

Policy Title:

General Regulation: Student Academic Integrity and Student Academic Misconduct Procedure

Decision: Screen out

Contact: [Jennie Hammond](#), Student Academic Affairs Team,

Date of Completion: 21 July 2025

Part 1: Policy Scoping

Information about the policy

Name of the Policy

General Regulation: Student Academic Integrity and Academic Misconduct Procedure

Is this an existing, revised, or new policy?

Revised – The Procedure replaces the current Academic Misconduct Policy 2023/24 and part of the Student Discipline Ordinance, which was removed in 2024 and partially replaced with Student Conduct Ordinance XXXVI. The new document forms a Regulation and Procedure.

What is it trying to achieve? (For example, intended aims and outcomes)

As a signatory to the Quality Assurance Agency's (QAA) Academic Integrity Charter, Ulster University seeks to empower all students to achieve academic excellence and expects that students will not in any way attempt to gain an unfair advantage in the process or outcome of assessment, either deliberately or unintentionally.

Therefore, all students are expected to understand and appreciate the value of academic integrity, familiarise themselves with and meet the University's standards of academic integrity by acquiring the necessary knowledge of academic writing, citing, referencing, and the appropriate use and correct citation and of Artificial Intelligence tools, where appropriate.

The Procedure aims to provide clarity to staff and students on the University's expectations in relation to academic integrity and steps that will be taken following an allegation of academic misconduct.

The Procedure extends to all undergraduate, postgraduate taught and short-cycle students in instances where academic integrity falls below, or is suspected of falling below, the expected standards.

Are there any Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the policy? If so, explain how below.

Note: The Section 75 categories are:

- religious belief
- political opinion
- racial group

- age
- marital status
- sexual orientation
- sex (men and women generally)
- disability
- dependants

Race: This procedure is largely technical in nature. It applies to all students regardless of S75 categories. However, students who are overrepresented in cases of academic misconduct – namely international students – may benefit from the consistency and standardisation brought about by this Procedure.

Who initiated or wrote the policy?

The Procedure was written by the Learning Enhancement Directorate, in consultation with the 2025 Academic Integrity Working Group, following on from the separation of academic and non-academic misconduct from the former Student Discipline Ordinance.

Who owns and implements the policy?

The PVC (Academic Quality and Student Experience) owns the Regulation and Procedure and the Student Academic Affairs Team (SAAT) oversees its implementation.

School and Faculty staff are responsible for the implementation of the Procedure, with support and guidance from SAAT.

Implementation factors

Are there any factors which could contribute to or weaken the intended aim or outcome of the policy?

Other – Future recommendations arising from external agencies such as the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA), or Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Bodies (PSRB).

Main stakeholders affected

Who are the internal and external stakeholders (actual or potential) that the policy will impact upon?

- Students (primarily)

- Staff (through its implementation and outworking)
- Students' Union (through its implementation and outworking)

Other policies with a bearing on this policy

What are they and who owns them?

Policy: University Ordinances

Owner: Vice Chancellor

Policy: Student Conduct Ordinance

Policy owner: PVC (Academic Quality and Student Experience)

Policy: Data Protection Policy

Owner: University Secretary

Policy: Extenuating Circumstances Procedure

Owner: PVC (Academic Quality and Student Experience)

Available evidence

What evidence or information (both qualitative and quantitative) have you gathered to inform this policy? Please specify details for each of the Section 75 categories below.

Note: Evidence can come from many sources. Examples include the University's management information systems, internal or external research, surveys or consultation exercises. The Equality Commission has produced a guide to [signpost to S75 data](#). Anecdotal evidence, such as feedback from service users may also be used.

Religious Belief

The University's EO data were reviewed. On 6 February 2024, our staff profile was 52.0% Catholic and 48.0% Protestant. Compared with 6 February 2019, this indicates a 2.9% increase in Catholic staff.

