

BPP University – University Policies and Procedures

Research and Scholarship Ethics and Integrity Policy



Scope	Students/Staff
Approved Date	July 2024
Approving Authority	Education and Standards Committee
Date Effective	September 2024
Review Date	July 2027
Document Owner	Proctor's Office
Purpose	Outlines the University's policy and procedure in relation to ensuring scholarly and research activity upholds good standards of integrity, ensuring it is ethically approved, and the approach taken when integrity of research conduct is in question.

Regulatory Mapping

BPP University General Academic Regulations
Section E: Examinations, Assessment & Academic Integrity

BPP University
University Policies and Procedures
Research and Scholarship Ethics and Integrity Policy

1. Introduction	2
2. Good Research and Scholarship Conduct	3
3. Ethical Review of Research and Scholarship with Human Participants	4
3.1. <i>Introduction</i>	4
3.2. <i>Key Principles for Consideration</i>	5
3.3. <i>Supervisor/Lead Researcher Responsibilities</i>	7
3.4. <i>Co-investigator Responsibilities</i>	7
3.5. <i>Application Process and Approach – Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught Programmes</i>	8
3.6. <i>Application Process and Approach – Staff Research Projects</i>	9
3.7. <i>Outcomes and post-approval revisions</i>	10
4. Research and Scholarship Misconduct Process	11
4.1. <i>Introduction</i>	11
4.2. <i>Definition of Research and Scholarship Misconduct</i>	12
4.3. <i>Procedure for Raising Concerns of Research and Scholarship Misconduct</i>	13
4.4. <i>Initial Investigation of Alleged Concerns:</i>	15
4.5. <i>The Panel Hearing:</i>	16
Policy Revision History	19

1. Introduction

- 1.1. The University is committed to the promotion of both research and scholarship within its learning and teaching activities. For example, this may include research activity undertaken by staff in pursuit of the scholarship goals outlined in the University's Academic Development Plan (ADP) and associated strategies¹ or may relate to research undertaken by students at the University during their studies (e.g., dissertation, research project). Please note that for purpose of the BPP University context, the term research is interchangeable with scholarship/scholarly activity.
- 1.2. All research and scholarship undertaken at the University is expected to meet the highest standards both academically and ethically. The purpose of this policy is to

¹ [BPP ADP and Strategies](#)

establish the principles of good research and scholarship conduct, how research and scholarship misconduct is managed by the University, and the process of ethical review for research and scholarly activity with human participants that is required to have oversight.

- 1.3. This policy applies to all members of the University (students, staff, and associated individuals) who conduct research and scholarship activity under the auspices of BPP University.
- 1.4. Scholarship and research activity at the University should be considerate of the principles of academic freedom and freedom of speech as outlined in the General Academic Regulations (GARs), [Section G: Rights and Duties, Point 2., Academic Freedom and Freedom of Speech Rights](#). A corresponding University Policy and Procedure on [Academic Freedom and Freedom of Speech Policy](#) should also be consulted.

2. Good Research and Scholarship Conduct

- 2.1. All research and scholarship activity conducted at the University should follow five core principles informed by the Concordat to Support Research Integrity (referred to as the Concordat from this point onwards)²:
 - a) **Honesty**: researchers must always be honest in the development, conduct, and dissemination of their research. Where work is done that incorporates the work of other researchers, this should be acknowledged, and claims made in research should be based on research findings that have been derived from honest research practices.
 - b) **Rigour**: researchers should be rigorous in their research practices (both when conducting research and disseminating research) which should be in line with disciplinary norms and standards.
 - c) **Transparency and open communication**: researchers should be transparent in their research practices, declaring any competing interests, and maintain transparency in the ways in which they analyse, interpret, and disseminate their research findings.

² [Universities UK Concordat to Support Research Integrity](#)

- d) **Care and respect:** for all that are involved in, and who will benefit from the research. A researcher's activities should in particular prioritise care and respect for any participants involved in the research, or any referent group within the research.
- e) **Accountability:** the researcher, the University, and any associated parties involved in the conduct of the research (e.g., funders), are responsible for creating a research environment that empowers researchers to pursue their research goals, but also an environment that holds those involved in research to account when behaviour falls short of the expectations as laid out in this policy and the broader research concordat.

