

THE UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

Taught Students Academic Misconduct Procedure

This procedure applies to all assessments set from September 2026.

Related resources:

[Academic Regulations for Taught Programmes](#)

[Academic Integrity and Assistance Policy](#)

[Assessment Policy and Procedures](#)

[Exam Rules](#)

[Mitigating Circumstances Policy and Procedure](#)

[Reasonable Adjustments to Assessment Policy](#)

Postgraduate research students:

[Postgraduate Research Academic Misconduct Procedures](#)

Links to sections:

Taught Students Academic Misconduct Procedure	1
Declaration of Academic Integrity	2
Types of Academic Misconduct Offence	4
Determining the Severity of Academic Misconduct Offences	7
Mitigating Circumstances	8
Procedure for investigation and determination of cases	8
Stage 1: Local Investigation	8
Stage 1a: Review of School Level Penalties	11
Stage 2: Committee on Applications (the Committee)	12
Stage 3: Pro-Vice Chancellor Review	13
Final Stage: Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education ..	14
Penalties for Academic Misconduct.....	145
Figure 1: Determination of Penalties: School/Committee on Applications	156
Figure 2: School Penalties: Level 0, Level 4	167
Figure 3: School penalties: all Levels that count towards classification ...	188
Figure 4: Committee on Applications penalties – all Levels	19
Penalties and Assessment Regulations	20

General Provisions	21
Where to get help and support	23

Introduction

1. Academic misconduct is defined by the *Academic Regulations for Taught Programmes* as 'any attempt by a student to gain an unfair advantage in assessment'.
2. It is expected that students can work with others, interpret, and present other people's ideas, and produce their own independent academic work in accordance with the University regulations on assessment and [University expectations of Academic Integrity](#).
3. When students submit work for assessment they are asked to declare that it is their own work using the University's Declaration of Academic Integrity:

Declaration of Academic Integrity

1. For Individual pieces of work

Schools may add to this declaration as they see fit provided that the provisions of the University's Declaration are included.

I am aware that as a member of the University community at the University of Leeds I am expected to act with Academic Integrity and this means that my work must be an accurate reflection of my own learning, understanding and skills.

I declare that this submission represents my own work and I confirm that any assistance used in its development has complied with the requirements of the assessment brief and the Academic Integrity and Assistance Policy.

Where I have used the ideas, words, data, materials or work of others, I have given appropriate acknowledgement using the referencing conventions required for my programme of study.

I confirm that the attached submission has not been submitted for marks or credits in a different module or for a different qualification or completed prior to entry to the University.

I have read and understood the University's rules on Academic Misconduct. I know that if I commit an academic misconduct offence there can be serious disciplinary consequences.

I re-confirm my consent to the University copying and distributing any or all of my work in any form and using third parties to verify that this is my own work, and for quality assurance purposes.

I confirm that I have declared all mitigating circumstances that may be relevant to the assessment of this piece of work and I wish to have taken into account.

2. For Group Work

On the understanding that other members of the group have made contributions to the attached submission, I declare that (as in 1 above).
--

4. All work submitted for assessment is expected to be students' own independent work. It must not be work that has been submitted for another assessment either at the University or elsewhere, except where there is explicit permission to include previously submitted work. Where students have been asked to work with others, or where students are presenting other people's work as part of an assessment, they must fully acknowledge this. Where students are suspected of submitting work for assessment in breach of University regulations they will be investigated and may be penalised for academic misconduct.
5. Academic Misconduct offences are the most serious of offences against the University as they undermine the value of the University's academic awards and reputation for academic excellence. The penalties for academic misconduct reflect the seriousness of the offences. Within the range of penalties students may find that they receive a penalty which has an impact on their final award from the University, or they may be suspended or permanently excluded from the University community if found to have committed an academic misconduct offence. It is important that students familiarise themselves with the University's expectations of Academic Integrity and the Academic Misconduct Procedure.
6. The Academic Misconduct Procedure applies to all taught elements of programmes of study at the University, including undergraduate programmes, taught postgraduate study and taught elements of research degrees. This includes full-time, part-time, study abroad students, students on an international foundation year, students on University of Leeds online programmes, students on University of Leeds programmes in Leeds and overseas, and students who have been given permission by the University to sit examinations as external students overseas.
7. The Procedure applies to all summative assessments. Where offences are identified in formative assessments Schools should provide feedback to students on the University expectations of Academic Integrity and provide support for good study practice.
8. The Procedure forms part of the Student Contract between students and the University. The Procedure provides a clear statement of academic misconduct offences and a transparent process for investigation and determination of academic misconduct cases.
9. All University academic misconduct case investigations are investigative rather than adversarial. Allegations and investigations shall be private to the student under investigation, members of the University who are directly concerned with the investigation and consideration of the offence, and the student's Head of Parent School. Findings of any offence and the penalty given will form part of a student's record.

Types of Academic Misconduct Offence

10. The following are offences under the Procedure:

10.1 Cheating in examinations

10.2 Cheating means breaching any of the University rules governing the conduct of University examinations.

10.3 An examination is defined in the Assessment Policy and Procedures as a formal in-person assessment that is carried out under timed conditions and conducted under the supervision of invigilators or an academic member of staff. It may be written, digital, i.e. on a device, oral or aural. All examinations must be held according to the Examination Procedure.

