ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

Version	1.0 for approval
Effective date	On approval
Date for review	November 2027
Policy owner	Chief Executive / Head of Quality
Reference points	Applicable law and BIMM partner requirements
Audience/handling notes	Students and staff; publication as in the policy register
Dissemination and implementation plan	Publish and communicate the approved policy. Train staff, confirm delegated roles and retain earlier versions.
Linked Policies, Procedures and Forms	Student Handbook; Complaints; Safeguarding; relevant NHAM and BIMM procedures
Date approved	Pending approval

1 Purpose and local responsibility

NHAM teaches and assesses academic integrity throughout the course. This NHAM policy sets the local process aligned with BIMM's August 2026 policy. BIMM retains authority over academic standards, penalties and awards under the approved partnership. The Head of Quality maintains the allocation of local and University responsibilities in the Operations Handbook.

Students must submit work they are entitled to submit, identify sources, distinguish collaboration from individual work, keep relevant development records and follow the brief. Teaching staff explain referencing, permitted assistance, use of AI, sampling, copyright and attribution in music and professional practice.

2 Academic practice and prohibited conduct

Academic misconduct includes presenting another person's writing, music, production, data or ideas as one's own, unauthorised collaboration, paid or unpaid contract cheating, fabricating research or evidence, impersonation, unauthorised reuse of assessed work, and cheating in examinations or practical assessments.

Permitted use of AI or other tools must be stated in the assessment brief. A student must acknowledge tool use as required and remain responsible for accuracy and authorship. Unauthorised generated content, fabricated references or an inaccurate declaration may be

investigated. Do not infer misconduct solely from a detection score, unusual style, language background or disability.

Poor Academic Practice can arise from a developing understanding of academic conventions and is normally addressed through explanation, a tutorial and a recorded learning action. Distinguish it from conduct that warrants formal investigation, considering the nature and extent of the issue and the student's stage.

3 Concerns and investigation

A marker preserves the submitted work, identifies the concern and supporting evidence, and sends a confidential referral to the Course Leader and Head of Quality. Avoid discussing allegations in shared student or staff spaces. Record the applicable policy version and whether marking or release of a result is paused.

The student receives written details of the concern and relevant evidence, the proposed procedure, possible outcomes, and a reasonable opportunity to respond. Normally provide at least five working days before a formal interview. Offer an accessible meeting, written response, support and reasonable adjustments. A companion supports the student but does not determine the case.

An impartial authorised investigator may examine drafts, source material and the development process, and seek an academic explanation. Any viva or authenticity interview must have a stated purpose, appropriately qualified staff and a written record. Offer accessible alternatives where needed and distinguish investigation from fresh assessment.

If a student misses the meeting, check receipt, access needs and any good reason, offer a reasonable rearrangement and explain whether the available evidence may be considered without attendance. Non-attendance does not prove misconduct.

4 Findings and penalties

Classify and decide a case under the applicable BIMM framework, using the balance of probabilities and a reasoned assessment of evidence. Keep investigation, decision and appeal roles independent as required. Consider each student individually in a group case.

Only an authorised decision-maker can impose an academic penalty. Use the approved BIMM penalty table and refer major or gross cases to the partner route where required. NHAM staff must not invent local mark deductions, impose a finding to avoid referral, or promise an award outcome. The Assessment Board receives the required record.

Where a concern is not established, close it, remove any inappropriate provisional flag and arrange the ordinary marking or result process. A finding letter states the allegation, evidence, reasons, classification, penalty authority, impact on assessment and the appeal route.

5 Appeals support and review

The September 2026 BIMM Academic Appeals Procedure directs partner students to the Partner Operations Handbook. NHAM must identify and publish the applicable submission route and deadline before this policy takes effect. The outcome letter must distinguish an academic-misconduct appeal from a complaint or a non-academic conduct appeal.

An independent reviewer considers the permitted grounds, including relevant new evidence unavailable earlier for good reason, a material procedural irregularity, or bias. Explain further University review and the eligible OIA route after Completion of Procedures. A student who needs

help accessing the appeal should contact Student Services promptly.

Keep restricted case records under the retention schedule and preserve live appeal evidence. The Education Committee reviews de-identified patterns, tutorials, assessment design and consistency of decisions. Train staff and students at induction and before assessment. Review annually and after a relevant BIMM change.