2.2. Where a researcher is considered in breach of these principles, they will be referred to the Research and Scholarship Misconduct Process (see Section 4) for investigation. The process provides examples of what research and scholarship misconduct constitutes and is clear on the approach and potential sanctions where research and scholarship misconduct are found. Ignorance to the principles of research and scholarship integrity will not be justification for instances of research misconduct.

3. Ethical Review of Research and Scholarship with Human Participants

3.1. *Introduction*

3.1.1. Where research involves human participants ethical review and approval is compulsory and the following section of this policy outlines the principles and procedure required.

3.1.2. The University identifies two ethical frameworks of guidance for use when considering ethical issues for research. Members of the University should consider which framework best suits the type of human research they are engaged in and cite this in their application. These are:

1. The [British Educational Research Association \(BERA\) Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research](#); and,
2. The [British Psychological Society's \(BPS\) Code of Human Research Ethics](#)

3.1.3. Aside of these ethical frameworks, where a member of the University has a specific framework their professional or disciplinary body subscribes to, this will take primacy and should be used. Reference to this alternative framework should be provided in the application.

- 3.1.4. Please note if you require a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check as your research involves working with vulnerable groups or children, you must have received this prior to your application being submitted. Please contact the Proctor's Office to arrange this if it is required.
- 3.1.5. Note on conducting research on sites external to BPP: The University understand that ethical consideration and approval may be required from the University prior to being able to receive consideration and approval from external research sites. In such cases, the University Proctor will consider the application and if acceptable will conditionally approve it on the basis that you receive permission to conduct research on those sites following BPP's confirmation. Confirmation of permission from those sites will however be required for full ethical approval to come into effect.
- 3.1.6. Note on external researchers wishing to access BPP students, staff, and premises for the purpose of research: A request must be submitted to the University Proctor for review, and this will be required to be presented to the BPP Legal Department for consideration. You should not access BPP students, staff, and premises for the purpose of research without the explicit permission of the University Proctor and BPP Legal Department.

3.2. *Key Principles for Consideration*

- 3.2.1. Whilst the ethical frameworks outlined in Section 3.1. of this policy provide more detailed guidance on matters for consideration when developing and conducting human research, this section of the policy outlines the key principles for consideration of any research to be conducted by University members or external parties working with University members. These are non-exhaustive and in addition one of the relevant frameworks in Section 3.1., or the ethical guidelines of the disciplinary or regulatory body, the researcher is operating within should be consulted in full alongside these principles when developing a research proposal and ethical application for human research.

1. Participant Autonomy: Participants must be able to choose to participate in the research with informed consent and without coercion or penalty for not participating. Participants should be able to withdraw at any point during or after the research has taken place, without requiring a reason and without detriment to themselves. Participants must be recruited fairly and must not be exploited.
2. Informed Consent: Arrangements for participants to provide informed consent must be included in research design and conduct. Researchers must select appropriate

means of communication appropriate to participants that ensure they are fully informed before decided whether or not to participate. Research participants must have the capacity to do so, which means they have the ability to comprehend and retain information relating to the decision to take part in the research. Valid consent means that a participant has consciously agreed to take part in the research from an informed position and has the capacity to do so. The participant should also have the capacity to make an informed decision at any point both during and after the research to withdraw.

