

Academic Integrity and Academic Misconduct:

A Guide for Students and Tutors

September 2024



**Harper Adams
University**

Academic Integrity and Academic Misconduct Policy

September 2024

Table of Contents

- 1. What is the purpose of this policy 2
- 2. Who is this policy for? 2
- 3. Academic Misconduct..... 2
- 4. Academic Misconduct Categories and Penalties..... 3
 - 4.1 Poor Academic Practice..... 3
 - 4.2 Minor Academic Misconduct 4
 - 4.3 Major Academic Misconduct 4
 - 4.4 Gross Academic Misconduct..... 4
- 5. Academic Misconduct Penalties 5
 - 5.1 Professional Practice Implications 6
 - 5.2 Retrospective Considerations of Academic Misconduct 6
- 6. Artificial Intelligence 7
- 7. Academic Misconduct: Investigation Steps 7
 - 7.1 Minor academic misconduct 7
 - 7.2 Major academic misconduct 7
 - 7.3 Gross academic misconduct..... 8
 - 7.4 Gross misconduct within examinations 9
 - 7.5 Academic Misconduct Panel Procedures 9
 - 7.6 Student support 11
- 8. Appeals 11
- 9. Relationship with other policies..... 12
- Appendix 1: Illustrative examples of acceptable use of AI tools 13
- Appendix 2: Glossary..... 15

1. What is the purpose of this policy

Our aim is to promote academic integrity, which is the commitment to act honestly during academic studies, maintain professional conduct, take responsibility for one's own work, and respect the rights of others' work. The academic community relies on academic integrity to ensure that work is ethical, trustworthy, and professionally produced.

Academic Integrity involves students:

- Taking responsibility for their own work
- Respecting the work of others
- Acknowledging the work of others wherever used
- Avoiding actions that lead to unfair advantage
- Honest reporting of work
- Ensuring that work is ethical
- Being responsible for complying with regulatory, legal, and professional obligations
- Maintaining appropriate standards of conduct
- Supporting others to behave with academic integrity
- Responsible use of technology

Actions that fail to meet academic integrity requirements are considered academic misconduct and can result in penalties. All students in all courses are expected to follow accepted academic practices when submitting work for assessment. This helps maintain academic integrity. Anyone who does not act with academic integrity in their assessed work is considered to have committed academic misconduct.

2. Who is this policy for?

This policy applies to all students including apprentices on taught undergraduate and postgraduate courses.

3. Academic Misconduct

The types of behaviour, which is associated with misconduct include, but are not limited to:

- AI-generated answers presented as a student's own work
- Cheating, including contract cheating and the use of essay mills
- Intent to deceive or circumvent text-matching software such as Turnitin
- Infringement of examination regulations
- Ethical breaches, which may include falsifying data, evidence, or experimental results
- Collusion
- Plagiarism

Academic misconduct is unacceptable as it provides an unfair advantage over others and may lead students to falsely claim knowledge and skills. The University takes academic misconduct seriously and has tools and processes to evaluate reported cases, including:

- Reports from staff, including exam invigilators
- The use of technologies such as original text-matching software
- Dedicated staff, including a Principal Academic Misconduct Investigator, who leads investigations into suspected academic misconduct.

Additionally, the University reserves the right to use appropriate methods to detect academic misconduct, which may include the use of a viva voce.

4. Academic Misconduct Categories and Penalties

The severity of academic misconduct can vary. Penalties are more severe for more severe forms of misconduct.

4.1 Poor Academic Practice

Poor academic practice occurs when students show they do not understand proper academic rules, often early in their studies. It includes errors like poor referencing or paraphrasing and might involve too many direct quotes or incorrect citation methods. It can also mean a lack of originality, copying the structure or a limited amount of the content of others' work, misunderstanding collaboration limits, or reusing their own past work without proper care. However, these actions do not show intent to cheat or deceive.

Poor academic practice could include, but is not limited to:

- Inadequate referencing and low levels of poor paraphrasing.
- A lack of original thought e.g. submission is modelled on the work of others in terms of structure, content, and flow.
- Misinterpretation of the line between collaboration and collusion.
- Self-plagiarised by inappropriately using a small amount of previously submitted material.

