



## Centre for Alternative Technology Academic Integrity Policy

These Regulations should be read in conjunction with the University of East London's Academic Integrity Policy which is available at: <https://www.uel.ac.uk/about/about-uel/governance/policies-regulations-corporate-documents/student-policies/manual-of-general-regulations>, and the Liverpool John Moores University regulations available at: <https://www.ljmu.ac.uk/~media/sample-sharepoint-libraries/policy-documents/6.pdf?la=en>

The Universities and the Centre for Alternative Technology are committed to ensuring that everyone is made aware of their responsibilities in maintaining the highest standards of academic integrity and of the steps taken to protect those standards.

### 1. Introduction

1.1 The Centre for Alternative Technology is committed to safeguarding academic integrity and will take firm action against any student who breaches these regulations and is found guilty of academic misconduct. All students are responsible for ensuring that; every element of their studies is their own work; the work of others is treated in respect and in accordance with good academic practice; and for following regulations for the proper conduct of assessments. No credit will be awarded for work which is found to have breached this Academic Integrity Policy.

### 2 Definition

2.1 For the purposes of these Regulations, academic misconduct is defined as any type of cheating in an assessment for the purposes of achieving personal gain. Examples of such misconduct are given below: the list is **not** exhaustive and the use of any form of unfair or dishonest practice to gain unfair advantage in assessment can be considered potential misconduct. A student cannot initiate an academic misconduct action against another student; this can only be done by an academic member of staff.

#### Coursework Submitted for Assessment

For coursework submissions, academic misconduct means:

- (a) The presentation of another person's work as one's own with or without obtaining permission to use it.
- (b) The inclusion within one's own work of material (written, visual or oral), originally produced by another person, or artificial intelligence software without suitable acknowledgment.
- (c) The submission, as if it were one's own work, of anything which has been offered to you for your use, but which is actually not your own work.
- (d) The inclusion within one's work of concepts paraphrased from elsewhere without citing your source.
- (e) The inclusion in submitted work of sections of text, whether from an electronic or hard copy sources, without appropriate acknowledgement of the source.
- (f) The submission of work that the student, as the author, has previously submitted, without suitable acknowledgement of the source of their previous work; this should not normally be more than a short quotation as the same work cannot be submitted for different assignments.
- (g) Including or quoting the work of other students in one's work, with the exception of published work, or outputs held in the library or dissertation database as a learning resource, which should be cited and acknowledged appropriately.
- (h) Being party to any arrangement whereby the work of one candidate is represented as that of another.
- (i) The submission, as your own work, of any work that has been purchased, or otherwise obtained from others, whether this is from other students, online services, "cheat sites", "essay mills" or other agents or sources that sell or provide assignments.
- (j) Practices such as 'cutting and pasting' segments of text into your work, without citing the source of each.
- (k) For work not intended to be submitted as a collaborative assignment: producing work with one or more other students, using study practices that mean the submitted work is nearly identical, overall or in part, to that of other students.
- (l) Offering an inducement to staff and/or other persons connected with assessment.

- 2.2 Recent developments in Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools such as ChatGPT, can create useful opportunities for teaching and learning when used correctly. However these tools do present a threat to academic integrity. Therefore when using AI tools, such as ChatGPT, to support your learning and in the development of your work you must maintain good academic practice. The use of AI can be considered as plagiarism (because you are relying on an unidentified source); commissioning (because you are relying on work produced by another person similar to an essay mill i.e. the company that owns the AI software) or fabrication if the AI makes up data or references, that you then rely on, for example in a dissertation.

If using AI, the aspects of good academic practice that you must consider should include:

- acknowledging AI sources through appropriate referencing where you have used content as an information source alongside your other reading
- acknowledging how and when you used AI to inform your approach to the assessment or as part of the writing process

**Unless you have been told explicitly that you can use AI as part of your assessment submissions, any assessment content produced by Artificial Intelligence platforms which does not represent the student's own original work will be considered a form of academic misconduct under this policy.**

- 2.3 Where academic misconduct is suspected, the awarding body (UEL or LJMU) Subject Area Progression Boards will not come to a decision on the candidate's result until the facts have been established.

### **3 Roles and Responsibilities**

- 3.1 The Chief Executive will appoint a Responsible Officer, usually the Head of School, to deal with cases of academic misconduct within the Centre on their behalf. The Responsible Officer is a senior member of the Centre's academic staff who works closely with Programme Leaders and the relevant administrator to manage incidents of reported academic misconduct within the School. This includes meeting with individual students to discuss cases and to outline the support available to prevent future incidents of academic misconduct. The role of Responsible Officer may be shared between two people and, in such cases, a minimum of one of the appointees must be a member of academic staff.