3. **Research Benefit:** Research must be worthwhile and beneficial effects of the research should outweigh any possible risks. Responsibilities to the participants, the institution, the sponsors, clients, and stakeholders to research, and the broader research community and third parties should be considered carefully. Researchers should ask what significant value this research adds to the lives of those involved and the wider society it affects in determining whether it should take place.
4. **Harm Mitigation:** Any potential harms to participants or researchers must be avoided or mitigated by robust measures and precautionary action. Where for example deception is involved in the research study (e.g., in order for the participant to fully participate they cannot be knowledgeable of the exact aims of the research), this must be justified, and all potential risks around this should be mitigated. For example, a participant should be fully debriefed and provided with relevant support following the study. Potential harms to researchers conducting the research should also be carefully considered, and how those aim to be mitigated.
5. **Confidentiality:** Participants have a right to confidentiality and assurances that their personal data are kept safe, stored securely, and shared only with members of the research team for the purposes of the research. Where data is to be shared beyond this must be justified and can only be done with the explicit agreement of the participant. For example, should a concern for the participant's safety and wellbeing arise during the study, mechanisms should be put in place to explain to the participant that there will be instances where confidentiality is not possible, and participants should be aware of this ahead of participating in the study (e.g., where a concern for wellbeing emerges the University or third parties may need to be contacted to ensure this wellbeing). Considerations around data collection, storage, and the limits of confidentiality should therefore be explicitly outlined in the ethical application.

6. Integrity: There must be transparency regarding any known personal, financial, institutional, or other gains, to be made from the research. There must also be acknowledgement of the relevant contributions of third parties involved in the project, and that research outcomes are disseminated appropriately. Transparency also extends to the research itself, especially with regard to the aims, methods, results, and research outcomes. Researchers must act with integrity and demonstrate how they will achieve this in their ethical application.

3.3. *Supervisor/Lead Researcher Responsibilities*

- 3.3.1. Each project submitted for ethical review must have a supervisor (in the case of students), as the lead applicant. For staff led projects, this will in most cases be the member of staff wishing to conduct the research and managing the project. For projects involving students (e.g., dissertations, research projects) a member of staff with the capacity to do so (e.g., tutor, lecturer etc) will be the principal investigator, with the student named as a co-investigator on the project. The member of staff will be the lead and corresponding individual for the application.
- 3.3.2. It should be clear in the application who is responsible for what in the project, and how those responsibilities are being managed and overseen.
- 3.3.3. The principal investigator is responsible for oversight of the project management and ensuring research is conducted with integrity in line with the principles of the project. Where they have concerns about the conduct of co-investigators on the project, they must raise these in line with the research misconduct process as soon as they become aware of these concerns. They will also act as the correspondent with participants and other associated third parties where concerns about research conduct of co-investigators is reported.

3.4. *Co-investigator Responsibilities*

- 3.4.1. Co-investigators whilst under the supervision of principal investigators must abide by the principles of research integrity and ethical review as outlined in this policy. Where they have concerns about the conduct of the research project, they must raise these in line with the research misconduct process, either through the principal investigator or where a conflict of interest occurs, through the relevant party as outlined.
- 3.4.2. It should be clearly stated on the application how the co-investigator is involved in the research and what they will have oversight and management over in the project.

3.5. *Application Process and Approach – Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught Programmes*

3.5.1. The University operates a supervisor-led process of review for undergraduate and postgraduate taught projects that are a component of their degree programme.

3.5.2. The student should complete the Application for Ethical Review for Research Involving Human Participants in partnership with their supervisor. These forms are available on the University's Policies and Procedures Webpage. This application consists of the following documents:

- Application Form
- Participant Information Sheet
- Consent Form
- Privacy Notice
- Indicative Research Materials (e.g., proposed research questions, questionnaire, outline of procedure participants will be taking part in and any stimuli that will be presented)

3.5.3. Once the application has been completed, this should be submitted for desk-based review to the supervisor, and the supervisor will assess this in line with the risk-based criteria. A decision will be made following review along the following lines:

- Ethical approval granted in line with risk-based criteria.
- Ethical approval provisionally granted subject to the satisfaction of minor revisions. Ethical approval will not be granted until these minor revisions have been completed and research should not commence until the supervisor has agreed.
- Ethical approval not granted and there should be a complete revision and resubmission in line with guidance provided.
- Referral to University Ethics Panel for consideration as the potential risk involved requires full review.

