded.

8.6.2 Belmont College will hold an electronic record of all allegations of academic misconduct. These data will inform the review processes.

8.7 Academic Misconduct and Assessment Boards

8.7.1 Except for noting the outcomes of this policy and procedure, Assessment Boards shall take no account of allegations of academic misconduct. The Boards will apply any penalty determined through this procedure. The Boards have no authority to vary the penalty⁴.

8.7.2 Where the penalty allows resubmission or reassessment, the work required will to be determined by the Board in the usual way.

8.7.3 Assessment Boards will be notified of every case where a decision on an academic misconduct allegation is pending and will not confirm an outcome for the relevant assessment until the decision is known. The element of assessment will be clearly identified and a ‘deferred decision’ will be recorded.

9 Management Responsibilities

- This policy is overseen, reviewed and monitored by the Belmont College Quality Standards Committee (QSC).
- The Head of Quality is responsible for ensuring that the Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy and procedures are effectively implemented and monitored and for staff training and development of AIOs.
- The Head of Academic Programmes, the Module Leaders and tutors are responsible for regularly informing students about this policy and implementing it, with the support of the Head of Quality, The Head of Academic Programmes and the Head of Academic and Pastoral Support.

⁴ A student whose assessment grade is adjusted as a result of an academic integrity process will still be entitled to be awarded the higher grade for that assessment component where this is relevant.

Bellmont College Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy					
Version	Date	Author(s)	Amendments	Approved by	Next review
1	March 2023	EWW	New Document	Advisory Board	October 2024
2	February 2024	EWW	Revised no update or changes made	Advisory Board	October 2024

Document Context	
This document relates to:	
Document/Policy	Date/version
Bellmont College Quality Assurance Handbook	February 2024 v2
Bellmont College Student Handbook	February 2024 v2
Bellmont College Employee Handbook	February 2024 v2
Bellmont College Academic Appeal Policy	February 2024 v3
Bellmont College Complaint Policy and Procedure	February 2024 v2
Bellmont College Internal Verification Policy	February 2024 v2
QAA Quality Code for Higher Education	2020
QAA Plagiarism in Higher Education	August 2016