



Registered in England and Wales at
13 North Common Road, Ealing,
London, W5 2QB, Phone: 02088323071

Registered no: 2918520

Registered Charity no: 1050175

Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy and Procedure

Metanoia Institute

Version Control

Document title: Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy Procedure		No of pages:
Version Number: 3	Date first published: -	
Approved by: Academic Board	Last review date: September 2025	
Date originally approved: -	Due for next review: September 2029	

1. Contents

1. Introduction **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
2. Scope **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
3. Timings **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
4. Disability **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
5. Stage 1: Informal resolution..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
6. Stage 2: Formal appeal **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
7. Stage 3: Review **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
8. Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Metanoia Institute is committed to operating in an ethical way in every area to ensure the highest possible standards of decision-making and accountability.
- 1.2 This Policy has been developed to help ensure our students learn about and develop a professional and ethically informed skillset based on fundamental values and principles such as trust, honesty and integrity. This is because being able to work in a professional and ethical way is essential for training in counselling and psychotherapy. As part of this development, it is fundamental that our students know how to learn from and acknowledge others' work in the process of creating their own unique pieces of academic work – and to be truthful about their own contribution.
- 1.3 The Metanoia Institute recognises that academic integrity is a set of learned skills, with honesty, fairness and respect for others and their work at the core. Metanoia Institute will support and guide students to learn the necessary skills through education and reinforcement of learning, the promotion of core values, enabling policies and the appropriate use of technology
- 1.4 In order to demonstrate academic integrity, students must produce their own work, acknowledging explicitly any material that has been included from other sources or legitimate collaboration. Students must also present their own findings, conclusions or data based on appropriate and ethical practice.
- 1.5 Academic misconduct is a breach of the values of academic integrity and can occur when a student cheats in an assessment, or misleads a marker or examiner that the work presented is their own when it is not. It includes, but is not limited to, plagiarism, unauthorised and/or unacknowledged use of generative AI, commissioning or buying work from a third party or copying the work of others or using false data or documentation.
- 1.6 Metanoia's [Academic Regulations](#), Section 11 Infringement of Assessment Regulations/ Academic Misconduct, deals with breaches of academic integrity through instances of academic misconduct and should be read in conjunction with this Policy and Procedure.
- 1.7 Metanoia will take action where it is believed that a student may have contravenes these regulations, intentionally or unintentionally, in any form of assessment. A finding that academic misconduct has occurred is an academic judgement based on available evidence, the standard of proof being the balance of probability.

2. Aims and Purpose

- 2.1 This policy is designed to support staff and students to embed good practice and develop methods for enhancing academic Integrity and it's aims are to:

- a) ensure fair and equal treatment of all students when considering whether academic integrity has been breached.
- b) make clear the types of behaviours that are considered to be academic misconduct.
- c) create a culture of enhancement seeking to learn from cases of academic misconduct and improve the student experience including through appropriate detection training for decision-makers.
- d) ensure clarity in language and process.
- e) uphold fairness, consistency and natural justice in the treatment of the student body as a whole.
- f) maintain awareness through collaboration with support services (academic and non-academic), and visible and accessible central information highlighted to students at relevant key points in the academic year.

3. Principles

- 3.1 Metanoia will provide guidance to students on good academic practice. This will be included in the programme teaching and learning. Students will also be able to access advice and support from the English and Academic Writing Tutor, Study Skills Officer and the Librarians. It is the student's responsibility to make use of the support available and to seek advice on good academic practice should they be unsure of what is required.
- 3.2 Metanoia considers the decision as to whether poor academic practice or unfair or academic misconduct has taken place to be a matter for academic judgement. An academic judgement is defined as any judgment that is made about a matter where only the opinion of an academic expert is sufficient.
- 3.3 The penalties applied where a case of academic misconduct is proven will vary according to the individual case and the seriousness of the offence; see Table at Section 11 below,
- 3.4 Students submitting an assessment will normally be required to accept a statement which confirms that the work they are submitting is their own work.
- 3.5 If academic misconduct is suspected in relation to work submitted by a student, in the interest of helping students to avoid continued acts, cases should be investigated as soon as possible.
- 3.6 Metanoia may make use of specialist systems and tools, such as Turnitin, where it deems it appropriate, to aid in the detection of academic misconduct. Where such systems indicate possible plagiarism or other misconduct, markers must still exercise academic judgement in determining whether academic misconduct has likely taken place.
- 3.7 In group work, where individual members submit parts of the total assignment, each member of a group must take responsibility for checking the legitimacy of the work