3.5.4. Risk-based criteria requiring ethical review by the University Ethics Panel – if the project involves the following criteria, the ethical application will need to be submitted to the University Ethics Panel for review:

- The research involves vulnerable groups.
- The research involves sensitive topics – such as participants’ sexual behaviour, political behaviour, potential breach of university regulations, potential illegal behaviour, experience of violence, issues on exploitation or abuse experiences, mental health, or issues linked to their protected characteristics for example. Please consult the relevant ethical guidance on what constitutes sensitive topics.
- Research involving groups where permission of a gatekeeper is normally required for initial access to members. For example, ethnic or cultural groups, or indigenous communities.
- Research involving deception or which is conducted without the participants’ full informed consent at the time the study is carried out.
- Research involving access to records of personal or confidential information.
- Research which could induce psychological stress, anxiety or humiliation, or cause psychological or physical pain.

3.5.5. Supervisors should consult with their School Ethics Lead where they require further clarification on the above criteria. The School Ethics Lead will be able to advise on whether the project is low-risk and does not require review by the University Ethics Committee or not. If there is any uncertainty on the supervisor’s part, the School Ethics Lead should be consulted.

3.5.6. It is important to note that where it is found a project has been categorised as low-risk by a supervisor when it is knowingly considered as requiring full ethical review from the University Ethics Committee, action will be taken under the research integrity and misconduct rules in Section 4.

3.5.7. If the supervisor has assessed the project to be low risk, the application should be recorded using the University Ethics Committee’s local arrangements.

3.5.8. Where full ethical review is required from the University Ethics Committee, please follow this policy from 3.6.2.

3.6. *Application Process and Approach – Staff Research Projects*

3.6.1. Staff members should complete the Application for Ethical Review for Research Involving Human Participants in partnership with any colleagues involved. These forms are available on the University’s Policies and Procedures Webpage, and on Connect. This application consists of the following documents:

- Application Form
- Participant Information Sheet
- Consent Form
- Privacy Notice
- Indicative Research Materials (e.g., proposed research questions, questionnaire, outline of procedure participants will be taking part in and any stimuli that will be presented)

3.6.2. Once the application has been completed, this should be submitted for desk-based review to the University Ethics Committee, and the allocated reviewer will assess this and provide an outcome. A decision will be made following review along the following lines:

- Ethical approval granted.
- Ethical approval provisionally granted subject to the satisfaction of minor revisions. Ethical approval will not be granted until these minor revisions have been completed and research should not commence until confirmation has been provided by the Proctor's Office.
- Ethical approval not granted and there should be a complete revision and resubmission in line with guidance provided. A full re-review will take place following resubmission.

3.6.3. Where reviewer has significant concerns with a proposed research project, they are to raise this with the University Proctor, who will review the application and have the final decision as to whether a research project may receive ethical approval or not.

3.7. *Outcomes and post-approval revisions*

3.7.1. Where applications are granted, researchers may conduct their project during the period within which ethical approval has been granted. Should the research extend beyond the ethical approval period, the researchers will need to seek written permission to extend this period. There may as part of this process be a request to resubmit the original ethical application with a cover letter outlining the rationale as to

why the study required to have extended ethical approval, but this should only occur where aims and methods are being adjusted.

- 3.7.2. Following the commencement of the research, where changes to the aims and methods occur during the ethical approval period that are not in line with the original application, the original application is to be resubmitted to the Pro-Proctor or delegate with a cover letter outlining what has changed and the implications of this. Being granted ethical approval does not mean researchers can then alter their aims and methods away from the original intended approach without permission from the ethics convenor or delegate.
- 3.7.3. Appeals for rejected applications by a reviewer for ethical approval can be made to the University Proctor, who will review the application and decision, and decide as to whether the outcome was valid. Where the outcome was deemed to be invalid on appeal, then the University Proctor has the power to review the application through the ethical review process themselves and make a new decision as to the outcome of the application.