When students submit work that does not follow academic conventions but does not warrant a misconduct penalty, it can be considered poor practice. This might include missing references or using a small amount of uncredited material. Such cases are handled through marking and feedback processes, and students are advised on proper academic practices, possibly with a requirement for mandatory online training. In most cases of poor academic practice students will be notified via a letter and the poor practice will be recorded centrally.

To discourage poor academic practices, tutors will adjust grades when academic standards are not met. The method of applying these penalties should align with the importance of academic conventions in the grading criteria. In cases of significant breaches, tutors might award a zero. Feedback should clearly communicate any grade adjustments and their reasons.

These instances do not require involvement from the Academic Misconduct Panel, and there is no need to report them to the panel's chair. However, staff should consult with the Principal Academic Misconduct Investigator as needed for advice. If a student wants to challenge a decision related to poor academic practice, they must appeal to the chair of the Academic Misconduct Panel.

There are three categories of formal misconduct.

- Minor academic misconduct
- Major academic misconduct
- Gross academic misconduct

Each category is defined below.

4.2 Minor Academic Misconduct

- i. Involves less than 25% of the assessed work or occurs in a part of the work of lesser importance in relation to the assessment marking criteria.
- ii. Misconduct arises solely from poorly applied citation conventions, including the absence or incorrect use of quotation marks where others' words are reproduced.
- iii. Misconduct occurred early in the student's studies, or there is another well-founded reason to suppose that the student did not understand academic conventions.
- iv. No indication that the student intended to gain an unfair advantage.
- v. No prior record of the student having committed any category of academic misconduct.

4.3 Major Academic Misconduct

- i. Involves between 25% to 50% of the assessed work.
- ii. Misconduct arises from the inclusion of unattributed material, including AI sources, as opposed to solely the misuse of citation conventions.
- iii. No reasonable reason to suppose that the student did not understand academic conventions and the need to declare where work is substantially that of another (be it published or from other sources, including AI, friend, family, employer, or another student).
- iv. There is a record of the student having previously committed minor academic misconduct.

4.4 Gross Academic Misconduct

- i. Misconduct occurred in an important part of the work in relation to the assessment marking criteria.
- ii. There is a reasonable indication that the student sought to gain an unfair advantage.
- iii. There is a prior record of the student having previously committed major academic misconduct.
- iv. Being in possession of unauthorised items/materials during an examination.
- v. Contract cheating or 'ghosting,' where work has been produced in whole or in part by another person and/or organisation on the student's behalf.
- vi. Extensive and deliberate use of artificial intelligence where it was not permitted or with the intention to untruthfully and unreasonably claim the work is original.

The tables below indicate how each type of misconduct is investigated and where students may appeal. Table 1 is for taught students, and Table 2 is for research students. In all cases, the burden of proof rests with the University.

Table 1 Academic misconduct investigation and appeals for taught students

Category of misconduct	Staff leading investigation and sanction	Student can appeal to
Minor academic misconduct	Module Leader	Chair of Academic Misconduct Panel
Major academic misconduct	Module Leader in consultation with the Principal Academic Misconduct Investigator	Chair of Academic Misconduct Panel
Gross academic misconduct	Module Leader, Principal Academic Misconduct Investigator and Academic Misconduct Panel	Head of Registry Services (using the Academic Appeals Policy)

Table 2 Academic misconduct investigation and appeals for research students

Category of misconduct	Staff leading investigation and sanction	Student can appeal to
Minor academic misconduct	Relevant examiner* (of year one or year two report or final thesis) in consultation with the Principal Academic Misconduct Investigator	Chair of Academic Misconduct Panel
Major academic misconduct	Relevant examiner* (of year one or year two report or final thesis) in consultation with the Principal Academic Misconduct Investigator	Chair of Academic Misconduct Panel
Gross academic misconduct	Relevant internal examiner* (of year one or year two report or final thesis) in consultation with the Principal Academic Misconduct Investigator and Academic Misconduct Panel	Head of Registry Services (using the Academic Appeals Policy)

*or postgraduate research programmes manager or nominee

5. Academic Misconduct Penalties

The following table outlines the penalties usually associated with each misconduct category for students on taught programmes.

Table 3: Penalties for Academic Misconduct (Taught Students)

Type of misconduct	Penalty
Minor academic misconduct	Marks reduced in line with extent of assessment affected. Maximum penalty is award of zero marks for the work. Written warning by Module Leader and note to student record database and file. Requirement to complete online training and a test in good academic practice and academic integrity.
Major academic misconduct	Zero marks for the module with opportunity to be reassessed recommended, but eligibility within the assessment regulations to be determined by the Course Assessment Board. Written warning by Module Leader and note to student record database and file. Requirement to complete online training in good academic practice and academic integrity, including the successful completion of an online test.

