

## **Academic Integrity Policy**

### **A. Introduction**

1. Academic Integrity is vital to the mission of Corndel College London (CCL). It is core to our commitment to academic excellence and demonstrates a shared set of principles to upholding good academic practices. It fosters a community of trust, respect, honesty, diligence, fairness and accountability.
2. **The Principles of Academic Integrity which applies to all members of CCL's academic community are set out below:**
  - Trust: A culture of trust encourages open communication and collaboration while upholding individual accountability.
  - Fairness: Assessments and evaluations must be conducted fairly.
  - Respect: Individuals are expected to honour the work and contributions of others.
  - Honesty: All members of the academic community are expected to be truthful in their academic work and uphold academic integrity and good academic practice.
  - Responsibility: Everyone in the academic community is responsible for upholding these principles.

### **B. Scope**

3. CCL support students to maintain academic integrity and avoid academic misconduct. This Academic Integrity Policy sets out the principles of academic integrity, the responsibilities of CCL's students and CCL staff members, and procedures for addressing violations of academic integrity in a student's assessment.
4. This policy applies to all higher education programmes delivered by Corndel College London including those that lead to a Kingston University Award or a Corndel College London Award.
  - Student studying for a Corndel College Award should read this policy alongside [Corndel College London Academic Regulations](#).
  - Student studying for a Kingston University Award should read this policy alongside Kingston University [Academic Regulations 2: Undergraduate Degrees](#) and [Academic Regulations 10: Degree Apprenticeship](#)
5. This procedure should also be read in conjunction with the following documents:
  - [Student Complaint Procedure](#)
  - [Academic Appeal Procedure](#)

- [Academic Integrity, Academic Misconduct and Generative Artificial Intelligence Policy Guidance.](#)

### **C. Definitions: Academic Integrity and Breaches of Academic Integrity**

- **Academic Integrity**

6. Academic integrity means demonstrating honest, moral behaviours when producing academic work. This involves acknowledging the work of third parties and giving appropriate credit to them where their ideas are presented as part of a students' work. CCL students must uphold academic integrity and good academic practices by always engaging in honest and fair academic behaviour in their work.
7. Student must always produce original academic work that is solely the student's own work and solely in the student's own voice. A student's intentions are not relevant to whether or not they have committed academic misconduct.
8. CCL has three categories of academic misconduct, and the seriousness of individual cases is, typically, a matter for academic judgement.

- **Academic Judgment**

9. Academic judgment involves decisions where the opinion of an academic expert is essential, such as judgments about marks awarded, degree classification, and research methodology. According to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) for Higher Education, "Academic Judgement is not any judgement made by an academic. Academic judgment is a judgment that is made about a matter where only the opinion of an academic expert is essential...Where an academic judgement is made it should be evidence based". For example, the decisions about whether a student's work contains plagiarism and the extent of that plagiarism will normally involve academic judgment, but that judgment must be evidence based.
10. Deciding questions of fact do not involve academic judgement. The following examples are decisions of fact that do not involve academic judgement:
  - a. the facts of a matter or case for example, where a student has confessed to academic misconduct.
  - b. the fairness of processes and/or procedures.
  - c. how communication has taken place with a student.
  - d. whether an opinion has been expressed outside the area of an academic's expertise.
  - e. the manner in which evidence has been considered.
  - f. evidence of bias or maladministration.

- **Types of Academic Misconduct**

11. Academic misconduct in assessment is any action by a student that has the potential to give them an unfair advantage, or to aid another to gain such an advantage. The three categories of academic misconduct at CCL are:

- Poor Academic Practice
- Academic Misconduct
- Severe Academic Misconduct

- **Poor Academic Practice**

12. Poor Academic Practice involves inappropriate use and breaches of discipline specific citation and/or referencing conventions. Examples of Poor Academic Practice are listed below and are not exhaustive.

- a. Wrong citations and unattributed quotations.
- b. Inappropriate paraphrasing or unintentional paraphrasing without proper acknowledgement.
- c. Unacknowledged proof-reading.
- d. Copying an existing concept or idea unintentionally.
- e. Absent, inaccurate or incomplete citations.
- f. Numerous sentences of direct copying without acknowledging the source.
- g. Unacknowledged help with English language accuracy.