In the Academic Year (AY) 2023 - 2024, 58.3% of our students identified as Christian and 11.1% identified as having 'No Religion'. Compared with AY 2018-2019, this indicates an 18.2% decrease in students who identified as Christian and a 2.5% decrease in students who identified as having 'No Religion'.

Political Opinion

The University does not collect information on Political Opinion or make assumptions regarding Political Opinion based on Community Background.

Racial Group

The University's EO data were reviewed. On 6 February 2024, our staff profile was 92.8% White and 7.2% Black and Minority Ethnic (BME). This indicates a 1.8% increase in BME staff compared with 2019.

In AY 2023 - 2024, 9.9% of students identified as BME. This indicates a 4.9% increase in BME students compared with AY 2018 - 2019.

Our BME profile suggests that we are twice as diverse as the local population, as the Northern Ireland Census 2021 suggests that 3.4% of the NI population is BME.

Age

The University's EO data were reviewed. On 6 February 2024, 31.1% of our staff were in the 46-55 age band and 25.8% of staff were in the 36-45 age band. 26.2% of staff were aged '56 and above', which represents a 3.8% increase compared to 2019.

In AY 2023 - 2024, the majority of students (67.0%) were aged '21 and under 40'. This indicates a 5.6% increase in students within this age band compared with AY 2018 - 2019.

Marital Status

The University's EO data were reviewed. In February 2024, 56.0% of staff were 'Married or in a Civil Partnership', a decrease of 6.0% compared to 2019.

In AY 2023 - 2024, 63.8% of students were 'Single', a 14.6% decrease compared with AY 2018 - 2019.

Sexual Orientation

The University's EO data were reviewed. In 2024, 74.0% of staff were 'Heterosexual'; 4.3% were 'LGBT+' and 21.4% were 'Not Known'.

Although we collect student data on sexual orientation, this is not considered to be reliable.

Men and Women generally

The University's EO data were reviewed. In 2024, 58.0% of staff were 'Female'. This indicates a 2.0% increase in female staff compared with 2019.

In AY 2023 - 2024, 61.2% of students were 'Female', a 4.3% increase compared with AY 2018 - 2019.

Disability

The University's EO data were reviewed. In 2024, 6.0% of staff declared a disability, an increase of 1.2% compared with 2019.

In AY 2023 - 2024, 8.4% of students declared a disability, a decrease of 2.0% compared with AY 2018 - 2019.

Our disability declaration rate is lower than expected, compared with the local population. The NI Census (2021) found that 24% of the NI population stated that their day-to-day activities were limited because of a long-standing health problem or disability.

Dependants

The University's EO data were reviewed. In 2024, 43.8% of staff had dependants. This indicates a decrease of 3.9% compared with 2019.

In AY 2023 - 2024, 11.4% of students declared they had dependants, a decrease of 4.6% compared to AY 2018 - 2019.

Needs, experience and priorities

Taking into account the information referred to above, what are the different needs, experiences and priorities of each of the following categories, in relation to the particular policy or decision? (Please specify for each of the Section 75 categories below the needs, experiences and priorities)

Religious Belief

When outworking this Procedure, staff should be mindful of scheduling meetings on religious observances, particularly of non-Christian cultures.

Political Opinion

None identified

Racial Group

Anecdotal evidence suggests that domicile, nationality and ethnicity (as well as subject and level of study) may contribute to over-representation in cases of academic misconduct. Specifically, that international students are over-represented in reports of suspected academic misconduct. Students for whom English is not a first language, in particular, may benefit from explicitly clear, student-friendly guidance to accompany the Procedure.