submitted in their name. If any part of the work is found to contain academic misconduct, penalties will normally be imposed on all group members equally.

4. Definitions of Types of Academic Misconduct

4.1 The definition and types of academic misconduct as set out in [Metanoia's Academic Regulations](#), Section 11. This information is summarised here for convenience, but reference should always be made to the full text within the Academic Regulations.

4.2 Academic Misconduct is where a student gains or seeks, attempts, intends to gain advantage in relation to assessments or to aid another to gain such an advantage by unfair or improper means.

4.3 The types of academic misconduct include, but are not limited to:

4.3.1 Minor Errors- minor errors arise when a student has attempted to adopt acceptable practices but has failed to do so accurately or fully. Examples include forgetting to insert quotation marks, minor mistakes in referencing or citation, gaps in the bibliography or reference list, non-compliance with some aspects of presentation guidelines.

4.3.2 Collusion- collusion occurs when, unless with official approval (e.g. in the case of group projects), two or more students consciously collaborate in the preparation and production of work which is ultimately represented to be the product of their individual efforts. Collusion also occurs where there is unauthorised co-operation between a student and another person in the preparation and production of work which is presented as the student's own.

4.3.3 Copying- Copying occurs when a student presents as their own work material copied directly from a fellow student or other person without their knowledge. It differs from collusion in that the originator of the copied work is not aware of or party to the copying. Copying of work from published sources would be dealt with as plagiarism.

4.3.4 Dishonest Use of Data: Fabricating or falsifying data or using without permission another person's work. Fabricating or falsifying data to include presenting work that has not taken place. It also includes falsifying attendance sheets for placements, supervision or therapeutic hours.

4.3.5 False declarations- False declarations presented in order to receive special consideration by Assessment Boards. This includes submission of false information to a Mitigating Circumstances panel in order to obtain a deferral or special consideration and requests for exemption from work or attendance.

4.3.6 Plagiarism - Passing off someone else's work, whether intentionally or unintentionally, as your own. Plagiarism occurs when a student misrepresents, as their own work, work

in the public domain, written or otherwise, of any other person. Examples of forms of plagiarism include:

- the verbatim (word for word) copying of another's work without appropriate and correctly presented acknowledgement and citation of the source
- the close paraphrasing of another's work by simply changing a few words or altering the order of presentation, without appropriate and correctly presented acknowledgement and citation of the source;
- failure to reference appropriately or to adequately identify the source of material used;
- unacknowledged quotation of phrases from another's work;
- the presentation of another's concept as one's own.

4.3.7 Self-Plagiarism- Self-plagiarism is when a student submits the same piece of work, or substantial part thereof, for assessment more than once for graded credit.

4.3.8 Purchasing or Commissioning-Purchasing or commissioning is either attempting to purchase or purchasing work for an assessment including, for example from the internet, or attempting to commission, or commissioning someone else to complete an assessment. For courses at all levels, the commissioning of proof-reading, where this substantially alters the content of the original work, whether this is from a commercial provider or a personal contact, falls under this definition and is considered academic misconduct.

5. Categories of Academic Misconduct

5.1 In order to ensure that allegations of academic misconduct are dealt with effectively they have been categorised to enable a response which is proportionate to the severity and impact of the misconduct.

5.2 The categories of academic misconduct are:

5.2.1 Category A, Minor- the misconduct is minor errors in the assessment which appear to arise from the student lacking understanding of academic good practice in the initial stage of their programme.