10.4 Students must not:

- a. introduce [unauthorised items](#) into the exam room;
- b. disobey the [regulations relating to mobile phones](#) – phones should be switched off and placed in the plastic bags provided (unless being used for DUO authentication during a digital exam)
- c. copy from other candidates or from notes;
- d. access or copy from sources of information (except what is allowed by the examiners) or annotate or mark this authorised information (except as authorised by the examiners);
- e. disobey the [regulations relating to calculators](#);
- f. communicate in any way with other candidates or persons except the invigilators;
- g. remove script books (blank or otherwise) from the examination room;
- h. fail to follow any other published [exam rule](#).

10.5 Plagiarism

10.6 Plagiarism means students presenting someone else's work, in whole or in part, as their own. Work means any intellectual output, and typically includes but is not limited to text, data, images, sound or performance. Where someone else's work is presented as part of an assessment, it must be correctly attributed and referenced.

10.7 Re-use of own work

10.8 Re-use of own work means students submitting the same work for two or more assessments, that has already been presented in another assessment, that has been presented for a different qualification, or completed before entry to the University. This is also known as 'self-plagiarism'. This does not apply where the nature of the assessment explicitly involves reworking an assessment (as in the Assessment Policy and Procedures, 4.3) or incorporating material created as part of another, linked assessment.

10.9 Theft of work

10.10 Theft of work means students trying to gain an advantage by taking or sharing information that does not belong to them, for example taking the work of other students and/or staff, acting to obtain assessment questions or examination papers in

advance of the period for assessment, or sharing University assessment questions with a third party in breach of University copyright.

10.11 Collusion

10.12 Collusion means unauthorised collaboration between two or more individuals that results in work being submitted which is not an independent reflection of each student's own learning, understanding and skills. This includes writing, rewriting, correcting or editing another student's work; sharing answers; providing examples of work to be incorporated into another student's work, knowingly aiding another student to copy work, or submitting work for another student.

10.13 Students are permitted to use peer assistance to prepare work for assessment. Peers may provide advice regarding the content, logic and clarity of the work but will not directly write, copy, edit or amend the work.

10.14 Fabrication of assessment or supporting evidence

10.15 Fabrication of assessment means submitting work that is untrue or made up, for example data or reports of laboratory or practical work. Fabrication of supporting evidence means falsifying drafts, submission receipts or feedback. Fabrication of transcripts, certificates or supporting information for mitigating circumstances may be considered under this offence but will normally be considered under the Student Discipline Procedure.

10.16 Contract cheating

10.17 Contract cheating means submitting work that has been obtained from third parties, whether they are inside or outside the University and whether on a commercial or non-commercial basis. This includes purchasing work from essay mills or commercial websites, and requesting or commissioning individuals to produce work for submission as the student's own. This also includes the use of paid services to prepare work for assessment. Disabled students may be able to access paid services and assistive technologies where recommended through Disabled Students' Allowances or Disability Services and confirmed as part of a Disability Support Summary.

10.18 Misuse of Assistance

10.19 Misuse of assistance means submitting work that has been created, modified, edited, translated, refined or otherwise prepared using assistance in a way that is not permitted by the assessment brief, the Academic Integrity and Assistance Policy, or other relevant University requirement.

10.20 Students are normally permitted to use assistance in preparing work for assessment, unless restrictions are specified within the assessment brief. Students remain responsible for ensuring that the work submitted is an accurate reflection of their own learning, understanding and skills and is appropriately referenced.

10.21 Misrepresentation, fraud and impersonation

- 10.22 Misrepresentation, fraud and impersonation means making a fraudulent declaration of academic integrity when submitting work for assessment or presenting as a candidate for assessment or examination.
- 10.23 This includes impersonating another student, requesting someone else to impersonate a student, misrepresenting or defaming the work or opinions of others, submitting work that has been wholly or partly obtained by deceit or fraud, or submitting work where the content has been manipulated to avoid detection. It also includes the falsification or concealment of word counts and the falsification of logs or signatures relating to placement or skills achievements.
- 10.24 **Facilitating academic misconduct**
- 10.25 Facilitating academic misconduct means inciting or conspiring with others to commit any academic misconduct offence, whether directly or indirectly. Indirectly facilitating misconduct includes uploading work to cheating websites or otherwise publishing or sharing work, feedback, examination questions or answers that can be used by other students for cheating.
- 10.26 Coercing, pressuring or blackmailing someone else to commit or conceal an academic misconduct offence may also be considered under the Student Discipline Procedure.
- 10.27 **Any other breach of University assessment regulations**
- 10.28 Any other breach of the University's published assessment rules and regulations may be investigated under this Procedure.

11. Multiple Offences

- 11.1 Students may be investigated for multiple offences relating to the same assessment.
- 11.2 Offences identified in assessments submitted in the same assessment or examination period will be treated as concurrent, and where possible will be investigated at the same meeting. Defining assessment and examination periods will vary by programme and is at the discretion of the school.
- 11.3 Where academic misconduct is suspected, but the alleged offence is unclear, allegations should be put to students against all possible offences for further investigation. This does not preclude any other offence being identified as a result of the investigation.
- 11.4 Where an academic misconduct offence is suspected, the University reserves the right to investigate and take action in respect of work previously submitted by the student, even if that work has already been assessed and the marks published. This also applies after a student has graduated (see 88).