- 4 Procedures to be followed in the event of a suspected case of academic misconduct in undergraduate programmes, taught postgraduate programmes, and undergraduate and postgraduate credit bearing short courses.**
- 4.1 If an assessor or invigilator suspects that academic misconduct has occurred, they will inform the relevant Programme Leader, and Responsible Officer, by email, within 5 working days after detection.
- 4.2 The Programme Leader, in consultation with the Responsible Officer, will determine whether or not it appears that academic misconduct has occurred, by reviewing the reported circumstances and any relevant materials, including suspected source materials within a period of twenty working days.
- 4.3 Academic Misconduct Regulations do not apply where the suspected breach has occurred in students' work which has been:
- submitted more than 24 hours after, but within 1 week of, the stipulated submission deadline
- and
- where no extenuation claim is made, or if made, not granted.
- 4.4 If, at the end of the twenty working day period stipulated in 4.2 above, the Programme Leader and Responsible Officer have not found evidence that misconduct may have occurred, the relevant administrator will be advised, and no further action will be taken.
- 4.5 If, at the end of the twenty working day period stipulated in 4.2 above, the Programme Leader and Responsible Officer have evidence that misconduct may have occurred and:
- (a) there is a record that the student has previously been issued with a previous misconduct penalty
- or
- (b) the suspected academic misconduct is such that it might (according to the tariff in the section 5 below) merit more than a Level A (UEL) or Academic Misconduct penalty (AMP) LJMU (regardless of whether it is a first instance of academic misconduct) the matter will be referred to either the UEL Academic Misconduct Officer or the LJMU Faculty registrar as appropriate within 5 working days (see section 5 below).

- 4.6 If there is no record of the student having breached our Academic Misconduct Regulations, the Programme Leader, together with the Centre's Responsible Officer, will hold a School Meeting with the student. The student may be accompanied by a relative, friend. The accompanying person cannot be a professional legal representative who has been employed to act on the student's behalf nor can they act in the capacity of a legal advisor. At that meeting, the student will be reminded of the Academic Misconduct Regulations (including the tariff of penalties), shown how they have breached the regulations and advised on how to adhere to them in future. The Programme Leader will present the evidence which must include appropriate source material and ask the student whether they accept that they have breached these regulations. The student will then be invited to make any further comments.
- 4.7 For students on UEL validated programmes: Where acceptance occurs a Level A penalty will be issued by the Responsible Officer and the piece of work concerned will be awarded a mark of 0.  
For students on LJMU validated programmes: the penalties for Academic Misconduct follow a tariff based on the tables in Section 5 below which applies metrics to the level of misconduct
- 4.8 Students are required to confirm their acceptance that they have breached these regulations by signing the School Meeting pro forma, that they understand how they breached these regulations, undertakes to take all necessary steps to ensure that they do not do so again and understands that any further instance of academic misconduct is likely to lead to a serious penalty. The Programme Leader or Responsible Officer will inform the relevant administrator, who will notify UEL. The Programme Leader will be responsible for notifying the student formally of the outcome and retaining the record of the School Meeting.
- 4.9 Where the student denies academic misconduct the Programme Leader and Responsible Officer will refer the matter to the UEL Academic Misconduct Officer or LJMU Faculty Registrar as appropriate to the degree programme.
- 4.10 If academic misconduct has been alleged because an assessor suspects that the work submitted is not entirely the student's own work, and it is deemed appropriate (e.g. in cases where it has not been possible to identify the sources from which the work (or parts of it) has (or have) been taken), then a *viva voce* interview may be incorporated within the School Meeting. The *viva voce* will be held in accordance with UEL's Guidance for Conducting *viva voce* in relation to academic misconduct.
- 4.10.1 A report of the meeting at which the *viva voce* is held will be produced and made available to the Responsible Officer.

- 4.11 At the discretion of the Responsible Officer and usually only to accommodate distance learning students, the School meeting may take place via a video or telephone conference.
- 4.12 If the student does not appear at the date and time scheduled for the School Meeting or refuses to take part in a viva voce interview, the Responsible Officer will consider whether any reasons offered are valid, and if they so judge, adjourn proceedings to a later date.
- 4.13 If no reasons are advanced, the reasons are judged invalid or the student refuses to take part in the viva voce interview, the meeting will conclude that the student has admitted academic misconduct and will issue a penalty appropriate to the course validating University as seen in Section 5 below or where appropriate, a referral to either the UEL Academic Misconduct Officer or LJMU Faculty Registrar will be made. In these circumstances, there is no right to appeal the decision of the School Meeting.
- 4.14 Where a Level A penalty has been issued in the student's absence, the Responsible Officer will send the student a copy of the record of the School Meeting decision
- 4.15 Where the outcome of the viva voce interview is such that the suspected academic misconduct might merit more than the equivalent of a UEL Level A penalty (regardless of whether it is a first instance of academic misconduct) the matter will be referred to either the UEL Academic Misconduct Officer or LJMU Faculty Registrar as appropriate (see section 5 below) within 5 working days.
- 5 Referrals to the UEL Academic Misconduct Officer or LJMU Faculty Registrar for alleged subsequent instances of academic misconduct and alleged first instances of serious academic misconduct will follow the course relevant university procedures and penalties referred to below:  
UEL: <https://www.uel.ac.uk/about/about-uel/governance/policies-regulations-corporate-documents/student-policies/manual-of-general-regulations>  
LJMU: <https://www.ljmu.ac.uk/~media/sample-sharepoint-libraries/policy-documents/6.pdf?la=en>