The Alberta Council on Academic Integrity's 2020 Statement Against Racism in Matters Relating to Academic Integrity identifies that racism may exist in dealing with relation to academic misconduct in relation to:

- Negative stereotyping of students from particular countries or cultures;
- Racially biased reporting of academic misconduct that either implicitly or explicitly targets students of colour, students for whom English is not a first language and other racialized minorities;
- Excessively harsh sanctioning of academic misconduct among racialized minorities;

and calls upon all educators, administrators and institutions to:

- Acknowledge that particular groups of students are over-represented in academic misconduct reporting;
 - Speak out against racial stereotypes that persist against Black, Asian, Latinx, and Indigenous students with regards to academic misconduct;
 - Ensure that reporting of academic integrity violations is consistent across the student body and breaches are addressed in fair and equitable ways;
 - Collect institutional academic misconduct data on racialized minorities in order to identify, prevent, and pro-actively address racial bias in reporting and sanctioning of students who are not white or for whom English is not their first language.
-

Age

When outworking this Procedure, staff should be mindful that mature students in particular may have specific responsibilities which may mean they require longer lead-in times for in-person meetings, as they often need to coordinate family or professional commitments that can make attending at short notice difficult.

Marital Status

None identified

Sexual Orientation

None identified

Men and Women generally

None identified

Disability

When outworking this Procedure, staff should be mindful that disabled students may require reasonable adjustments at all stages, as appropriate.

Dependants

When outworking this Procedure, staff should be mindful that those with dependants in particular may have additional responsibilities.

Consultation

Consultation with relevant groups, organisations or individuals about the policy can provide useful information about issues or opportunities which are specifically related to them (that is evidence to inform the policy).

Please indicate whether you carried out or intend to carry out any consultation exercises prior to equality screening?

Yes

The following were consulted with during the development of this policy:

- Academic Integrity Working Group
- Ulster University Students' Union
- Policy Clinic
- Trade Unions
- Senate
- Academic Standards and Quality Enhancement Committee (ASQEC)

Part 2: Screening questions

Introduction

The answers to the following screening questions will assist the University in making a decision whether or not there is a need to carry out an equality impact assessment on the policy. The following information is provided to help you to identify and comment on the level of likely impact of the policy in question 1 to 4.

Select 'major' impact if:

- a) The policy is significant in terms of its strategic importance;
- b) Potential equality impacts are unknown, because, for example, there are insufficient data upon which to make an assessment or because they are complex, and it would be appropriate to conduct an equality impact assessment in order to better assess them;
- c) Potential equality and/or good relations impacts are likely to be adverse or are likely to be experienced disproportionately by groups of people including those who are marginalised or disadvantaged;
- d) Further assessment offers a valuable way to examine the evidence and develop recommendations in respect of a policy about which there are concerns amongst affected individuals and representative groups, for example in respect of multiple identities;
- e) The policy is likely to be challenged by way of judicial review;
- f) The policy is significant in terms of expenditure.

Select 'minor' impact if:

- a) The policy is not unlawfully discriminatory and any residual potential impacts on people are judged to be negligible;
- b) The policy, or certain proposals within it, are potentially unlawfully discriminatory, but this possibility can readily and easily be eliminated by making appropriate changes to the policy or by adopting appropriate mitigating measures;
- c) Any asymmetrical equality impacts caused by the policy are intentional because they are specifically designed to promote equality of opportunities for particular groups of disadvantaged people;

- d) By amending the policy there are better opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations;
- e) Differential impact observed and opportunities exist to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations.

Select 'none' if:

- a) The policy has no relevance to equality of opportunity or good relations;
- b) The policy is purely technical in nature and will have no bearing in terms of its likely impact on equality of opportunity or good relations.

Taking into account the evidence presented in Part 1, please complete the screening questions (Question 1 to 4).

Screening questions

1. What is the likely impact on equality of opportunity for those affected by this policy, for each of the Section 75 categories?

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Religious Belief**

This Procedure is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this category. It is largely technical in nature.

What is the level of impact?

None

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Political Opinion**

This Procedure is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this category. It is largely technical in nature.