- **Academic Misconduct**

13. Examples of academic misconduct include:

- a. Repeated Poor Academic Practice, particularly if the student has been previously reprimanded.
- b. Plagiarism: Inclusion of extensive sections of unreferenced text, whole paragraphs or substantial sections of unattributed work.
- c. Collusion: Unauthorised collaboration on written, oral or practical work with another person or persons (also see collusion under paragraph 16)
- d. Plagiarism: Large sections of unreferenced text.
- e. Self-Plagiarism: Submission of the same piece of work, or major part thereof, for assessment.
- f. Fabrications and falsification of data or evidence by altering research data and/or evidence to obtain advantage.
- g. Lending submitted work another student.
- h. An assignment which has been translated into English by another person or Generative Artificial Intelligence (Gen AI) or Large Language Models (LLMs).

- **Severe Academic Misconduct**

14. This is a serious type of academic misconduct that could lead to major sanctions and outcomes. Examples include:
- a. Fabrications and falsification of data or evidence by generating set of false research data or creating/acquiring evidence illegally.
  - b. Collusion: Proof of extensive collusion (see also collusion under paragraph 15).
  - c. Cheating: gaining access to unseen assessment/examination/test questions or being impersonated during an examination/test or copying work.
  - d. Contract Cheating. Examples include:
    - Purchasing or commissioning work from a third party. Third parties include organisations such as essay mills or individuals including friends or family members.
    - Using Artificial Intelligence and/or Large Language Models (LLMs) in an unauthorised manner and/or to obtain an unfair advantage by creating work that is then dishonestly submitted as the student's own.

**D. Responsibilities**

15. To foster a culture of upholding academic integrity, CCL provides resources and training for staff members and students. These include workshops and seminars, and access to Turnitin (online plagiarism detection tools).

**16. Students are expected to:**

- a. understand and adhere to the Academic Integrity Policy.
- b. avoid engaging in any form of dishonesty.
- c. properly attribute sources in all academic work.
- d. report any suspected violations of academic integrity.

**17. CCL Staff are expected to:**

- a. understand and adhere to the Academic Integrity Policy.
- b. clearly communicate expectations regarding academic integrity in their programmes.
- c. educate students on good academic practice.
- d. foster an environment that promotes ethical academic behaviour.
- e. report and address suspected violations in a timely and fair manner.

18. Commitment to academic integrity is essential for maintaining the credibility of CCL's awards and the value of our academic programmes. All members of the community are encouraged to uphold these standards and contribute to a culture of integrity. Any member of the academic community who suspects a violation of

academic integrity should report it to the Registry Team by sending an email to [registry@corndel.com](mailto:registry@corndel.com)

#### **E. Academic Induction Period**

19. CCL is devoted to supporting students to succeed and has a culture of continuous learning. CCL educates students about academic integrity and where applicable, students are offered an Academic Induction Period.

20. CCL uses the Period to address any signs of plagiarism and/or collusion in a student's academic work by developing the student's skills and ensure appropriate academic practice.

#### **21. For the avoidance of doubt, Academic Induction Period only applies to:**

- a. first occurrence of plagiarism and/or collusion for a first attempt at an assessment that do not constitute 'Severe Academic Misconduct' (as set out in paragraph 14 above).

AND

- b. first teaching block of a short course; or
- c. a foundation programme at level 3; or
- d. the first level of an undergraduate programme (i.e. level 4 only).

#### **22. The Academic Induction Period does not apply to:**

- a. Any other forms of academic misconduct that are not plagiarism and/or collusion.
- b. Multiple occurrences of poor academic practice where it has been determined that such a matter will be considered under "Academic Misconduct" (as set out in paragraph 13 above).
- c. Any form of severe academic misconduct including severe forms of plagiarism and/or collusion.
- d. Students on level 5 and level 6 of their programme of study.
- e. Direct entrants to levels 5 and 6.
- f. Postgraduate students.
- g. Any form of reassessment.
- h. Second and subsequent occurrences of misconduct.

#### **Procedure for managing Academic Induction Period**

23. Where there is evidence of plagiarism and/or collusion in a student's assessment and the Academic Induction Period applies (see Section E above), the Professional Development Expert should report the matter to Registry in the first instance.