Determining the Severity of Academic Misconduct Offences

12. Academic misconduct offences are treated by the University as 'strict liability' offences. This means that the University does not consider whether a student intended to commit an offence, or whether they were aware their actions were in breach of University rules, in determining whether an offence has occurred.
13. In determining whether an offence has occurred, in the first instance the University will not consider whether the student intended to gain an unfair advantage.
14. In determining the severity of the offence, and any penalty to be applied, the University may consider any or all of the aggravating or mitigating factors set out below, along with any other contextual factors identified in the investigation of the alleged offence.
15. Aggravating factors that increase the severity of the offence may include:
 - a) the student is at an advanced stage in their academic integrity development.
 - b) the offence appears to be intended or planned to gain an unfair advantage.
 - c) successful commission of the offence would give a clear advantage to the student over others.
 - d) the extent of misconduct within the assessment is significant.
 - e) the student is unable to provide supporting evidence regarding the authorship, development or preparation of the work.
 - f) the offence is the second or subsequent offence, and the student has had the opportunity to develop their understanding of academic integrity since the first offence.
 - g) there are multiple concurrent offences.
 - h) the offence constitutes a serious breach of trust between the University and the student, for example where there are similarities with criminal conduct, such as theft, fraud or blackmail, or where the student may have coerced or pressured another member of the University community to commit or conceal an academic misconduct offence.
16. Mitigating factors that reduce the severity of the offence may include:
 - a) the student is at an early stage in their academic integrity training.
 - b) the offence does not appear to be intended or planned to gain an unfair advantage.
 - c) successful commission of the offence would give no advantage to the student over others.
 - d) the extent of misconduct within the assessment is low.
 - e) the student is able to provide supporting evidence regarding the authorship, development or preparation of the work.
 - f) the offence is a first offence.
 - g) the offence is the second or subsequent offence, but the student may not have had sufficient opportunity to develop their understanding of academic integrity since the first offence.
 - h) the student may have been subject to coercion, pressure or blackmail to commit or conceal an academic misconduct offence.

- i) the student presents mitigating circumstances as defined by the University Mitigating Circumstances Policy and Procedure and as set out below.

Mitigating Circumstances

17. Students who are found to have committed an academic misconduct offence will be given the opportunity to disclose any mitigating circumstances in advance of a penalty being set. Mitigation may lessen the penalty, but it does not excuse an offence.
18. The consideration of mitigating circumstances will be in line with the University Mitigating Circumstances Policy and Procedure, and supporting information is expected in all cases.
19. Mitigating circumstances (additional consideration) does not apply to assessment components where academic misconduct has been proven/found. Normal mitigating circumstances rules can be applied to other components within the same module.

Procedure for investigation and determination of cases

Stage 1: Local Investigation

Allegations of cheating in examinations

20. Allegations of cheating in examinations will be overseen by a University Assessment Manager, who is a nominee of the Head of Student Education and Experience.
21. Where a student is suspected of cheating in an examination, the University Assessment Manager will investigate the allegation, consulting and informing both the teaching and parent Schools. Where the University Assessment Manager determines that case should not be referred to the Academic Misconduct Procedure, they will record the reasons for this, notify the student and may issue informal advice on examination rules.
22. Where the University Assessment Manager determines that the case should be referred to the Academic Misconduct Procedure, they will provide and assemble a Report within 10 working days that includes the following documentation and supporting evidence:
 - a. a report including the results of consultations with the teaching and the parent School and external authorities (where the examination has been taken overseas);
 - b. a copy of the examination question paper (see below);
 - c. a copy of the Student's script book(s) for the examination in question;
 - d. a copy of this Procedure.
23. The University Assessment Manager's Report will be sent simultaneously to the Student Cases Team, the student, and the student's teaching and parent Schools for consideration by the Committee on Applications under Stage 2 of the Procedure.
24. The original evidence will be sent to the Student Cases Team and a copy will be provided to the candidate. If the evidence is of a type that makes it difficult or impossible to provide a copy, i.e. a mobile phone, calculator, pencil case, annotated dictionary etc, then this will be recorded in the report and the article sent to the Student Cases Team if relevant. If the examination paper is not to be provided to the candidate (e.g. for

academic and business reasons), the reason for this being withheld will be recorded in the Assessment Manager's report.