Level of impact

None

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Racial Group**

The Procedure is likely to have a positive impact on quality of opportunity for this category. Students who are overrepresented in cases of academic misconduct – namely international students – may benefit from the consistency and standardisation brought about by this Procedure.

Level of impact

Minor +

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Age**

This Procedure is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this category. It is largely technical in nature.

Level of impact

None

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Marital Status**

This Procedure is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this category. It is largely technical in nature.

Level of impact
None

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Sexual Orientation**

This Procedure is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this category.
It is largely technical in nature.

Level of impact
None

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Men and Women generally**

This Procedure is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this category.
It is largely technical in nature.

Level of impact
None

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Disability**

This Procedure is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this category.
It is largely technical in nature.

Level of impact
None

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Dependants**

This Procedure is unlikely to impact on equality of opportunity for this category.
It is largely technical in nature.

Level of impact
None

2. Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within the Section 75 categories?

Religious Belief

No, the Procedure is largely technical in nature and will have no bearing in terms of its likely impact on equality of opportunity for this category.

Political Opinion

No, the Procedure is largely technical in nature and will have no bearing in terms of its likely impact on equality of opportunity for this category.

Racial Group

No. The Procedure is likely to have a positive impact on quality of opportunity for this category. Students who are overrepresented in cases of academic misconduct – namely international students – may benefit from the consistency and standardisation brought about by this Procedure.

Age

No, the Procedure is largely technical in nature and will have no bearing in terms of its likely impact on equality of opportunity for this category.

Marital Status

No, the Procedure is largely technical in nature and will have no bearing in terms of its likely impact on equality of opportunity for this category.

Sexual Orientation

No, the Procedure is largely technical in nature and will have no bearing in terms of its likely impact on equality of opportunity for this category.

Men and Women generally

No, the Procedure is largely technical in nature and will have no bearing in terms of its likely impact on equality of opportunity for this category.

Disability

No, the Procedure is largely technical in nature and will have no bearing in terms of its likely impact on equality of opportunity for this category.

Dependants

No, the Procedure is largely technical in nature and will have no bearing in terms of its likely impact on equality of opportunity for this category.

3. To what extent is the policy likely to impact on good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group?

Religious Belief

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Religious Belief**

The Procedure is unlikely to impact on good relations between people of different religious belief. It is largely technical in nature.

Level of impact

None

Political Opinion

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Political Opinion**

The Procedure is unlikely to impact on good relations between people of different political opinion. It is largely technical in nature.

Level of impact

None

Racial Group

Details of the likely policy impacts on **Racial Group**

The Procedure is likely to have a positive impact on good relations between people of different racial group, as it may help address any racism that may exist in relation to academic misconduct.

This Procedure will enable Ulster University to apply fair and consistent penalties to all students regardless of racial group and to accurately report instances of academic misconduct.

Level of impact

Minor +

4. Are there opportunities to better promote good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group?

Religious Belief

No. The Procedure is largely technical in nature and will have no bearing in terms of opportunities to better promote good relations between people of different religious belief.

Level of impact

None

Political Opinion

No. The Procedure is largely technical in nature and will have no bearing in terms of opportunities to better promote good relations between people of different political opinion.

Level of impact

None

Racial Group

No. This Procedure will enable Ulster University to apply fair and consistent penalties to all students regardless of racial group and to accurately report instances of academic misconduct.

Level of impact

None

Additional considerations

Multiple identity

5. Generally speaking, people can fall into more than one Section 75 category. Taking this into consideration, are there any potential impacts of the policy or decision on people with multiple identities? (For example, disabled minority ethnic

people; disabled women; young Protestant men, and young lesbians, gay and bisexual people). (Please select one answer)

Yes

Please specify the relevant Section 75 categories concerned below.

Provide details of the policy impact and data which describes the policy impact.

Yes, Race: All those impacted by this Procedure comprise multiple identities, and it is envisaged that its focus on delivering an enhanced user experience through consistency and standardisation of approach will benefit all, regardless of ethnic group.