24. Using the criteria set out in Section E above Registry will confirm to the relevant Professional Development Expert if the matter falls under the definition of Academic Induction Period.
25. Where the matter falls under the Academic Induction Period, a new deadline for resubmitting the assessment will be set by the Registry Team. The Professional Development Expert will be informed of this date.
26. Where the assessment type permits work to be corrected and resubmitted within the same assessment period (for example coursework), it should be returned to the student by the Professional Development Expert with the appropriate feedback provided on the unacceptable material for correction and resubmission.
27. The student will be provided with a new assessment submission date.
28. Where the student resubmits the assessment and it is of a pass standard, the work will be capped at the pass mark.
29. A student who fails to resubmit the assessment by the agreed deadline, will be awarded a mark of zero.
30. Where a student fails to correct their resubmitted work properly and/or is suspected of potential academic misconduct in the resubmission, the matter will be treated as a new offence. The procedures set out in **Section F** will be followed.

**F. Procedure for managing Poor Academic Practice, Academic Misconduct and Severe Academic Misconduct**

31. Where poor academic practice, academic misconduct or severe academic misconduct is suspected and the Academic Induction Period does not apply, the procedure below should be followed:

- **Preliminary Investigation**

32. The member of staff who identifies suspected poor academic practice or academic misconduct by a student should make a report to the Registry Team providing details of their concerns and any evidence.
33. The member of staff making the report should not discuss the matter informally with the student. Marks and feedback for the affected assessment should not be released until the outcome of the case is confirmed.

34. The Registry Team will ask the Professional Development Expert reporting the matter to act as the Preliminary Investigator and conduct a preliminary investigation.
35. The purpose of the preliminary investigation is to:
- a. establish the details of the allegation.
  - b. collect any evidence relating to the allegation.
  - c. determine whether there is a case to answer (i.e. whether there is sufficient evidence that academic misconduct or severe academic misconduct has been committed and if not, whether there is sufficient evidence of poor academic practice).
  - d. resolve the matter, decide on action to be taken, or refer the matter to an Academic Misconduct Panel. See paragraph 43 below for more information about Academic Misconduct Panel.
36. Determination of the outcome of a preliminary investigation is a matter of academic judgement of the Preliminary Investigator and must be evidence-based. Where relevant and appropriate, decisions may be made based on evidence of the process of producing the work, (e.g. evidence that an essay mill was used) rather than a judgement on the originality of the content. If considered appropriate and depending on the nature of the allegation, the student may be asked to demonstrate that the work is their own original work (e.g. through an informal viva).
37. The Preliminary Investigator may seek regulatory advice from the Registry Team and request support for the collection of relevant evidence.
38. During the preliminary investigation, the student will be informed of the allegation against them and invited to a meeting with the Preliminary Investigator to discuss the allegations. The student should normally be provided with at least five CCL working days' notice of the meeting to enable them to prepare.
39. The student is entitled to be accompanied by a CCL current student or a current member of staff. Students who wish to be accompanied to a preliminary investigation meeting must inform CCL no later than three CCL working days prior to the relevant meeting. The student or staff member accompanying a student can only offer support to the student they accompany and cannot speak for or on behalf of the student.
40. The possible outcomes of a preliminary investigation are as follows:
- a. **There is insufficient evidence that academic misconduct or poor academic practice has occurred:**

- i. The case will be dismissed, and the student will be informed of this in writing. The staff member who raised the allegation, where they are not the Preliminary Investigator, should also be informed that the matter is now closed.
- b. There is insufficient evidence that academic misconduct has occurred but there is (a) sufficient evidence of poor academic practice; and (b) the student has NOT previously had a finding of poor academic practice or academic misconduct against them:**
  - i. The work should be marked accordingly in line with the marking criteria.
  - ii. Support will be provided to the student to promote the development of good academic practice.
  - iii. The student will receive a formal written warning kept on their file that further breaches would be referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel and/or a more serious sanction applied.
- c. There is insufficient evidence that academic misconduct has occurred but there is (a) sufficient evidence of poor academic practice; and (b) the student has previously had a finding of poor academic practice or academic misconduct against them:**
  - i. The case will be treated as academic misconduct and referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel.
- d. There is sufficient evidence of academic misconduct (not severe):**
  - i. If the student admits to committing the academic misconduct and it is the first instance of academic misconduct, a recommendation will be made to the Assessment Board to apply an appropriate sanction from those available for a first instance of non-severe academic misconduct (see Appendix A)
  - ii. If the student disputes the allegation of a first instance of academic misconduct or the allegation relates to a subsequent instance of academic misconduct, the case will be referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel.
- e. There is sufficient evidence of severe academic misconduct:**
  - i. The case will be referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel.