All other academic misconduct allegations

25. Where a student is suspected of an offence other than Cheating, the School where the concern has arisen ('The Investigating School') will:
- ensure that the student's parent School is kept informed (if not the same School).
 - ask the student's parent School (if not the same) whether there have been previous offences.
 - determine (if appropriate) whether any further assessment currently or previously submitted by the student is subject to an academic misconduct investigation under the Procedure.
26. It is expected that module leaders will discuss with markers any concerns about academic integrity and raise potential offences with the School Academic Integrity Lead for review. The investigation will be led by the Academic Integrity Lead as the nominee of the Head of School, who may delegate to Module Leaders or other nominee(s) the preparation of paperwork relating to the investigation of an alleged offence on their modules.
27. The Investigating School will assemble the evidence and will give the student not less than three working days' notice in writing of:
- the allegation(s);
 - the details of all the piece(s) of work that will be discussed;
 - the evidence being relied on by the School, including details of any use by the School of technology to support detection of academic misconduct in accordance with the Assessment Policy and Procedures.
 - the assessment brief, and in cases of misuse of assistance, the specific restriction(s) alleged to have been breached should be clearly identified.
 - in cases of alleged plagiarism, marked-up work which the student will retain after the School meeting;
 - the date of the School Investigation meeting.
28. The School Investigation Meeting will:
- be conducted in person or online at the discretion of the School
 - normally comprise the Academic Integrity Lead as nominee of the Head of School and up to two other members of School staff, including those academic staff most closely associated with the work in question
 - be minuted by a member of the School attending the Investigation Meeting;
 - address all the allegations faced by the student;
 - allow the student an opportunity to explain how they created the work submitted;
 - ask the student whether the offence is admitted or denied;
 - determine on the evidence whether an offence has occurred on a balance of probabilities (i.e. more likely than not); and
 - provide an opportunity for the student to put forward evidence of any mitigating circumstances at the time of the assessment, before any penalty is decided.
29. Students are encouraged to attend the Investigation Meeting with a supporter under the terms of paragraph 91. The School is responsible for notifying the student of the role of the supporter, and may set other reasonable terms and conditions for the supporter's attendance as relevant to the circumstances.

30. Students should make all reasonable efforts to attend the meeting or request that it be rearranged. Where the student is absent from the meeting without good cause they will be presumed to have admitted the allegations. The School will progress the case as an admitted offence. 'Good cause' is at the discretion of the School, but it is expected that there is supporting information from a third party explaining why the student cannot attend at the date and time of the meeting.

Admitted allegations

31. Where the student admits the allegation(s), the School will decide whether it can give a penalty or whether it is necessary to refer to the case to the Committee on Applications for a penalty to be given (refer to figure 1: determination of penalties).

Denied allegations

32. Where the student denies the allegation(s), after the student has withdrawn from the Investigation Meeting, the School will determine whether there is sufficient evidence to prove the allegation(s) made on the balance of probabilities, i.e. that what is alleged is more likely than not to have happened. The Investigation Meeting will record its findings and the reasons for them as the conclusion of the minutes.
33. Where the allegation(s) are considered to be proven/found by the Investigation Meeting, the School will decide whether it can give a penalty or whether it is necessary to refer the case to the Committee on Applications for final determination. If it is to be referred to the Committee, the School's determination of the offence will be considered by the Committee as a preliminary finding.
34. Where a penalty is to be given by the Investigating School, the School should decide on the penalty (refer to figures 2 and 3: School penalties), and record the reasons why a particular penalty has been applied, making reference to all available penalties.
35. The School should notify the student in writing of the offence(s) found, the penalty, and the reasons for the penalty, along with a copy of the minutes of the Investigation Meeting, no later than 10 working days after the meeting. This should be copied to the student's parent School. The School should record the penalty in its Academic Misconduct tracker and make any necessary updates to the student record.
36. Where the allegation(s) are not proven/found by the Investigation Meeting, the School should notify the student in writing within 10 working days of the meeting. The case will be at an end and no records will be retained, except for an anonymised summary in the School's own Academic Misconduct records, which are retained for the purpose of reporting overall case numbers. The work submitted for assessment will be marked in accordance with normal arrangements and without penalty.
37. Where an admitted offence is to be forwarded to the Committee on Applications for a penalty to be given, the Investigating School should, within 10 working days of the Investigation Meeting, send to the student:
- a letter informing them that the case is being sent to the Committee; and
 - a copy of the minutes including the Investigating School's reasons, findings and conclusions.

38. Where the case is to be forwarded to the Committee for final determination the School should, within 10 working days of the School meeting, send to the Student Cases Team:
- a completed pro-forma;
 - copies of documentation sent to the student including the invitation to the Investigation Meeting and the evidence;
 - a copy of the correspondence informing the student the case is being sent to the Committee;
 - the minutes of the School Investigation (as provided to the student) and copies of all additional correspondence, showing the dates of correspondence;
 - the assessment brief relevant to the allegation;
 - if the student is being referred to the Committee for a second or subsequent offence, copies of the documentation relating to the first offence.
39. Within 10 working days of the date of the letter notifying the student that the case is being sent to the Committee, the student should send to the Student Cases Team:
- confirmation as to whether the allegation is admitted or denied; and
 - any statement in defence of the allegation or in mitigation.

The student must submit all supporting information that they want to be considered by the Committee at this stage. If information is submitted later without a good reason why it could not be provided earlier, it will be discounted. Where a statement is received after the deadline it will be accepted only at the discretion of the Committee.