5.2.2 Category B, Moderate- the misconduct is related to a small portion(s) of the assessment and have limited impact overall.

5.2.3 Category C, Serious- the misconduct is related to a large proportion of the assessment and/or undermines the integrity of the assessment.

5.2.4 Category D, Gross- the misconduct is extensive and/or repetitive and undermines the academic integrity of the Institution.

5.3 The table in Section 11 of this policy provides further guidance on what behaviours may constitute each category of misconduct and the relevant penalties which may be applied.

6. Stage 1 Initial Procedures

- 6.1 Cases of suspected academic misconduct should be evidenced and documented before the procedure is instigated.
- 6.2 Where an internal or external examiner/marker suspects a candidate of misconduct in assessed coursework. They should endorse the candidate's work on the front cover, or as appropriate, with a note detailing the location of any plagiarised passages or any other evidence of misconduct and appending sources where appropriate.
- 6.3 They should then discuss the allegation with the Module Leader (ML) in order to confirm the likelihood of misconduct and determine the likely category of misconduct. Where the marker/examiner is the Module Leader, they should discuss the allegation with the Head of Programme.
- 6.4 Where there are concerns that submitted work may not be the student's own, it is permissible for a marker to undertake a viva voce discussion of the assessment with the student before an allegation is reported. This should normally be discussed and agreed with the Module Leader/HoP in advance. The purpose of the viva voca discussion is to assist the marker in consolidating their view as to whether it is likely the work in question is the student's own. The viva voca discussion must not be treated as a formal hearing to consider academic misconduct rather it is only to help inform the decision of the marker about whether or not to make an allegation of misconduct. Student's invited for a viva voca discussion should be provided advanced notice of the meeting and the reason for it.
- 6.5 The ML should complete an Allegation of Academic Misconduct Form. This must include details of the allegation, the suggested category of misconduct, the marker's/ MLs reasons for concluding that misconduct is likely and appending any supporting evidence. As an example of appropriate evidence, for a written assessment this might include the student's submitted work, a Turnitin Report and the uncredited sources identified by Turnitin. It will be up to the judgement of the marker/ML as to what evidence is provided with the report.
- 6.6 The deadline by which a report of an allegation of academic misconduct should be submitted to the Registry should normally be no later than 4 weeks after the submission deadline date for that component of assessment and before the release of provisional marks.
- 6.7 Exceptionally, where evidence of serious or gross academic misconduct is discovered after the deadline for submission of an allegation as set out above in 6.6, an allegation may be pursued retrospectively under these procedures. Where a student has already graduated, the outcome may result in the revoking of a qualification already awarded

7. Stage 2 for Minor Misconduct (Category A) Only

- 7.1 Where the marker and Module Leader/HoP concur that the allegation is likely to be Category A, minor misconduct in assessed coursework, they should report the allegation to Registry as set out above. The Module Leader is then able to undertake the following actions.
- 7.2 The student should be called in to meet with the Module Leader or their nominee and the concerns regarding the work should be discussed. The student should be given support and guidance in appropriate academic good practice, along with signposting to appropriate resources and support services. The aim is to assist the student to improve their understanding and skills in academic good practice so that they may avoid errors in future.
- 7.3 The ML should advise Registry that the meeting with the student has taken place for recording purposes, in order for Registry to close the case.
- 7.4 Repeated Category A misconduct should be considered as a higher category of misconduct where the student has already received support and guidance under this provision of the procedure and continues in their poor practice or where the student is at higher stages of their programme and reasonably should be familiar with the expectations of good academic practice.

8. Stage 2 for Other Categories of Misconduct (Categories B-D)

- 8.1 Where the ML/HoP confirms the allegation would likely be Category B – D misconduct the case should be referred to the Registry for investigation.
- 8.2 In place of a provisional grade for the work submitted the students will receive notification from the marker that their work is under investigation for Academic Misconduct.
- 8.3 Whilst an investigation is being carried out, the Assessment Board should note that an allegation is being investigated and defer any judgement regarding the module outcome and any decision of progression or award.
- 8.4 A holding grade of U (allegation of academic misconduct under investigation) should be entered on the student's module record (for cross- reference with other alleged infringements).