41. The Preliminary Investigator should send a written report with the findings following the preliminary investigation meeting to Registry.

42. The Registry Team will inform the student of the outcome of the Preliminary Investigation within five CCL working days of the student's preliminary investigation meeting.

- **Academic Misconduct Panel**

43. The Academic Misconduct Panel conducts Academic Misconduct meetings, and has responsibility for proving Academic Misconduct allegations.

44. The 'burden of proof' during Academic Misconduct meeting lies with CCL and not on the student. The standard of proof required is measured based on the 'balance of probabilities'. This means that CCL is required to show that based on evidence gathered, it is more than likely that the academic misconduct took place.

45. Where the outcome of a preliminary investigation is to refer the case to an Academic Misconduct Panel, the following information will be sent to the student in writing at least ten CCL working days prior to the Panel meeting:

- Notice of the Panel meeting and the Panel membership
- The name of the Preliminary Investigator attending
- The student's right to be accompanied
- Details of the allegation against the student
- All documentary evidence considered during the preliminary investigation
- A record of any proven academic misconduct and poor academic practice committed by the student prior to the meeting.

46. The purpose of the Academic Misconduct Panel meeting is to:

- consider the evidence relating to the allegation gathered during the preliminary investigation
- provide the student with an opportunity to discuss the allegation against them
- based on the available evidence, determine whether academic misconduct has occurred on the balance of probabilities, i.e. that it is more likely than not that academic misconduct has occurred
- where academic misconduct has been found, make a recommendation to the Assessment Board on the appropriate sanction to be applied (see Appendix A). When determining an appropriate sanction, the Panel will consider the student's individual circumstances, e.g. the number of attempts that the student has had, any previous cases recorded on the student file, whether there are any material extenuating circumstances.

47. The Panel will comprise three academic members of staff who have not had prior involvement in the case, one of which will be the Chair. The Academic Registrar will nominate a member of staff to act as Secretary to the Panel who is also able to advise the Panel on regulatory matters.
48. The Academic Registrar has discretion to nominate an academic staff member from the panel membership pool as the Chair or member of an Academic Misconduct Panel.
49. The student is entitled to be accompanied by a CCL current student or a current member of staff. Students who wish to be accompanied to a meeting must inform the Panel Secretary five CCL working days prior to the Panel meeting. The student or staff member accompanying a student can only offer support to the student they accompany and cannot speak for or on behalf of the student.
50. If a student cannot attend the Panel meeting on the scheduled date for good reason, but wishes to be present, the Chair of the Panel should consider a postponement.
51. If a student chooses not to attend the Panel meeting, or fails to attend without submitting, in writing, valid reasons for a postponement, the Panel may meet in the student's absence.
52. If a student chooses not to attend, the student will be provided with the opportunity to provide a written response to the allegation against them, which must be submitted at least three CCL working days prior to the Panel Meeting. The Panel may seek clarification from the student on their written response prior to the Panel meeting. The Panel will not consider any written response from a student that is received after the Panel meeting or seek clarification on a written response after the meeting.
53. During the Panel meeting:
- a. the Chair will ask the student (where present) whether they accept the allegation.
  - b. the Chair will invite the student (where present) to respond to the allegation.
  - c. the Panel may ask questions of the student or the Preliminary Investigator to obtain further information or clarification.
54. Once the Panel has heard from those present at the meeting, all attendees except the Panel members and Secretary should withdraw whilst the Panel determines the outcome.