Stage 1a: Review of School Level Penalties

40. A student may appeal to the Committee on Applications about a penalty imposed by the Investigating School.
41. Such appeals must be made to the Student Cases Team not later than 10 working days after the Investigating School's decision has been issued.
42. The Head of Student Cases (or nominee) will evaluate the request to ensure that it has been made in time and falls within the grounds for review. If it is to proceed, the request will be acknowledged in writing. If the decision is not to proceed, an explanation will be provided.
43. The Committee on Applications will review the penalty on the following grounds:
- The School's decision was unreasonable in the light of the evidence supplied;
 - The procedure for the School investigation was deficient in a way that materially prejudiced the case;
 - New evidence has emerged that was not available when the School Investigation Meeting was held and there is a good reason why it was not brought to the School's attention earlier.
44. In their penalty appeal, students should state the ground(s) for review and provide any relevant evidence. Disagreement with the outcome is not in itself a ground for review.
45. The student will not appear before the Committee unless the Committee so decides.
46. The Committee will consider whether:
- the School has followed the Procedure for investigation;
 - the imposition of a penalty was reasonable in the light of the case presented;

- the penalty applied is within the range of penalties available to the Investigating School.
47. The Committee will not reopen the investigation. If the School is found not to have acted in accordance with the Procedure, not to have acted reasonably in imposing a penalty or not to have applied a penalty within the range available, it will be asked to reconsider the case. If the Committee determines there is no case to be found, it will dismiss the case.
48. The student will normally receive a final decision in writing by e-mail, including the reasons for the decision, within 10 working days after the Committee meeting. This will include details of their right to appeal the decision of the Committee at stage 3.

Stage 2: Committee on Applications (the Committee)

49. The Committee has delegated authority of the University Senate to consider and determine academic misconduct offences on its behalf and to impose penalties.
50. The Committee may proceed as it determines, subject to the following:
- a. the student(s) must have an opportunity to attend: if the student does not attend without good cause the case will be considered and determined in their absence. 'Good cause' is at the discretion of the Committee, but it is expected that there is supporting information from a third party explaining why the student cannot attend at the date and time of the meeting;
 - b. the student may be accompanied by a single supporter of their choice who may or may not be a member of the University (see paragraph 91);
 - c. the student may put their case and the Committee may ask the student to answer questions;
 - d. the papers for the case that are available to the Committee shall be available to the student no less than five working days before the meeting;
 - e. The Committee may ask questions of the Head of the Investigating School concerned, or their nominee. Where this is not the parent School, the Head of the parent School may also be required to give evidence to the Committee.
 - f. the student and the School(s) representative(s) shall appear separately before the Committee;
 - g. the Committee will not enter into any discussion of any penalty with anyone who is not a member of the Committee;
 - h. The Committee hears cases in good faith and will accept statements and answers accordingly. However, the Committee will not ignore abuses of its trust or deceptions and reserves the right to take further or separate action where such abuses are found to have been perpetrated.
 - i. No one on the Committee will be from the Investigating School or the student's parent School.

- j. Meetings take place online, and may take place in-person at the discretion of the Committee.
- 51. The Committee will decide whether there is sufficient evidence to substantiate the allegations made on the balance of probabilities, i.e. that what is alleged is more likely than not to have happened. The Committee will also determine a penalty (refer to figure 4: Committee penalties).
- 52. A student will not receive a final decision on the day of the hearing. A student will normally receive a final decision in writing by e-mail, including the reasons for the decision, within 10 working days after the Committee's meeting has ended. This will include details of any right to appeal the decision of the Committee at stage 3.

Stage 3: Pro-Vice Chancellor Review

Review of Committee on Applications Penalties

- 53. The student may appeal to the Pro-Vice Chancellor: Student Education & Experience against the findings of the Committee, the penalty that it has imposed, and/or the Committee's decision on a penalty appeal.
- 54. Such appeals must be made in writing to the Student Cases Team not later than 10 working days after the date of issue of the Committee's decision.
- 55. The Pro-Vice Chancellor: Student Education & Experience (or nominee) will review the decision on the following grounds:
 - a. The decision of the Committee on Applications was unreasonable in the light of the evidence supplied.
 - b. The procedure for the Committee on Applications meeting was deficient in a way which materially prejudiced the case.
 - c. New evidence has emerged which was not available when the Committee met and there is a good reason why it was not brought to the Committee's attention during the meeting.
- 56. In their request for review, students should state the ground(s) for review and provide any relevant evidence. Disagreement with the outcome is not in itself a ground for review.
- 57. The Head of Student Cases (or nominee) will evaluate the request to ensure that it has been made in time and falls within the grounds for review. If it is to proceed, the request will be acknowledged in writing. If the decision is not to proceed, an explanation will be provided and a Completion of Procedures letter will be issued.
- 58. The Pro-Vice Chancellor: Student Education & Experience (or nominee) will review the written material submitted to the Committee, a written statement of the outcome of the investigation and the request for a review.
- 59. The Pro-Vice Chancellor: Student Education & Experience (or nominee) will issue their decision as soon as possible and normally **within 20 working days** of receipt of the request for review. The Pro-Vice Chancellor: Student Education & Experience may:
 - a. Uphold the Committee outcome;

- b. Vary the Committee outcome;
- c. Refer the matter back to the Committee for reconsideration.

A Completion of Procedures letter will be issued where appropriate.