Gross academic misconduct	Failure of module with no reassessment and recommendation that the failed module should impact on any progression or award entitlement with opportunity to restudy only if eligible within the assessment regulations, as determined by the Course Assessment Board.
	Failure of module with no reassessment and recommendation to the Course Assessment Board that the failed module should impact on any progression or award entitlement, with no opportunity to restudy that or an alternative module. Record on student record database and file.
	Failure of all modules studied in the academic session with no opportunity for reassessment and a recommendation to the Course Assessment Board that either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) an opportunity to restudy in the following academic session is permissible; or b) the candidate is withdrawn from the programme with no opportunity to re-enrol until at least one year has elapsed; or c) the candidate is withdrawn from the programme permanently. Record on student record database and file.

Table 4: Penalties for Academic Misconduct (Research Students)

Type of misconduct	Penalty
Minor academic misconduct	Failure of Research Degree report / thesis with opportunity for resubmission recommended to Research Degrees Awarding Board. Written warning and direction to guidance by relevant internal examiner, and note on student file. Requirement to complete online training in good academic practice and academic integrity, including the successful completion of an online test.
Major academic misconduct	Failure of Research Degree report / thesis with opportunity for resubmission recommended to Research Degrees Awarding Board. Written warning and direction to guidance by relevant internal examiner, and note on student file. Requirement to complete online training in good academic practice and academic integrity, including the successful completion of an online test.
Gross academic misconduct	Failure of Research Degree report / thesis with a recommendation to the Research Degrees Awarding Board that there should be no opportunity to resubmit the report / thesis nor continue with studies.

5.1 Professional Practice Implications

Students enrolled on a professional vocational course, such as Veterinary Nursing and Veterinary Physiotherapy have additional responsibility under professional and/or regulatory body requirements. Academic misconduct could raise questions to a student's fitness to practise, and as such, fitness to practice policies will be initiated as appropriate.

5.2 Retrospective Considerations of Academic Misconduct

If evidence of academic misconduct is found after modules or degrees have been awarded, the Academic Misconduct Panel will review the evidence and provide a written recommendation and report if the allegations are confirmed. In cases of severe misconduct, penalties will be applied retroactively according to the penalty guidelines, which may include revoking previously awarded credits or degrees. The decision to withdraw academic credits or degrees is then reviewed by the relevant Course Assessment Board or Research Degrees Awarding Board. If evidence shows misconduct, the panel or the Chair of Academic Misconduct can ask the Principal Academic Misconduct Investigator to review the student's past submissions.

6. Artificial Intelligence

Generative AI may be used as a tool to support student work unless otherwise specified in an assignment brief, but it is essential that every student's work remains original. Illustrations of acceptable and unacceptable use are offered for illustrative purposes in Appendix 1.

All use of generative AI must be acknowledged in an 'Acknowledgements' section on the first page of any piece of academic work where it has been used. This includes the use of translation tools. The acknowledgement must include the following details:

- Name and version of the generative AI system used, e.g., ChatGPT-3.5
- Publisher (company that made the AI system), e.g., OpenAI
- URL of the AI system
- Brief description (single sentence) of how the tool was used

If a student wishes to refute a judgment of misconduct related to how they have used AI in constructing their work, they may request a meeting with the Principal Academic Misconduct Investigator. The student will need to provide clear evidence of their authorship of the work, for example, dated files or screenshots providing evidence of research and planning or evidence of prompts used and outputs generated. For this reason, students are encouraged to keep a record of any AI usage (e.g. saved searches).

7. Academic Misconduct: Investigation Steps

7.1 Minor academic misconduct

If a module leader / examiner / postgraduate research programme manager concludes that a student has committed minor academic misconduct, they should write to the student (as in Annex 5.02a-g of the *Academic Quality Assurance Manual*) advising them of the violation while also directing them to a source of guidance. A copy of the letter must be linked to the student file by copying the letter to the student's Course Tutor or Director of Studies and the Registration Assessment Records and Awards Office, marked for the attention of the Chair of the Academic Misconduct Panel. Please note the occurrence of minor academic misconduct will be recorded centrally on a database.