55. If the Panel finds that academic misconduct has not taken place, no further action is taken, and the student's record is updated to remove reference to the allegation. The notes of the Panel are retained. The marking process will resume and proceed as normal. The allegations will not be considered as part of the Assessment Board's deliberations.
56. If the Panel finds that academic misconduct has occurred, the Panel will make a recommendation to the Assessment Board providing details of the offence and the sanction to be applied, and the reasons for the recommendation. Where the Panel recommends a sanction that is not the normal sanction for the type of offence, the Panel must provide a clear rationale for this.
57. The sanctions available to the Academic Misconduct Panel can be found in Appendix A. The central principle behind applying a sanction to a student who has been found to have committed Academic Misconduct is that no student should receive an outcome where they benefit in any way from their misconduct. For example, it would be unacceptable for a student who is found to have committed Poor Academic Practice to receive a sanction that permits the student to correct the work and obtain full marks. This is because it would be equivalent to providing formative feedback and an extension, creating an unfair advantage over students who failed the assessment and then received a capped mark for a resit attempt.
58. The student will be informed in writing of the outcome of the Academic Misconduct Panel meeting within ten CCL working days of the meeting. The outcome letter will make clear that the outcome is provisional until approved by the Assessment Board.
59. Students awaiting the outcome of an academic misconduct case including those awaiting approval of a decision by the Assessment Board should continue studying on the programme unless:
- i. the student has been suspended from the programme under the [Student Conduct and Disciplinary Procedure](#) pending the outcome of a case; OR
  - ii. the student is at a progression point in their programme and their eligibility to progress to the next stage cannot be confirmed until the outcome of the academic misconduct case has been approved by the Assessment Board.
60. Following the approval of the decision of the academic misconduct case by the Assessment Board, students who remain dissatisfied with the outcome, should refer to the [Academic Appeal Procedure](#) for further guidance on how to request a review of their academic misconduct outcome.

61. The Assessment Board Secretary will present the recommendations to the Chair of the Assessment Board for final approval.

### **G. Confidentiality and Data Protection**

62. The information gathered as a result of possible academic misconduct will be held in accordance with General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR), Data Protection legislation and our Student Privacy Notice. We will make sure that matters overseen by us will have the appropriate level of confidentiality. Information will only be made available to those who need it for the purposes of managing and responding to the student's case.
63. We may need to disclose to other relevant staff and external organisations as part of the management of a student's case. Where there are elements which are particularly sensitive and the student has concerns about their confidentiality, the student can raise this with the Academic Registrar who will discuss how disclosure can be minimised, if possible and appropriate to do so.
64. Where we need to obtain information from a third party as part of processing a student's case, we will only give the third party as much detail about the student and their situation as is necessary to obtain the evidence required. Staff will ensure that discussions held about the student's case are undertaken with the correct level of confidentiality, unless, where doing so could put others at risk.

### **H. Reporting and Monitoring**

65. The Academic Board and the Board of Governors will receive an annual summary report of academic misconduct cases, and an overview of decisions reached. The reports will show trends and make recommendations for improvements where necessary. There will be no reference to individual cases. A confidential record, as required by the general data protection requirements, will be kept separately for individual cases.

## Appendix A: Sanctions for Academic Misconduct

The Academic Misconduct Panel will take into account the individual circumstances of a student's case when considering which sanction to apply. Where the panel applies a different sanction to the normal sanctions for a particular category of academic misconduct, a clear rationale must be provided.

Type	Examples	Normal Sanction
Poor Academic Practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wrong citations and unattributed quotations.</li> <li>• Inappropriate paraphrasing or unintentional paraphrasing without proper acknowledgement.</li> <li>• Unacknowledged proof-reading.</li> <li>• Copying an existing concept or idea unintentionally.</li> <li>• Absent, inaccurate or incomplete citations.</li> <li>• Numerous sentences of direct copying without acknowledging the source.</li> <li>• Unacknowledged help with English language accuracy.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Sanction A: Written Warning</b></p> <p>Student's work should be marked. The student's failure to address the marking criteria in relevant areas may result in the mark being reduced.</p> <p>A formally recorded warning will be kept on the student's record.</p>
Academic Misconduct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Repeated Poor Academic Practice, particularly if the student has been previously reprimanded.</li> <li>• Plagiarism: Inclusion of extensive sections of unreferenced text, whole paragraphs or substantial sections of unattributed work.</li> <li>• Collusion: Unauthorised collaboration on written, oral or practical work with another person or persons (also see severe academic misconduct sanctions).</li> <li>• Plagiarism: Large sections of unreferenced text.</li> <li>• Self-Plagiarism: Submission of the same piece of work, or major part thereof, for assessment.</li> <li>• Fabrications and falsification of data or evidence by altering research data and/or evidence to obtain advantage.</li> <li>• Lending submitted work from another student.</li> <li>• An assignment which has been translated into English by another person or Gen AI Intelligence or LLMs.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Sanction B: Capping of Marks (assessment element)</b></p> <p>Failure of the affected element with a mark of zero recorded. If the academic misconduct applied to the first attempt, the opportunity of a resit for the assessment element will be offered. The mark for the resit will be capped at the pass mark.</p> <p>A record of academic misconduct will be kept on the student's record.</p>
		<p><b>Sanction C: Capping of Marks (module mark)</b></p> <p>Failure of the affected element with a mark of zero recorded. If the academic misconduct applied to the first attempt, the opportunity of a resit for the assessment element will be offered. The mark for the assessment element and the overall module mark will be capped at the pass mark.</p> <p>A record of academic misconduct will be kept on the student's record.</p>