Final Stage: Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education

60. If a student is dissatisfied, they may complain to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for HE (OIA). The OIA will require evidence that a student has exhausted the University's procedures, and that the University has issued a Completion of Procedures letter. To make a complaint a student must send the Completion of Procedures letter to the OIA within 12 months of the date of the letter, together with a completed copy of its complaint form, which the OIA will use to assess whether a case is eligible for review under its rules. Further and specific details about the OIA can be obtained from its website: www.oiahe.org.uk.

Penalties for Academic Misconduct

General Principles

61. The University is committed to supporting students to develop the understanding and skills needed to maintain the academic integrity of their work. This commitment must be balanced against the need to protect the academic standards of the University and issue penalties for academic misconduct offences where these standards may be jeopardised.
62. The University is committed to thorough investigation of all allegations and careful discussion with students about the circumstances of an offence before penalties are applied.
63. Penalty tables are arranged by level according to the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ) and in line with the academic regulations. For reference, equivalent University levels are:

FHEQ level	University level
Level 0	Foundation year, non-degree study
Level 4	Level 1
Level 5	Level 2
Level 6	Levels 3-5, depending on programme
Level 7	Level M, taught postgraduate

64. Except for cheating in examinations and offences that are deemed to be serious, students at Level 0 and Level 4 will be issued with warnings for admitted academic misconduct offences.

65. The University will not tolerate cheating or deception of any kind in work submitted for assessment at any level of study. Since April 2022 it has been a criminal offence in England to provide or arrange for another person to provide assessment services for financial gain to students enrolled at a University in England. Students who commission third party services relating to assessment may therefore be supporting criminal activity.
66. Penalties will normally be higher for those at Level 5 and above, who are expected to be aware of academic integrity expectations in a higher education context, and where an offence can directly undermine the academic standards of their University award. Penalties can be severe for repeat offences at this level. Discretion may be applied at Levels 5 and above where students are at an earlier stage in their development of academic integrity in relation to UK higher education standards, for example direct entry and new Masters level students.
67. Penalties will be issued for students who deny offences that are proven/found.
68. Any escalation to Committee for a second or subsequent offence is where two or more academic misconduct cases have occurred at Level 5 and above. Offences at Level 0 and Level 4 will not count for this purpose.

Determination of Penalties

69. Penalties will be determined either by the Investigating School or the Committee on Applications. Responsibility for determination of penalties is set out at figure 1:

Figure 1: Determination of Penalties: School/Committee on Applications

Admitted first, second and subsequent misconduct offences, all levels	School
Denied first misconduct offences, all levels	School
Denied second and subsequent misconduct offences, levels that do not count towards classification	School
Cheating in examinations, all offences	Committee
Denied second and subsequent misconduct offences, all levels that count towards classification	Committee
Any misconduct offence where the School considers an appropriate penalty is not available at School level, all levels	Committee

Considering the Penalty

70. When considering a penalty, School Investigation Meetings and the Committee on Applications should make a decision that is just and proportionate to the overall misconduct, and should consider:
- The range of penalties applicable for the offence

- Any aggravating or mitigating factors, including mitigating circumstances
- The context of the offence in relation to the student's development of academic integrity skills
- Any previous offences, and the student's engagement with instructions to undertake further academic integrity training and/or skills development

71. There are no default penalties for each type, instance or severity of offence. Each case should be considered on its merits, and Schools and the Committee on Applications should record their reasoning for the application of each penalty. Schools, Faculties, Chairs and Members may discuss anonymised cases as necessary to undertake standardisation/calibration of approach.

72. The penalties that can be applied by Schools and Committee are set out at:

Figure 3: School penalties: all Levels that count towards classification

Figure 4: Committee on Applications penalties – all Levels

73. Consideration of Penalties for Postgraduate Research is included in the 'Procedure for investigating plagiarism in University assessments by postgraduate researchers'. A link to this procedure is available from the Governance and Compliance website.

<https://secretariat.leeds.ac.uk/student-cases/>

Figure 2: School Penalties: Level 0, Level 4

All cases	The School will not mark the specific content in the assessment that contains academic misconduct. Students will receive a written warning and one of the following: - The assessment will be marked with the specific content that contains academic misconduct redacted, or - The assessment will receive a mark of zero. Students must also: - Attend a meeting in the School to discuss academic skills. - Engage with Skills@Library resources (website, workshop or 1-1 appointment), or other appropriate resources specified by the School, to develop their academic skills. Schools may direct the student to retake the Academic Integrity Test at the appropriate level. Students are not required to resit to expunge an offence, but may need to resit to satisfy progression requirements: - If the assessment is failed, but the overall module is passed, students may not resit. - If the assessment is failed and is required to be passed, students may resit in line with normal procedure. - If the overall module is failed, students may resit for a capped module mark in line with normal procedure.
-----------	--

	Where students resit, in all cases the assessment component containing academic misconduct is capped at the pass mark. For Foundation/Level 0 programmes, Schools may choose to cap at the progression mark.
--	--