8.5 Procedure for investigation by the Academic Misconduct Panel:

- 8.5.1 As soon as reasonably practicable following receipt of any allegation of Category B-D misconduct an Academic Misconduct Panel shall be convened. The Panel will consist of a Head of Programme (Chair) and two experienced members of academic staff from outside the student's programme with no experience of teaching or assessing the student. The Panel will be supported by a secretary drawn from Registry and Academic Services.
- 8.5.2 The Panel will review the allegation and decide if there are reasonable grounds, at first sight, to suggest the student contravened assessment regulations.

8.5.3 If the Academic Misconduct Panel determines there are no reasonable grounds, they shall dismiss the case and request the Assessment Board to consider the work on its academic merits and remove all record of the alleged misconduct from the student's record.

8.5.4 If the Academic Misconduct Panel determines there are reasonable grounds to suggest the candidate may have contravened the regulations in assessment, they shall confirm the category of misconduct and write to the student(s) concerned:

- To put the allegation.
- If appropriate, to enclose copies of any evidence or report.
- To request a written statement to explain how the allegation may have arisen, stating any mitigating circumstances which may be taken into account when considering a penalty (authenticated evidence to be provided where appropriate).
- To request a reply within 10 working days of the date on which the letter is sent and explaining the consequences of failure to reply.

8.6 Student Response

8.6.1 If a written reply to the allegation is not received from the student within 10 working days of the date on which the letter is sent, or if the student replies accepting the allegation, the Academic Misconduct Panel shall consider an appropriate penalty on the basis of the guidance provided in Section 11 below.

8.6.2 For Category B and C offences, where the penalty does not involve retaking a module, the Academic Misconduct Panel will have the authority to impose a penalty and inform both the relevant Assessment Board and the student of the outcome.

8.6.3 For Category B & C offences, where the penalty involves the student retaking the module, the Academic Misconduct Panel should submit a report to the relevant Assessment Board regarding their decision and recommending a penalty

8.6.4 For Category D offences, the Academic Misconduct Panel should submit a report to the relevant Assessment Board regarding their decision and make a recommendation regarding the appropriate penalty.

8.6.5 If the student does reply within the time limit denying the charge the Academic Misconduct Panel will proceed and convene a full Panel Hearing.

8.7 Academic Misconduct Panel Hearing

8.7.1 Following 8.6. above, an Academic Misconduct Panel Hearing will be convened

8.7.2 Staff involved in the assessment of the student shall be required to attend as witnesses.

- 8.7.3 The student will be given 10 working days' notice of the date, time, place and Panel membership, together with any documents to be consulted by the Panel. The Panel meeting may take place in person or on-line at the discretion of the Chair.
- 8.7.4 The student may object to the appointment of members of the Panel and to the date giving grounds for the objection. However, any change to the arrangement is solely at the discretion of the Chair of the Panel.
- 8.7.5 Due notice of the Panel hearing will be considered to have been given on sending the notice and supporting information to the student's Metanoia email address or, for those students without a Metanoia account, to the email address held for them on the student records system Quercus. At the discretion of the Panel the case may then be heard whether or not the student attends the meeting.
- 8.7.6 All proceedings and papers associated with the meeting shall be strictly confidential to those invited to attend.
- 8.7.7 The student has the right to be accompanied by a supporter to the hearing. The supporter is intended to support and assist the student and will not normally be permitted to participate directly in the proceedings. The supporter will normally be another student or staff member with no connection to the case. Legal representation is not normally allowed at a Panel meeting.
- 8.7.8 The student shall have the right to submit oral or written evidence to the Panel during the meeting.
- 8.7.9 The Panel Chair has discretion to organise the meeting as they see fit in order to achieve the principal aims of a hearing:
- i. to clarify evidence as necessary by questioning those who have submitted it;
 - ii. to enable the student to dispute the allegation;
 - iii. to enable the Panel to reach a decision.
- 8.7.10 Recording of the meeting by any means shall be prohibited.
- 8.7.11 The Panel shall consider its decision in private after the evidence has been heard and shall reach a decision in the light of the evidence presented and on the balance of probabilities, whether the student infringed assessment regulations. If the Panel cannot reach a unanimous decision, a majority decision is sufficient.
- 8.7.12 The Panel may reach one of the following decisions:
- a) That there was not academic misconduct on the part of the student.
 - b) That there was academic misconduct on the part of the student.
 - c) Where misconduct is found, the Panel is able to change the Category of misconduct, from that which was originally assigned, where they consider the information gained in the Panel meeting, makes it reasonable to do so.