4. Research and Scholarship Misconduct Process

4.1. Introduction

- 4.1.1. Research and scholarship misconduct is unacceptable and will not be tolerated by the University and there is a zero tolerance of dishonest academic and research and scholarship practices. The process outlined here relates to the investigation process and not the disciplinary process. The purpose of the process is to safeguard the research and scholarship record, determine whether research and scholarship misconduct has taken place in response to alleged concerns, and support any corrective action that is to take place if research and scholarship misconduct is found.
- 4.1.2. Where research and scholarship misconduct are found the outcome of the investigation and hearing will result in referrals to other university disciplinary processes for sanction and corrective action, and the evidence gathered from the research and scholarship misconduct process will be entered into evidence as part of deliberations under those processes. For research and scholarship misconduct involving members of staff, referral will be made to BPP's Disciplinary Policy and Procedure. For research misconduct involving students, referral will be made to either the University's Academic Practice Policy where concerns relating to academic integrity arise, or the University's Student Conduct Policy where concerns sit outside of academic integrity.

4.1.3. A key aim of this procedure is to protect the integrity of the research and scholarship record, and consequently where concerns are raised with respect to research or scholarship of a member of staff or student who has left the University, the University is within its rights to investigate the concern raised. Once an investigation has been initiated, it will be completed, regardless of the following:

- a) The Complainant withdrawing the allegation at any stage.
- b) The Respondent admitting the alleged misconduct in full or in part.
- c) The Respondent or Complainant resigning, or having resigned, from the University.

4.1.4. The balance of probabilities will be the burden of proof in any investigation to determine whether research and scholarship misconduct has occurred or not.

4.2. *Definition of Research and Scholarship Misconduct*

4.2.1. Research and scholarship misconduct is defined as committing one of the following acts, although these definitions are not exhaustive, and where concerns regarding research and scholarship conduct arise, these will be considered in line with the principles of Section 2 of this policy. Ignorance to knowledge of what research and scholarship misconduct is shall not be a valid defence for having committed research and scholarship misconduct:

- Misappropriation of the materials, resources, and/or the work of others.
- Fabrication and/or falsification at any point of the research process, including reporting its outcomes. This includes misrepresenting either explicitly or implicitly credentials, qualifications, and/or experience.
- Failure to comply with relevant legal and ethical requirements both internal and external to the University. This includes not obtaining and adhering to ethical approvals, licenses, or legally binding agreements set out in research contracts or agreements.
- Failure to comply with relevant University policies in relation to research, health and safety, and relevant policies that may be breached because of research and scholarship misconduct. This is particularly acute where failure to follow policy results in unreasonable risk of harm to humans.
- Ethically and/or morally inappropriate use of research data or the outcomes of research or scholarship work (e.g., identifying participants in data where

confidentiality was assured, or trying to re-identify and contact participants who are anonymised in data from other research studies).

- Collusion in, or deliberate concealment, of research and scholarship misconduct by others.
- Making a malicious allegation of unfounded research and scholarship misconduct.
- Retaliation against others who have raised a concern about research and scholarship misconduct.
- Actions that attempt to mislead any investigation into research and scholarship misconduct.

The following are NOT instances of research and scholarship misconduct:

- Unintentional error.
- Debate, discussion, or professional difference in interpretation or judgement.
- Holding and disseminating controversial and/or unpopular opinions (see the University's Policy on Academic Freedom).
- Pre-submission disputes about co-authorship.

4.3. *Procedure for Raising Concerns of Research and Scholarship Misconduct*

4.3.1. Where a concern of research and scholarship misconduct emerges, the University Proctor should be notified in writing of the concern and any evidence to substantiate those concerns. This will normally be completed within 10 working days of the concern being raised. Should this decision require longer consideration, the University Proctor will write to the complainant and outline the reasons why and the date by which they will be expected to receive an update on action to be considered.

4.3.2. The University Proctor will then proceed with one of the following actions:

- a) There is a case to be heard, and an investigation shall take place to consider the concerns. The University Proctor will then appoint an investigative officer to examine the concerns.
- b) Further information is required from the complainant with respect to the concern before the University Proctor can make a judgement.
- c) There is no case to be heard, and it should be dismissed. Where a concern arises as to whether this case is vexatious, the University shall make a decision as to

whether a subsequent investigation is to take place into the complainant if a member of University staff or students. This will be proceeded under the relevant University policy as determined by the University Proctor.