7.2 Major academic misconduct

To assess cases of possible major academic misconduct, staff should complete the following steps before referring any suspected cases of major academic misconduct to the Principal Academic Misconduct Investigator:

- a. Confirm if the student has previously contravened the academic misconduct expectations of the University.
- b. Review the Turnitin originality report for the submitted work to help determine if the work represents poor academic practice or requires further investigation.

If after completing the steps above, major academic misconduct is still suspected, the relevant tutor should collate the following information for the Principal Academic Misconduct Investigator:

- i. A short report explaining why major academic misconduct is suspected.
- ii. A copy of the work under consideration.
- iii. A copy of the assignment brief and the Turnitin originality report.

Staff marking the assessment should consult with the Principal Academic Misconduct Investigator in time to meet the module's published feedback deadline.

Upon receipt of the evidence, the Principal Academic Misconduct Investigator will:

- Arrange a discussion with the student.
- Set out the reasons why there is a suspicion of major academic misconduct.
- Offer the student the opportunity to refute the claims.

Students must respond promptly to requests from the Principal Academic Misconduct Investigator. Dates by which information is needed will be specified.

The Principal Academic Misconduct Investigator and tutor will assess the information and confirm whether major academic misconduct has been committed. If there is an agreed outcome, the relevant penalty will be applied.

If they do not agree, the Chair of the Course Assessment Boards or Research Degrees Awarding Board will be asked to make a judgment.

If a module leader concludes that a student has committed major academic misconduct, they should write to the student (as in Annex 5.02a-g of the *Academic Quality Assurance Manual*) advising them of the violation and directing them to a source of guidance. A copy must be linked to the student file by copying the letter to the student's Course Tutor or Director of Studies and to the Registration Assessment Records and Awards Office, marked for the attention of the Chair of the Academic Misconduct Panel. Please note that the occurrence of major academic misconduct will be recorded centrally on a database.

7.3 Gross academic misconduct

To assess cases of possible gross academic misconduct, staff should complete the following steps before referring any suspected cases to the Principal Academic Misconduct Investigator:

- a. Confirm if the student has previously contravened the academic misconduct expectations of the University.
- b. Review the Turnitin originality report for the submitted work to help determine if the work represents poor academic practice or requires further investigation.

If, after completing the steps above, gross academic misconduct is still suspected, the relevant tutor should collate the following information for the Principal Academic Misconduct Investigator.

- i. A short report explaining why major academic misconduct is suspected.
- ii. A copy of the work under consideration.
- iii. A copy of the assignment brief and the Turnitin originality report.

Students must be advised by the tutor in a message to their University email address that:

Your submission has been passed to the Principal Academic Misconduct Investigator to consider whether it demonstrates gross academic misconduct. You will receive an invitation to discuss this matter with them shortly.

Where applicable, feedback and the mark that would have been awarded for the work, assuming that acceptable academic practice has not been contravened, should be advised to the student, with a note indicating that:

This mark is provisional and assumes that the work has been produced within normal academic practice expectations. It is, therefore, subject to change, depending on the outcome of the misconduct investigation.

7.4 **Gross misconduct within examinations**

Where student conduct in an examination is suspected to show gross academic misconduct, the Senior Invigilator should refer cases to the Academic Misconduct Panel. The referral must include a report indicating:

- Reasons why gross academic misconduct is suspected, e.g. relevant physical evidence (e.g. unauthorized materials), photographic evidence.
- If appropriate, statements from other individuals who also observed the student's actions.

The Chair of the Academic Misconduct Panel, with assistance from the Principal Academic Misconduct Investigator, will take the following steps:

- i. The Principal Academic Misconduct Investigator will, normally within five working days, invite the student to meet with them, outlining the nature of the suspicion, the possible penalties, and the arrangements the panel will use to consider the case. If the suspicion arises during an examination period, the Principal Academic Misconduct Investigator may exercise their judgment to defer this meeting.
- ii. The Principal Academic Misconduct Investigator will share the Senior Invigilator's report with the student and the tutors.
- iii. The student will be invited to write to the Principal Academic Misconduct Investigator, normally within 72 hours of the meeting, indicating whether they accept or refute the suspicion of gross academic misconduct and whether they would like to present their case in person to the Academic Misconduct Panel.
- iv. Having spoken with the student, if the Principal Academic Misconduct Investigator is satisfied that there is evidence of gross academic misconduct, they will Request that the Chair of the Academic Misconduct Panel convene a meeting of the Academic Misconduct Panel, normally within ten working days of the initial meeting between them and the student.
- v. If they are not satisfied that there is evidence of gross academic misconduct, they will propose that the tutor treat the submission as a less severe category or reject the suspicion.
- vi. Where the tutor and Principal Academic Misconduct Investigator disagree, the Chair of the Course Assessments Boards/Research Degrees Awarding Board will be asked to adjudicate.