Disability Duties

6. Does the policy provide an opportunity to encourage disabled people to participate in University life?

No. The Procedure aims to provide clarity to staff and students on the University's expectations in relation to academic integrity and steps that will be taken following an allegation of academic misconduct.

The Procedure extends to all undergraduate, postgraduate taught and short-cycle students in instances where academic integrity falls below, or is suspected of falling below, the expected standards.

7. Does the policy provide an opportunity to promote attitudes towards disabled people?

No. The Procedure aims to provide clarity to staff and students on the University's expectations in relation to academic integrity and steps that will be taken following an allegation of academic misconduct.

The Procedure extends to all undergraduate, postgraduate taught and short-cycle students in instances where academic integrity falls below, or is suspected of falling below, the expected standards.

Part 3: Screening decision

Based on the evidence considered and outlined in Part 1 and the responses to the screening questions (Part 2), please indicate the screening decision for this policy.

Note: The University should take particular care not to screen out policies that have a procurement aspect if there is potential to promote equality of opportunity through the procurement of services.

- ☐ **Screen in** the policy (that is, subject to an Equality Impact Assessment). The likely impact is **major** in respect of one, or more of the equality of opportunity or good relations categories.
- ☐ **Screen out** the policy without mitigation or an alternative policy proposed to be adopted (that is, **no** Equality Impact Assessment). The likely impact is **none** in respect of all of equality of opportunity or good relations categories.
- ☒ **Screen out** the policy and **mitigate the impacts on equality by amending or changing the policy**, or by **developing an alternative policy or action** (that is, **no** Equality Impact Assessment). The likely impact is **minor** in respect of one or more of the equality of opportunity or good relations categories.

If the decision is to subject the policy to an equality impact assessment (that is, 'screen in' the policy), please provide details of the reasons.

Not applicable

If the decision is not to conduct an equality impact assessment (that is, 'screen out' the policy), please provide details for the reasons.

Not applicable

If the decision is not to conduct an equality impact assessment (that is, 'screen out' the policy), and mitigate the impacts on equality of opportunity by amending or changing the policy, or by developing an alternative policy or action, please provide reasons to support your decision, together with the proposed changes, amendments or alternative policy.

The likely impact is **minor** in respect of one or more of the equality of opportunity or good relations categories. The Procedure aims to provide clarity to staff and students on the University's expectations in relation to academic integrity and steps that will be taken following an allegation of academic misconduct.

In line with University policy, the final approved policy will be reviewed 2 years post-implementation, and if necessary, amended.

Timetabling and prioritising

If the policy had been '**screened in**' for an equality impact assessment, then please answer the following questions to determine its priority for timetabling the equality impact assessment.

On a scale of 1 to 3, with 1 being the lowest priority and 3 being the highest, assess the policy in terms of its priority for equality impact assessment.

Priority rating for timetabling the equality impact assessment in terms of effect on equality of opportunity and good relations:

Not applicable

Priority rating for timetabling the equality impact assessment in terms of social need

Not applicable

Priority rating for timetabling the equality impact assessment in terms of effect on people's daily lives

Not applicable

Priority rating for timetabling the equality impact assessment in terms of relevance to the University's functions

Not applicable

Note: The Total Rating Score will be used to prioritise the policy in rank order with other policies screened in for equality impact assessment. This list of priorities will assist the University in timetabling. Details of the University's Equality Impact Assessment Timetable will be included in its quarterly Screening Reports.

Is the policy affected by timetables established by other relevant public authorities?
Not applicable

Approval and authorisation



Screened by:

Position or Job Title:

PVC Academic Quality and Student Experience

Date screened:

11 June 2025



Approved by:

Position or Job Title: Chief People Officer

Date approved: 21 July 2025

Review

This policy is due for review (in terms of its impact on equality of opportunity and good relations) by the policy owner on: 21 July 2027