- 4.3.3. Those involved are expected to co-operate with the process, and where there is lack of co-operation by those involved, this in itself may represent an offence under the terms of this policy, and the University may take action under the terms of this policy as a result. Furthermore, should the those involved in the case choose not to co-operate or respond to the University's requests as part of this process, then the University can progress and conclude the process in the involved parties absence.
- 4.3.4. The University does however understand that the essential importance of involved parties input into an investigation may be affected by issues that prevent them from engaging and the University will show flexibility within reasonable means to support involved parties in engaging fully, for example by extending timelines to the process within reason or making reasonable adjustments to elements of the process to support their needs. The University recognises however that processes cannot be extended indefinitely as this may affect the ability of the process to effectively conclude the concerns raised so as not to have a detrimental impact on the parties involved. The University will therefore not delay a process beyond a period of three months from the point the involved parties advise us they cannot engage with the investigation. Following this three-month period, the investigation will resume and proceed to conclusion, even if the involved parties in question are absent.
- 4.3.5. Involved parties have a right to be accompanied to any related meeting, for support, by another member of the University under the following terms:
 - a) For students, a fellow student unconnected to the concern raised;
 - b) For staff and students, a member of staff of the University unconnected to the concern raised;
 - c) For students, a member of the Students' Association of the University.
 - d) For staff, an accompanying individual unconnected to the incident that Human Resources deem permissible under the University's regulations.
- 4.3.6. Accompanying persons must abide by the following principles:
 - a) They are there for the purposes of supporting the individual, and are not normally expected to participate in the meeting;
 - b) They are not to be a legal practitioner of any kind;

- c) They are not to have been involved in the alleged concern raised.
- 4.3.7. Any electronic (audio or video) recording of any meeting is forbidden. Any electronic recordings of meetings will not be admissible to the investigation and they will not form part of the process or decision-making. Furthermore, any recording of the meeting may constitute an offence under the terms of this policy. All meetings will be recorded by a written minute of the meeting which will be circulated to all parties in attendance at the meeting, where decisions and actions will be recorded. All those involved in the meeting will have the opportunity to check those minutes for factual accuracy.
- 4.4. *Initial Investigation of Alleged Concerns:*
- 4.4.1. The Investigative Officer will meet/seek to meet with the complainant making the allegation in order to gather information about the allegation in person. Where it is not possible for the Investigative Officer to meet in person with the complainant making the allegation, an investigation may still proceed if it is possible for sufficient information to be obtained through other means. Where a complainant making an allegation does not, cannot or refuses to meet with the Investigative Officer, and/or insufficient information is provided to the investigation regarding the allegation, the investigative officer may decide that the allegation cannot be considered any further under the terms of this policy.
- 4.4.2. Whilst the University will seek to protect the confidentiality of a complainant making an allegation against a respondent, confidentiality can only be maintained as far as is reasonable. A complainant making an allegation will be made aware that in order for action to be progressed under the terms of this policy, it will generally be necessary for the University to make the respondent aware of the details of the allegation, and the name of the person making the allegation. This is in order to provide the respondent with a fair opportunity to respond to the allegation and ensure a robust decision can be made on the outcome of the investigation.
- 4.4.3. If a complainant making an allegation is not willing for their name or the details of the allegation they wish to make to be provided to the respondent once formal investigation has taken place, it may not be possible for the University to progress any action in response to the allegation. There may be instances however where the alleged concern raised and evidence provided is sufficient enough to proceed a case for investigation without the requirement to disclose the identity of the complainant. This approach would only be used in exceptional circumstances however.
- 4.4.4. Where a complainant who has made an allegation indicates that they wish to withdraw the allegation, such a withdrawal would be noted and acknowledged by the University.