7.5 **Academic Misconduct Panel Procedures**

- a) An Academic Misconduct Panel will be convened when a student is suspected of gross academic misconduct once the procedures outlined have been completed.
- b) An Academic Misconduct Panel has the full delegated authority of the relevant Course Assessment Board or Research Degrees Awarding Board, and its final decision is final. The Academic Misconduct Panel will, however, make recommendations to the board for it to determine the consequences of its decisions on student progression or award.
- c) The Academic Misconduct Panel comprises at least three staff members and one student representative, typically the SU President, although the Student Services Manager may be called upon when the SU President is unavailable. The Chair is a member of staff nominated by the Quality & Standards Committee. Other staff members are typically, but not exclusively, drawn from the Quality & Standards Committee membership.

The panel members will be independent of the case under consideration. Under no circumstances shall the Principal Academic Misconduct Investigator be permitted to actively participate in any subsequent Academic Misconduct Panel that may be convened.

- d) Where a student has elected to attend an Academic Misconduct Panel meeting to present their case, they may be accompanied by a current Harper Adams University enrolled student, Students' Union representative, or staff member for support. The person accompanying the student may offer advice to the student during the Academic Misconduct Panel; however, they have no right to question any member of the Panel but may be permitted to make a statement to the Panel if invited to do so by the Chair. Where the need to make reasonable adjustments to the normal process is demonstrated by the student (e.g. appointment of a representative), the panel will confirm with the Student Wellbeing Officer the most appropriate approach/adjustments to apply.
- e) The Academic Misconduct Panel shall conduct its business in an open and constructive manner and normally in accordance with the procedures outlined herein. However, the Chair, in consultation with other members of the Panel, may change the procedures to take account of particular circumstances. This may include inviting the module leader/relevant internal examiner to the meeting to clarify aspects, deferring decisions pending resolution of conflicting evidence, or undertaking the proceedings by correspondence if the student elects not to attend.
- f) Documentation summarising the student's position will be circulated by the Academic Misconduct Panel Chair prior to the panel meeting to each of the panel members and the student whose work is under suspicion, at least seven calendar days in advance of the meeting. This will typically include a statement from the student indicating whether they refute or accept the accusation and any circumstances they wish the panel to consider, plus a report from the module leader/relevant internal examiner, including the items listed, and any other relevant information or evidence collected by the Principal Academic Misconduct Investigator during their inquiries.
- g) The Academic Misconduct Panel will meet in private to discuss the issues pertinent to the student's case.
- h) The student and advisor, if appropriate, will be invited to join the meeting of the Academic Misconduct Panel.
- i) The Chair will set out the reasons why there is a suspicion of gross academic misconduct, making reference to supporting evidence.
- j) The student will be offered the opportunity to refute the suspicions and associated evidence. The student will also be given the opportunity to ask questions of the Panel.
- k) The panel will ask the student questions to clarify issues.
- l) The student will be given a final opportunity to explain their position.
- m) The student and advisor, if present, will be asked to withdraw from the meeting, and the Panel will meet in private to arrive at its decision.
- n) The Panel's decision shall be guided by the standard of proof required (i.e. balance of probability) and the penalty tariffs outlined. The student and advisor, if present, will be invited to return to the meeting, and they will be informed of the Panel's decision.
- o) The student will receive written confirmation of the Panel's decision from the Chair of the Panel, normally within 5 working days of the meeting. The

decision of the Panel shall be implemented with immediate effect. For information, a report will also be submitted to the next meeting of the relevant Course Assessment Board or Research Degrees Awarding Board and copied to the student's file, Course Tutor or Director of Studies, and relevant module leader/relevant internal examiner.

