



## **Non-Academic Misconduct Procedure**

**2025/26**

This procedure applies to undergraduate programmes delivered by Boomsatsuma and validated by Kingston University London.

It should be considered as an addendum to [Kingston University Student Conduct and Behaviour Procedure](#) and a 'Stage 1' process that takes into account Boomsatsuma's position as a collaborative partner of Kingston University London.

# Student Non-Academic Misconduct Procedure

## 1. Purpose and Definitions

- 1.1 This document outlines the procedure used by Boomsatsuma when considering cases of non-academic misconduct.
- 1.2 Non-academic misconduct includes but is not limited to:
- Bullying or harassment, or similar forms of unacceptable behaviour towards other students, staff, or visitors
  - Sexual misconduct towards students, staff and third parties
  - Disorderly, threatening, or offensive behaviour, whether expressed verbally or in writing (including electronic forms and social media)
  - Obstruction or interference with the functions, duties, and activities of any student or member of staff
  - Other forms of misconduct that may damage the reputation of Boomsatsuma
- 1.3 The following procedure outlines steps taken to resolve cases of non-academic misconduct. Where a case cannot be resolved internally at Boomsatsuma, a decision may be made to initiate the [Kingston University Student Conduct and Behaviour Procedure](#).

## 2. Reporting

- 2.1 Staff that wish to report a case of non-academic misconduct should approach their Head of Subject. Where this is inappropriate or not possible, it should be reported to the Head of Higher Education.
- 2.2 Students that wish to report a case of non-academic misconduct can approach one of their tutors or their Course Leader/Head of Subject in the first instance, or otherwise contact [studenthelp@boomsatsuma.com](mailto:studenthelp@boomsatsuma.com) for advice.

### **3. Preliminary Meeting**

- 3.1 After a report of Non-Academic Misconduct, we will invite the Reporting Party to a preliminary meeting to gather key information about the allegation. The preliminary interview will be conducted by a member of academic staff with appropriate experience, or where more appropriate, a member of the Student Support team. The Reporting Party may be accompanied for support by another student, a friend, or family member.
- 3.2 Following the preliminary meeting, the member of staff will make an assessment regarding whether or not to conduct an investigation. In some cases, this decision will require consultation with the Head of Higher Education or another member of staff at an appropriate level of seniority.
- 3.3 If a decision is made to take no further action following the preliminary interview, the Reporting Party will be notified in writing. The Reporting Party may also may also request a review of the decision, in writing, to the Head of Higher Education.

### **4. Investigation**

- 4.1 The following procedure is initiated in cases where an allegation of Non-Academic Misconduct has been deemed to warrant an investigation.
- 4.2 All cases of non-academic misconduct that fall within the scope of this procedure will be handled by an Investigating Officer. This person is a staff member at the level of Head of Subject or above that is not directly involved in the allegation. The Investigating Officer is responsible for gathering information from relevant parties and providing recommendations for action.
- 4.3 The Investigating Officer will arrange and conduct interviews with individuals involved in the allegation, including the Reporting Party, those against whom the allegation is levelled (the Responding Party), and any other relevant

parties. In all cases, interviewees will be given a fair and unbiased opportunity to present their version of events.

- 4.4 All students involved in investigatory meetings have the right to be accompanied for support by another student, a friend, or family member. In all cases, the student is expected to speak on their behalf. Legal representatives are not permitted in investigatory meetings without prior written consent and approval.
- 4.5 If a Responding Party fails to attend an investigatory meeting without good reason, the Investigating Officer may handle the case in their absence. If the Reporting Party, witnesses, or related parties fail to attend an investigatory meeting, the Investigating Officer will similarly review the case based on the evidence available to them.
- 4.6 Following an investigation, the Investigating Officer will prepare a short report that summarises the case and the process undertaken to investigate it, and will prepare a set of recommended actions. This report will be reviewed by the Head of Higher Education, in consultation with relevant members of Boomsatsuma's senior leadership team, to agree appropriate outcomes and penalties.

## **5. Outcomes and Penalties**

- 5.1 Within the remit of this procedure, there are four possible conclusions to a case of non-academic misconduct. They comprise:
- Acquittal. The Responding Party is acquitted of any wrongdoing and the case is dismissed with no follow up actions
  - Caution. The Responding Party is found guilty of a minor case of non-academic misconduct and receives a written caution that requires a cessation of certain actions or behaviours
  - Precautionary Measures. In some instances, Boomsatsuma may conclude that precautionary measures are required to safeguard our community

Precautionary measures may include, amongst others, fully or temporarily suspending access to specific facilities, non-participation in certain activities, or ceasing communication with particular individuals

- Referral. For repeat cases of non-academic misconduct, or if the allegation is found to be more serious during the course of the investigation, a case may be escalated to the [Kingston University Student Conduct and Behaviour Procedure](#). This process is applied particularly where the resolution of the case may be suspension or partial suspension

## **6. Appeals**

- 6.1 Both the Reporting Party and the Responding Party have the right to appeal the outcome of an investigation. Appeals should be made in writing to the Head of Higher Education. An independent panel is convened to review appeals.