Figure 3: School penalties: all Levels that count towards classification

Assessment-based penalties In cases where there are material substantial mitigating factors.	The School will not mark the specific content in the assessment that contains academic misconduct. Students will receive a written warning and one of the following: - The assessment will be marked with the specific content that contains academic misconduct redacted, or - The assessment will receive a mark of zero. Students must also: - Attend a meeting in the School to discuss academic skills. - Engage with Skills@Library resources (website, workshop or 1-1 appointment), or other appropriate resources specified by the School, to develop their academic skills. Schools may direct the student to retake the Academic Integrity Test at the appropriate level. Students are not required to resit to expunge an offence, but may need to resit to satisfy progression requirements: - If the assessment is failed, but the overall module is passed, students may not resit. - If the assessment is failed and is required to be passed, students may resit in line with normal procedure. - If the overall module is failed, students may resit for a capped module mark in line with normal procedure. Where students resit, in all cases the assessment component containing academic misconduct is capped at the pass mark.
Module-based penalties In cases where there are no material substantial mitigating factors.	The assessment is failed. Students are required to resit the assessment to expunge the offence and one of the following: - The resit assessment will be capped at the pass mark. - The resit assessment will be capped at zero. - The resit will be capped at the pass mark for the module. - The resit will be capped at zero for the module. If students attain a pass standard at resit (before any marks penalty is applied), the module credits are awarded. Students must also: - Retake the Academic Integrity Test at the appropriate level, or engage with other appropriate resources specified by the School, to develop their academic skills. - Retake Using GenAI at Leeds Training, where appropriate and specified by the School.

Figure 4: Committee on Applications penalties – all Levels

Assessment-based penalties In cases where there are material substantial mitigating factors.	The School will not mark the specific content in the assessment that contains academic misconduct. Students will receive a written warning and one of the following: - The assessment will be marked with the specific content that contains academic misconduct redacted, or - The assessment will receive a mark of zero. Students must also: - Attend a meeting in the School to discuss academic skills. - Engage with Skills@Library resources (website, workshop or 1-1 appointment), or other appropriate resources specified by the School, to develop their academic skills. The Committee may direct the student to retake the Academic Integrity Test at the appropriate level. Students are not required to resit to expunge an offence, but may need to resit to satisfy progression requirements: - If the assessment is failed, but the overall module is passed, students may not resit. - If the assessment is failed and is required to be passed, students may resit in line with normal procedure. - If the overall module is failed, students may resit for a capped module mark in line with normal procedure. Where students resit, in all cases the assessment component containing academic misconduct is capped at the pass mark.
Module-based penalties In cases where there are no material substantial mitigating factors.	The assessment is failed. Students are required to resit the assessment to expunge the offence and one of the following: - The resit assessment will be capped at the pass mark. - The resit assessment will be capped at zero. - The resit will be capped at the pass mark for the module. - The resit will be capped at zero for the module. If students attain a pass standard at resit (before any marks penalty is applied), the module credits are awarded. Students must also: - Retake the Academic Integrity Test at the appropriate level, or engage with other appropriate resources specified by the School, to develop their academic skills. - Retake Using GenAI at Leeds training where appropriate and specified by the School.
Level and Award-based penalties	Any combination of penalties including the above and the following: - Requirement to repeat credits or year(s) - Reduction of classification/removal of credits - Exclusion with intermediate concluding qualification - Exclusion without award - Any other suitable penalty proportionate to the circumstances

Penalties and Assessment Regulations

Failed Attempts

- 74. Where an offence has occurred at any level of study that counts towards classification or award and where the student is required to resit to expunge the offence, the attempt in which the offence has occurred cannot receive a mark or credit and will be deemed a failed attempt.
- 75. No more attempts will be permitted than the Academic Regulations provide for a student who has not committed academic misconduct, except where there is a further attempt to expunge an offence.

Expunging the Offence

- 76. Where a student is required to resit an assessment to expunge an offence, the student cannot receive an assessment mark, module mark, credits or award until the offence is expunged through a new attempt.
- 77. A completely new piece of work must be submitted to expunge the offence. The new piece of work must address the learning outcomes of the assessment and be free of academic misconduct. Students cannot graduate until the offence is expunged.
- 78. Where possible, the work should be repeated in the same format it was originally set, and with a new topic or title. Where this is not possible, the School is responsible for providing an alternative form of assessment that is consistent with the learning outcomes of the original assessment, or for ensuring that any resubmission provides sufficient evidence to assess whether the offence has been expunged.
- 79. If an offence is identified in work submitted to expunge an offence it will be investigated through the normal procedure as a second or subsequent offence, and if proven/found the original offence will not be expunged.
- 80. Students who do not expunge an offence, either through non-submission or where the resubmission does not address the learning outcomes of the assessment, will be deemed by the Progression and Awards Board to have failed the award and will be withdrawn from the University.
- 81. If an offence is identified in resit work that has been submitted following an offence, but has not been submitted to expunge an offence, it should be investigated through the normal procedure as a second or subsequent offence.
- 82. A student cannot transfer from or be admitted or re-admitted to a programme while an offence remains unexpunged. A student can however progress to the next level of study if the normal progression rules have been met.
- 83. A student can permanently withdraw from a programme while an offence remains unexpunged, but they cannot receive any credits or award.

Penalties and Award

- 84. Students who complete their degree programme with penalty marks in their profile will be classified normally as specified in the Academic Regulations for Taught Programmes,

with the penalty grade(s) being used in the classification calculation.