- p) The student has the right to appeal against the decision of the Academic Misconduct Panel. An appeal must be received by the Head of Registry Services within fourteen days of the notification of the Panel's decision to the student. The extant Academic Appeals policy may be accessed via the University's website (www.harper.ac.uk/keyinfo).

Where a student elects not to attend the meeting, steps h, j, k, l and n are omitted.

Where suspected breaches occur at partner colleges, the approved academic misconduct procedures of the partner college will apply. However, the categories of academic misconduct and the associated penalties that will be applied by the partner colleges are common to the principles outlined in paragraphs section 4 of the Harper Adams University Academic Misconduct Policy.

7.6 Student support

In cases of alleged misconduct, students may seek support from their Course Team, Student Services, or the Student Wellbeing Officer. For advice about the alleged misconduct, students may contact the Module Leader or Principal Academic Misconduct Investigator. Postgraduate research students may wish to contact the Postgraduate Research Office or their Director of Studies for advice.

Students who have been victims of blackmail or extortion are encouraged to speak up to any member of staff. Students are to be assured that they will be fully supported while an investigation takes place.

8. Appeals

Students may not appeal against the academic judgement of examiners, such as by claiming that the marks awarded were too low. Neither can a student appeal on the grounds that they did not understand or were not aware of the University's regulations or procedures.

Appeals can only be raised if i) there was a material error that affected the decision of the approved decision-making body, ii) there is evidence of bias or a reasonable perception of bias, or iii) if there are mitigating circumstances.

Examples might include:

- The assessment was not conducted in accordance with the regulations
- A Misconduct Panel failed to follow its own procedures
- There is evidence of blackmail or extortion

Appeals relating to cases of minor academic misconduct and major academic misconduct should be directed to the Chair of the Academic Misconduct Panel. Appeals relating to cases of gross academic misconduct should be directed to the Head of Registry Services using the Academic Appeals Policy, which may be accessed via: www.harper.ac.uk/keyinfo

Following an independent investigation of the academic misconduct case, the Chair of the Academic Misconduct Panel or the Head of Registry Services will respond to the appeal. One of the following decisions will be made, and the student will be notified accordingly:

- a) **Appeal rejected** – If there is evidence that the misconduct case was dealt with properly, and regulations and procedures were properly implemented the case will be rejected.
- b) **Appeal upheld (or partially upheld)** - If there is evidence that there was an error or irregularity which affected the decision the Chair of Academic Misconduct Panel or Head of Registry Services will refer the matter back to the relevant tutor or Principal Academic Misconduct Investigator.
- c) **Appeal referral** – Refer appeal back to relevant tutor or Principal Academic Misconduct Investigator to consider that they review and confirm or amend the original decision in light of new evidence collected during the investigation.

9. Relationship with other policies

Action Relating to	Is Dealt with via	Possible external referrals
Requests for a review on a decision relating to academic progress or an Academic Award.	Academic Appeals Policy	N/A
Concerns about the health or wellbeing of a student	Student Health and Wellbeing Policy	Local authority bodies and health services.
The exercise of freedom of speech, balanced debate and involving external speakers	Freedom of Speech, Academic Freedom and External Speakers' Policy	Police Prevent

Appendix 1: Illustrative examples of acceptable use of AI tools

	Acceptable use *	Unacceptable use
Writing assistance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of tools such as Grammarly or Co-Pilot to suggest improvements to grammar, spelling, clarity and conciseness of writing. • Use of AI tools to suggest ways that writing could be made more concise to help with word limits. • If using AI to modify your writing, it is recommended that you retain evidence of this, for example the original text or AI history showing how it has been used. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of the AI-functionality in tools such as Grammarly and Co-Pilot as well as other AI tools such as Chat-GPT, Scite AI etc. to draft content. • Submitting writing that does not sound like you, includes words or concepts that you do not understand, or that you have not checked and edited. • Being uncritical in accepting any suggestions about amendments to writing. <p>AI generated text can be easy to spot due to its common usage of particular words, hyperbolic tone and Americanisms. Handing in work that sounds like it has been written by AI means your work may be investigated for misconduct.</p>
Getting initial ideas about an assignment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using AI to generate initial ideas. These should then be researched and developed fully by the student using appropriate academic sources. • Using AI to suggest a structure for an assignment. Be cautious though – AI suggestions are likely to be very similar, possibly leading to an unoriginal assignment, work that does not reflect the taught material, or suspicion of collusion if no adaptations are made. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Getting AI to write whole sections of an assignment and simply altering a few words without demonstrating any original thought or understanding. • Failing to develop the ideas suggested by AI through personal research using appropriate academic sources. <p>AI generated work is often flagged for misconduct investigation because it does not reflect what has been taught or because it is very similar to other submissions in wording, choice of examples and structure.</p>
Researching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AI may provide some helpful ideas about areas to research, but these should always be followed up with research using the appropriate academic sources. • Tools such as Research Rabbit and typeset.io can be useful in finding relevant papers to research a topic. • AI tools can be helpful in summarising the key 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using material generated by AI as evidence to support a claim without checking its accuracy using and citing appropriate academic studies. AI is a machine operated by algorithms. Its outputs must always be treated critically. • Copying the summaries generated by tools such as Pop-AI rather than interpreting these yourself. This is an example of getting AI to think for you.