## UEL Academic Misconduct Penalties – Level A

Academic Misconduct Penalties – Postgraduate Programmes
<b>Level A: First instance of non-serious offence</b>
<p>A student who plagiarises or colludes for the first time will be issued with a Level A Penalty if there is a <i>prima facie</i> case, provided that there is no evidence that they have behaved in a pre-meditated dishonest way. The work concerned will be awarded a mark of 0.</p> <p>Where a Level A Penalty is issued at the first assessment opportunity, the relevant component at reassessment will be capped at the minimum pass mark.</p> <p>Where a Level A Penalty is issued at a reassessment opportunity, the Subject Area Progression Board will determine the appropriate consequence.</p> <p>NB: A Level A Penalty is a penalty but is neither recorded on a transcript, nor reported to a professional body.</p>

## LJMU Academic Misconduct Penalties

The University strives to ensure fairness and consistency in the application of penalties to students across all faculties and has adopted a standard penalty tariff to be used in all cases of proven academic misconduct.

The tariff works on a points system - where the misconduct is proven, points are attributed according to:

- the type and extent of academic misconduct
- the level of the student
- any previous proven academic misconduct by the student
- the notional credit size of the assessment item

Calculation of penalty points (points from each criteria are added together to assess against the AMP target)

Category of misconduct	Points Awarded
Cheating in an examination	50 points
Collusion 1% - 25% of assessment item	10 points
Collusion 26 - 50% of assessment item	20 points
Collusion 51%-75% of assessment item	30 points
Collusion 76% - 100% of assessment item	40 points
Falsification of data	50 points
Plagiarism 1% - 25% of assessment item	10 points
Plagiarism 26% - 50% of assessment item	20 points
Plagiarism 51% - 75% of assessment item	30 points
Plagiarism 76% - 100% of assessment item	40 points

Submission commissioned or purchased from a third party	50 points
Any other categories of Cheating	50 points

Level of module	Points Awarded
Level 3 or 4	5 points
Level 5	10 points
<b>Level 6, 7 or 8</b>	<b>15 points</b>

History of Misconduct	Points Awarded
1 <sup>st</sup> Time	0 points
2 <sup>nd</sup> Time	25 points
3 <sup>rd</sup> Time	75 points

The **notional credit size** is calculated dependent on the module credit size and the weighting of the assessment item

#### Example 1

A module is 15 credits, and the assessment item is worth 60%

15 credits multiplied by 60%

$15 * 0.6 = 9$  points

#### Example 2

A module is 60 credits, and the assessment item is worth 90%

60 credits multiplied by 90%

$60 * 0.90 = 54$  points

The points total is calculated, and the appropriate penalty applied as outlined below:

BANDING	POINTS	PENALTY
AMP1	Up to 39 points	Zero for assessment item
AMP2	40 – 69 points	Zero for assessment item and module mark capped at pass mark
AMP3	70 – 89 points	Zero for module
AMP4	90 - 99 points	Zero for module and no referral
AMP5	100 or more points	Case referred to Board of Examiners to determine one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommendation for expulsion with an alternative exit award as appropriate</li> <li>• Recommendation for expulsion with any alternative exit award withheld</li> </ul>

Note: A referral will only be offered by a Board of Examiners if the student has not exhausted the referral opportunities for the module.



## **Amendments to Academic Integrity Policy v 1 Dated 13 July 2017**

Update to UEL Academic Integrity URL  
Addition of LJMU Academic Integrity statement URL  
Gender specific pronouns removed

2.1.i reference to 'essay mills' added  
4.5b reference to both UEL and LJMU approaches to Academic Misconduct added  
4.7 reference to both UEL and LJMU policies added  
5. Updates to UEL and LJMU university procedure URLs  
LJMU Academic Misconduct Penalty process details added

## **Amendments to Academic Integrity Policy v 2 Dated January 2021**

2.1 (b) - reference made to artificial intelligence as a source of unacceptable material  
2.1 (g) – added dissertation database as a source of other students work  
2.2 – statement regarding the misuse of AI produced assessment material  
4.7 - added clarity for UEL and LJMU programmes  
Added clarity to scoring system for LJMU AMP calculation  
Amended Example 1 of calculation for LJMU penalties amended to match CAT module credit rating.

Date Document Approved July 2023

By Academic Council

To be reviewed by July 2026