85. For programmes with enhanced or non-standard rules that affect eligibility for progression or award, classification may be based on marks obtained after the offence is expunged but before the application of any penalties that reduce the marks or credits awarded.
86. A student cannot take a replacement module to substitute for a module in which an offence has been identified.
87. Where an academic misconduct offence is found in a final attempt at an assessment, one further exceptional attempt is permitted to expunge the offence. The module in question will receive no marks and no credit. Once the offence is expunged, if the student's remaining marks and credits satisfy the requirements for the original award, they will be eligible for the award. Otherwise, an intermediate concluding qualification will be considered.

General Provisions

Ownership of Procedure

88. The administration of the Procedure is undertaken by the Student Cases Team in the Directorate of Governance and Compliance. The Procedure is owned by the Head of Student Cases as nominee of the University Secretary and approved by the Student Education and Experience Committee.

Results, transcripts and awards

89. A student cannot be issued with a transcript or have a degree conferred or an award presented while an allegation(s) remains unresolved. The student's name will not appear on pass lists while an allegation is under consideration.
90. A student can permanently withdraw from a programme while an allegation(s) remains unresolved, but they cannot receive any credits or award. The investigation will be continued and a finding recorded.

Revocation of degrees

91. In the event of an allegation(s) being proved after a student has graduated, any degree or award of the University that is held by the student may be revoked by the Committee.

Retaining papers

92. Students are responsible for retaining copies of their case papers, correspondence and other records.

Supporter

93. Students are expected to respond to the allegations and submit all correspondence personally and they cannot delegate these responsibilities to a third party. This does not affect the student's right to a supporter. All substantive correspondence will be addressed directly to the student personally, but may be copied by a school or by the Student Cases Team to a third party or to the supporter on request.

94. A supporter can be anyone of the student's choosing (e.g. LUU representative, family member, friend, fellow student with no involvement in the allegation), but the supporter can neither act as an advocate for the student nor attend if the student is not present. The supporter may be a member of staff at the University, however a member of staff must not exceed the remit of a supporter at any time and students are advised that there is no advantage in asking a member of staff to act as a supporter.
95. It is the responsibility of the student to invite the supporter to attend any meeting and notify the supporter of the time and place of the meeting (including the joining link, where the meeting is online). The student is responsible for providing any documentation they wish their supporter to receive.
96. The student is responsible for the conduct of their supporter and the University will not pay any costs of a supporter, including legal or other professional fees that a student may have chosen to incur. Students are encouraged to access free, confidential and independent support from Leeds University Union (LUU) Advice.
97. A meeting may be stopped if a supporter does not conduct themselves in accordance with the University's expectations on preventing bullying and harassment. Students may be asked to nominate a new supporter or they may choose to continue without a supporter.

Procedural irregularity

98. If the student believes that a procedural irregularity has occurred at any point in the Procedure, this must be drawn to the attention of the Student Cases Team immediately. Notice of such irregularities embedded in the response or other correspondence or papers will not be accepted. In response the Student Cases Team will either offer an explanation or appropriate action will be taken to ensure that the Procedure is followed. Pending resolution by the Student Cases Team, the case will be halted.
99. Should a student remain dissatisfied with the explanation or action taken to follow procedure, they will have a further right of review when the Committee on Applications outcome is communicated.
100. If a procedural irregularity is raised at or immediately prior to the hearing of the Committee on Applications it will be set aside by the Committee if it is judged that it could have been raised in time for appropriate corrective action to be taken.

Correspondence

101. All correspondence in relation to an allegation will normally be to the student's University email account. It is a student's responsibility to ensure access to their University email account throughout a period of investigation and regularly check their emails. Students whose account is terminated during the procedure should provide an alternative email address.

Anonymous allegations and 'whistleblowing'

102. The University may review anonymous concerns or reports of academic misconduct, but the reporting party should be aware that any potential action will be limited if the University is not able to substantiate the concerns that have been raised. The school may request evidence from the reporting party to support any claims made, and may

discount the claim if no evidence is provided. Any action taken to investigate or substantiate anonymous reports is at the discretion of the school.

Your Data

103. The University holds and retains information about an investigation in accordance with the University Student Privacy Notice. For more information see www.leeds.ac.uk/privacynotice. Personal information about third parties should not be submitted to the University as part of a student case at any stage unless necessary. If third party information is included it must be accompanied by consent for the University to process the data.

Behaviour

104. At the University of Leeds, everyone in our community has the right to study and work in a supportive environment that values compassion and integrity. If there is unacceptable behaviour by a student or their supporter towards any other party in the Procedure, the University reserves the right to suspend or cease consideration of a case, and/or take action under the Student Discipline Procedure.

Where to get help and support

105. Students who are subject to the Academic Misconduct Procedure are advised to seek free, confidential and independent advice from [Leeds University Union](#).
106. General information about the Procedure can be obtained from the [Student Cases team](#). The Student Cases Team will be pleased to give procedural advice but will not comment on or offer advice upon any part of the case itself.

Version control

Title: Taught Students Academic Misconduct Procedure

Document owner: Governance and Compliance

Version: 6

Approved by: PVC Student Education and Experience

Approval date: 17 September 2026