- d) Where misconduct is found, the Panel will consider the guidance on Penalties below (Section 11) and recommend a penalty appropriate to all the circumstances of the case.
- e) The Panel may consider whether the nature of the academic misconduct would reasonably raise concerns about the student's Fitness to Practice and referral to the Fitness to Practice Procedure is appropriate in the circumstances.
- f) The Panel may consider whether the nature of the academic misconduct would reasonably also be considered a breach of the Student Code of Conduct and referral to the Student Disciplinary Procedure is appropriate in the circumstances.

8.7.13 The student will normally be informed of the decision of the Panel, which will be in the form of a recommendation to the Assessment Board, within five working days of the Panel meeting.

9. Decision of the Assessment Board following a Misconduct Finding

9.1 Where an allegation of academic misconduct is not sustained following the Panel Hearing, the student's work shall be assessed on its academic merit, and all record of the alleged misconduct shall be removed from the student's record.

9.2 Where an allegation of academic misconduct is sustained, either by admission of the student or following investigation, the Assessment Board shall:

- a) Accept the decision of the Panel where the Panel is empowered to impose a penalty (8.6.5.2)
- b) Receive the recommendation of the Panel regarding penalty where the Panel is not empowered to impose a penalty (8.6.5.3, 8.6.5.4 and 8.7.11c) and to reach a decision as to the penalty to be imposed on the student.
- c) Any reassessment opportunities following an Assessment Board's decision to fail the student in one or more units of assessment as the result of a finding of Academic Misconduct shall be at the absolute discretion of the Assessment Board as permitted within the Academic Regulations.
- d) Should an Assessment Board decide that a student be expelled from the Metanoia Institute for Academic Misconduct then the Assessment Board Chair will inform the Academic Board. The Academic Board will issue the notification of expulsion. Copies of the notification shall be sent to the appropriate Head of Programme.
- e) Assessment Boards should report all its decisions related to Academic Misconduct to the Academic Board for recording and monitoring purposes.

9.3 Where the Panel considers it appropriate to refer a case to the Fitness to Practice Procedure or Student Disciplinary Procedure. The Panel Secretary will advise the

Registrar and the evidence considered by the Panel and its decision will form the basis of a Report Conduct Cause for Concern in order to start the next Procedure.

10. Appeals

- 10.1 A student may appeal against the decision of the Assessment Board, as set out in 9.2 above, to impose a penalty for Academic Misconduct under this Procedure. Such an appeal should be made through the [Academic Appeal Procedure](#).

11. Guidelines for penalties for Academic Misconduct

Category	Examples	Key Indicators	Outcomes
CATEGORY A Minor Misconduct	• Reproducing an existing concept or idea unintentionally • Failure to adequately reference sources, including incomplete or incorrectly cited bibliographies, footnotes and/or quotations • Several sentences of direct copying without acknowledging the source • Several instances of inappropriate or unacknowledged paraphrasing • Unacknowledged proof reading by another person • Unacknowledged help with English language accuracy • Errors likely to have arisen from inexperience	• The student has likely not yet learned about the importance of referencing or has misunderstood the referencing or paraphrasing principles. • The student's behaviour is on an insignificant scale • The student is in the 1st year of programme • The student is not used to UK academic culture	• Tutorial support and guidance to help the student understand what is and is not acceptable. • Written advice for the student on where they can seek help • Warning regarding penalties for Academic Misconduct offences
	• Several paragraphs of direct copying without acknowledging the source (including one's own previously submitted work on another assignment)	• The student's behaviour will not have a significant impact on their module outcome or final award.	• Normally a mark of P for that module with the opportunity to resubmit the affected component. Resubmitted component will be capped at the pass mark if passed.