The University may still decide that it is necessary/appropriate for action under this policy to continue, unless the withdrawal is made on the basis that the complainant who made the allegation has since determined, or admits that, it is not true. It should be noted that within the terms of this policy, maliciously making an allegation or deliberately making a false allegation may constitute an alleged concern to be investigated under the terms of this policy.

- 4.4.5. The Investigative Officer will contact the respondent notifying them of the allegation and invite them to attend a meeting with the Investigative Officer in order that they can respond to the allegation. Where a respondent does not engage with the University, this will not prevent or preclude the University from progressing action and making decisions in respect of the matter, including decisions to progress disciplinary action against the respondent.
- 4.4.6. Where either a complainant or respondent wishes to nominate a witness to contribute to a disciplinary process, they may do so, as long as that witness has information directly in relation to the allegation concerned. The Investigative Officer may decide either to meet with appropriate witnesses during the investigation, or to seek a written statement from such witnesses as the Investigative Officer considers most appropriate. Where any witness does not engage with the University, this will not prevent or preclude the University from progressing action and making decisions in respect of the matter.
- 4.4.7. Throughout the investigative process, notes will be taken, and information gathered by the Investigative Officer and/or the staff member attending a meeting or discussion with the Investigative Officer as support/administrative support. A summary note of a meeting will be shared and agreed with the individual with whom discussion at the meeting took place. Where a point within the summary note of a meeting is disputed by the individual but considered accurate by the Investigative Officer, both views will be recorded in the final version of the note.
- 4.4.8. On conclusion of the investigation the Investigative Officer will prepare an investigation report that will summarise the investigation process and note the key findings and conclusion of the investigation. Information gathered through an investigative process will be retained in line with the University's Data Retention Schedule.

4.5. *The Panel Hearing:*

- 4.5.1. Once the investigation process has concluded the Academic and Research Misconduct Panel will meet to consider the investigation findings and make a decision on the outcome. Where it is agreed that a complainant and/or respondent may attend

the Panel, they will only do so for the purpose of making a brief statement and answering any questions. An individual attending will have the right to be accompanied at the meeting for support as set out in this policy. Should it be agreed that both the complainant and the respondent are to attend the meeting of the Panel, they will do so separately. Where it has been agreed that an individual may attend a meeting of the Panel, failure by either to do so will not preclude the Panel from considering the matter and reaching a decision.

- 4.5.2. The Panel will be composed under the terms for the Academic and Research Misconduct Panel set down in Schedule A of the General Academic Regulations, but will be chaired by the University Proctor.
- 4.5.3. Where the Panel considers it necessary, an appropriate member of University staff, normally the Investigative Officer, will be invited to attend the meeting to answer any questions the Committee has on the investigative report/information on the matter. The member of staff attending will do so separately to any individuals who are also attending.
- 4.5.4. The Panel will consider the matter and reach its decision in private. Decisions will be taken on the basis of majority among the members of the Panel. The chair of the Panel will hold a casting vote which will apply in circumstances where there is a split-decision.
- 4.5.5. The Panel may decide:
 - a) The allegation is to be dismissed as there is not sufficient evidence to establish on the balance of probabilities that the allegation occurred; or
 - b) The allegation is confirmed as there is sufficient evidence to establish on the balance of probabilities that the allegation occurred. The Panel will then refer the matter to the following bodies in the University for consideration under its disciplinary procedures:
- 4.6. For research and scholarship misconduct involving members of staff, referral will be made to BPP's Disciplinary Policy and Procedure and Human Resources.
- 4.7. For research misconduct involving students, referral will be made to either the University's Academic Practice Policy where concerns relating to academic integrity arise, or the University's Student Conduct Policy where concerns sit outside of academic integrity. In both cases, these will be referred to the Proctor's Office for progression.
- 4.7.1. The decision of the Committee will be simultaneously communicated to the complainant and respondent, within ten working days of meeting. The communication

will provide both with a concise summary of reasons for the decision and details of any right of appeal.

Policy Revision History

Version Number	Description	Author	Reviewed by	Date
1.0	Policy and Procedure established.	Director of Academic Governance & Proctor	Dean of Academic Quality & Policy	July 2024