	arguments and supporting evidence in papers, but you should check copyright agreements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Using literature review generators etc. to create work for you. This risks major misconduct and failure of the module.
Clarifying understanding of concepts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AI can be used as a ‘tutor’ to explain ideas and concepts. It can be useful to ask it to give real world examples as these can help with understanding. AI may be useful in helping to decide which statistical tests would be most appropriate to use (and why) and in understanding what the results show. Always treat the output critically though and check it against reliable sources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Using AI to conduct statistical analysis for you represents academic misconduct. <p>Some work has been flagged as major misconduct as the statistical tests conducted by AI were highly unusual, overly advanced, or contained inaccuracies and unusual reporting of results. This led to failure of the module.</p>
Transcribing interviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tools such as Otter AI and Fireflies.AI can support qualitative research by transcribing interviews. There can be mistakes in the transcriptions though, so these must be checked carefully for accuracy. Such tools can only ever be used if participants have given signed agreement to this, use of such tools was agreed by the ethics committee, and all participant data must be anonymised. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some transcription tools offer coding and thematic analysis functions. This represents academic misconduct as it involves AI thinking for you. There are also ethical issues to consider. Concerns have been expressed about the level of data extraction demanded by these tools, with this possibly conflicting with data protection requirements. Use such tools cautiously and only ever with explicit ethics committee approval.
Revision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AI can act as a coach, creating questions based on your own notes uploaded to it, and assessing your answers for accuracy. AI can also help to plan and structure revision. AI can be used to generate practice exam questions on a topic on the basis of sample questions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes, handouts and slides created by lecturers represent their intellectual property and should never be uploaded into AI without their explicit permission to do so.

Appendix 2: Glossary

Auto-plagiarism, or self-plagiarism involves resubmitting one's own previous work for new academic credit without proper citation, except in cases like reassessment, where it's permitted.

Cheating refers to any student attempting to unfairly advantage themselves in assessments through dishonest means, such as communication during exams, using unauthorised materials, obtaining papers early, and passing off another's work as one's own. It also covers falsifying data, misleading tutors, misusing AI-generated content, and manipulating assignment submission systems.

Collusion involves students collaborating to produce work meant to be submitted by one student alone, misleading markers about the sole authorship. While some assignments may require or allow group collaboration, it's crucial that students ascertain when individual work is expected and secure their work to prevent misuse.

Contact Cheating is when a student commissions another person or organisation to complete their assignments or exams, presenting the work as their own. This includes using services like essay mills and paying someone else to take an exam on their behalf.

Plagiarism is the act of using someone else's work without proper attribution, effectively presenting it as one's own. This can range from direct copying to paraphrasing without acknowledgement. It's important for students to understand what constitutes plagiarism and to cite sources consistently.

Viva Voce is an oral examination where students are required to explain and defend their work in person. This method may be used to verify the authenticity of a student's submitted work and to assess their understanding of the material.

Policy information

Date of last review	September 2024
Individual policy owner(s)	Sue Jeavons, Chair of Academic Misconduct Panel
Collective oversight	Quality and Standards Committee (QSC)
Approval date	September 2021
Equality Impact Assessment approval date	November 2021
Date of next review	June 2025
Date and description of any minor amendments made: The policy's principles remained unchanged and work had taken place to re-write the policy into succinct, plain English. The Quality and Standards Committee endorsed the Academic Integrity and Academic Misconduct Policy on 12 th September 2024.	