Type	Examples	Normal Sanction
Severe Academic Misconduct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Fabrications and falsification of data or evidence by generating set of false research data or creating/acquiring evidence illegally.</li><li>• Collusion: Proof of extensive collusion (also see academic misconduct sanctions).</li><li>• Cheating: gaining access to unseen assessment/examination/test questions or being impersonated during an examination/test or copying work.</li><li>• Contract Cheating. Examples include:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Purchasing or commission work from a third party. Third parties include organisations such as essay mills or individuals including friends or family members.</li><li>- Using Artificial Intelligence and/or Large Language Models (LLMs) in an unauthorised manner and/or to obtain an unfair advantage by creating work that is then dishonestly submitted as your own.</li></ul></li></ul>	<b>Sanction D: Award of zero marks with credit</b> Failure in the assessment element with a mark of zero recorded. If the academic misconduct applied to the first attempt, the opportunity of a resit for the assessment element will be offered. A mark of zero will be recorded for all assessment elements of the module and the module overall. If the module is passed, credit for the module will be awarded to recognise that the learning outcomes have been met.  A record of severe misconduct will be kept on the student’s record.
		<b>Sanction E</b> <b>Capping of Marks (all marks for programme stage)</b> Failure in the assessment element with a mark of zero recorded. If the academic misconduct applied to the first attempt, the opportunity of a resit for the assessment element will be offered. The mark for the resit will be capped at the pass mark. Additionally, the marks for all other assessments completed during the same programme stage (e.g. all level 4 assessments) will be capped at the pass mark.  A record of severe misconduct will be kept on the student’s record.  Sanction E should not normally be used for level 3 students or first year undergraduate students
		<b>Sanction F (See note 1 below)</b> Refer student to CCL’s Student Disciplinary Panel in line with the procedure set out in the Student Conduct and Disciplinary Policy.  A formally recorded warning kept on the student’s record
<b>Academic Induction Period:</b> Students who qualify to be considered under the Academic Induction Period should be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- required to resubmit the affected work. The mark will be capped at the pass mark if of a pass standard.</li><li>- required to undertake additional study skills support session(s) to support them with academic writing and academic integrity.</li><li>- There will be a formal note kept on the student’s record.</li></ul>		

**Note 1: Sanction F**

For severe academic misconduct cases, where the application of sanctions A – E are not suitable because of the seriousness of the misconduct, the Academic Misconduct Panel may escalate the matter to the Student Disciplinary Panel (Sanction F). The Student Disciplinary Panel will review the matter, in line with the Student Conduct Policy. Where the allegations are found to be substantiated the Disciplinary Panel can apply relevant sanctions as listed in the Student Conduct Policy. Sanctions may be combined as appropriate and reasonable. The outcome and rationale for any sanction(s) applied will be recorded and communicated to the student in writing.

<b>Version Control</b>	
<b>Document Title</b>	<b>Academic Integrity Policy</b>
<b>Maintained By</b>	<b>Assistant Registrar (Quality)</b>
<b>Owned By</b>	<b>Academic Registrar</b>
<b>Ratifying Committing</b>	<b>Academic Board</b>
<b>Last Review Date</b>	<b>December 2024</b>
<b>Next Review Date</b>	<b>December 2028 (or prior if required)</b>
<b>Current Version</b>	<b>Version 1</b>