CATEGORY B Moderate Misconduct	• Several paragraphs of unacknowledged paraphrasing of another person's thoughts, ideas or text. • An assignment that has been translated into English by another person • An assignment that has been edited by another person • Submitting the same piece of work for assessment for more than one assignment. • Collusion • Repeated Minor Misconduct, particularly if the student has been previously referred for guidance under Category A.		• Where the student has already been given the opportunity to resubmit a failed component, the Board will normally, subject to Programme Regulations, award P for the module with the opportunity to repeat the module, or an alternative. All repeat, or alternative modules will be capped at the pass mark and charged full fees. • Warning that further offences will have serious consequences for final qualification
	• Large sections of unacknowledged paraphrasing of another person's ideas or text • Presentation of the work of other students, commercial or industry practitioners without acknowledgement • Deliberate falsifying of data or using another person's work without permission.	• The student's behaviour appears intentional and on a significant scale • The student would benefit substantially from the offence • The student's behaviour would significantly compromise the integrity of the University's awards • The student had been warned and/or	• Normally a mark of P for that module with the opportunity to resubmit the component. The module will be capped at the pass mark if the resubmission is passed. • Where the student has already been given the opportunity to resubmit, or for substantial plagiarism in a project or dissertation, the Board will normally, subject to Programme Regulations, award P for the module with the opportunity to repeat the module, or an

CATAGORY C Serious Misconduct	•Breach of Examination Room rules •Conspiring or colluding with others to commit any of the above •Repeated Moderate Misconduct, particularly if the student has been previously reprimanded •False declarations in order to receive special consideration by Assessment Boards, including deferrals and requests for exemption from work.	reprimanded for previous moderate misconduct.	alternative. All repeat, or alternative modules will be capped at the pass mark and charged full fees Or, for the most serious misconduct: •A mark of P for all modules at that level/stage with the opportunity to repeat the Level/stage. All repeat modules will be capped at the pass mark and charged full fees. •Exceptionally, the Board may, at its discretion and for reasonable cause, decide that a candidate may not be reassessed.
CATEGORY D Gross Misconduct	•Submitting an assignment purchased or downloaded from the internet. •Substantial Plagiarism in a Postgraduate Dissertation •Commissioning another person to produce a piece of work. •Theft of the work of other students or the work of commercial or industry practitioners •Copyright Theft •Fraud, including impersonation and misrepresentation of identity	• The student's behaviour appears intentional and on a significant scale •The student would benefit substantially from the offence •The student's behaviour would significantly compromise the integrity of the University's award. • The student has been warned and/or reprimanded for previous attempts to deceive	• A mark of P for that module and repeat Module with new registration, capped at the pass mark, and full fee payable. • Termination of studies and award exit qualification • Expulsion with no award • Revoking a previously awarded degree

	•Breach of Examination Room Rules •Conspiring or colluding with others to commit any of the above •Repeated Serious Misconduct, particularly if the student has been previously reprimanded		
--	---	--	--

- a) The minimum penalty imposed shall normally exceed that which would follow if the student had merely failed the assessment.
- b) Panels should normally recommend the least severe penalty they consider appropriate for the misconduct and any relevant circumstances.
- c) All confirmed offences must be recorded on the student's record as grade P. This grade to remain throughout the student's registration at the Metanoia Institute.
- d) All records of disproved offences must be deleted from the student record.
- e) A student may appeal against the decision of the Assessment Board to impose a penalty. (see Section 10 above)