Quality Assurance Code of Practice

Promoting Academic Integrity*
*Previously known as Examination and Assessment Offences

Queries:
First point of contact - Assistant Registrars or equivalent
Technical/specialist contact - Academic Registry

Contents

Legal and Regulatory Compliance

QA53 supports the University to comply with Ongoing Condition of Registration B4: Assessment and Awards in respect of ensuring students are assessed effectively.

QA53 supports the University to comply with Ongoing Condition of Registration C2 and the Good Practice Framework of the Office of the Independent Adjudicator in respect of investigating academic misconduct.

Purpose

QA53 sets out the University's principles and assigns responsibilities in respect of promoting academic integrity.

Scope

QA53 applies to the promotion of academic integrity to students enrolled on courses leading to undergraduate and postgraduate taught awards of the University.

QA53 applies to the promotion of academic integrity to students enrolled on programmes leading to postgraduate research awards of the University in respect of any taught elements of those courses.

Principles

1. Students are encouraged to commit to, and maintain, high standards of academic honesty and integrity, respecting the work and originality of others throughout their course of study.

2. Students are offered guidance and the opportunity to engage in training on academic integrity.

3. Students' attention is clearly drawn from the outset, and wherever applicable throughout their course of study, to the principles of academic integrity and how they apply to different assessments, the nature of academic misconduct, the consequences of detection and the penalties that will follow.

4. Assessments are set and designed to minimise opportunities for academic misconduct.

Responsibilities

Education, Quality & Standards Committee approves the generic Academic Integrity Initiative Test.

Department Learning, Teaching and Quality Committees approve course-specific academic integrity tests.

For the School of Management, the responsibilities of the Department Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee are exercised by the School Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee

Directors of Studies:

- ensure that students are made aware of Regulation for Students 19: Conduct of Investigations into Academic Misconduct

- ensure that students are signposted to central academic integrity training resources

- ensure that students take an academic integrity test according to the deadlines set in Regulation for Students 15.

- decide whether students should take the generic Academic Integrity Initiative Test or a course-specific test

- design course-specific academic integrity tests

- ensure the dates and results of course-specific academic integrity tests are accurately recorded in SAMIS

Unit Convenors:

- assign a category and specify the acceptable use of AI for each summative assessment task

- explain how the principles of academic integrity apply to each summative assessment task

- inform students that coursework and practical summative assessment tasks must be submitted with a signed Academic Integrity Statement.

- provide relevant feedback to students who have engaged in academic misconduct in work submitted for formative assessment

Markers:

- check work submitted for assessment for academic misconduct

- notify Unit Convenors of suspected academic misconduct.

Faculty Assistant Registrars advise on QA53.

Academic Registry advises on QA53 and publishes supporting guidance.

Centre for Learning and Teaching publishes supporting guidance.

Monitoring and Review

Education, Quality and Standards Committee reviews QA53 on a cyclical basis.

1. Training on academic integrity

Academic misconduct

1.1.   Course handbooks include a link to [Regulation for Students 19: Conduct of Investigations into Academic Misconduct](#).

1.2.   Directors of Studies ensure that students are made aware of Regulation for Students 19.

Central academic integrity training resources

1.3.   The Library publishes [guidance on referencing and plagiarism](#).

1.4.   The Skills Centre provides [online academic skills short courses,](#) including a module on responsible use of Gen AI.

1.5.   Courses handbooks include links to central academic integrity training resources.

1.6.   Directors of Studies ensure that students are signposted to central academic integrity training resources.

2. Academic integrity tests

Test deadlines

2.1.   All students must take and pass an academic integrity test:

- undergraduate students must pass a test to progress from the first year of the course and to qualify for award

- postgraduate taught and postgraduate research students must pass a test to qualify for award.

2.2.   Directors of Studies ensure that students take an academic integrity test by the appropriate deadlines.

Choosing a test

2.3.   Directors of Studies decide whether students should take the generic Academic Integrity Initiative Test or a course-specific test.

2.4.   Education, Quality & Standards Committee approves the generic Academic Integrity Initiative Test.

Course-specific tests

2.5.   Directors of Studies design course-specific academic integrity tests including subject-specific material.

2.6.   Directors of Studies submit draft course-specific academic integrity tests to Department Learning, Teaching and Quality Committees for approval.

2.7.   Department Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee approves course-specific academic integrity tests where they are of an equivalent standard to the generic Academic Integrity Initiative Test.

2.8.   Department Learning, Teaching and Quality Committees reports approval of course-specific academic integrity tests to Faculty Learning, Teaching and Quality Committees for noting.

2.9.   Directors of Studies ensure that the dates and results of course-specific academic integrity tests are entered into SAMIS.

3. Use of Generative AI

3.1.   Unit Convenors assign a category indicating the acceptable use of Generative AI for each summative assessment task.

3.2.   Where limited use of Generative AI is permitted, Unit Convenors explain how Generative AI can effectively be used.

3.3.   When assigning a category, Unit Convenors ensure that assessment tasks are capable of robustly testing the relevant Unit Intended Learning Outcomes.

3.4.   The CLT publishes guidance on assessment design and the use of Generative AI categories

4. Information to students about each summative assessment

4.1.   Unit Convenors explain to students how the principles of academic integrity apply to each assessment task.

4.2.   Unit Convenors explain to students:

- the differences between the group and any individual elements of group assessment tasks

- the acceptable extent of collaboration between students.

4.3.   Unit Convenors explain to students the category for use of Generative AI assigned to the assessment task and the specific ways in which Generative AI can or must be used.

4.4.   Unit Convenors inform students that coursework and practical summative assessment tasks must be submitted with a signed Academic Integrity Statement (this can include confirming they have read and agree to the statement in Moodle by checking a tick box).

4.5.   The Centre for Learning and Teaching published a template assignment brief which Unit Convenors can use.

5. Detecting academic misconduct

Checking work for academic misconduct

5.1.   Markers check work submitted for assessment for academic misconduct (see *Types of Academic Misconduct*).

5.2.   Markers who suspect academic misconduct in work submitted for assessment notify the Unit Convenor.

Evidence-based academic judgement

5.3.   Staff use their academic judgement to make reasonable efforts to detect academic misconduct. This means that they exercise their professional knowledge and expertise.

5.4.   Academic judgements are evidence-based.

Guidance on the typical [evidence for different types of academic misconduct](#) is published by the Centre for Learning and Teaching:

Similarity-checking software

5.5.   Where feasible, staff check work submitted for coursework and practical summative assessment tasks using the University's licensed similarity-checking software.

Students have consented to this when registering at the University.

5.6.   Staff do not submit, or upload, work submitted for assessment to any similarity checking software or AI detection tools etc., for which the University does not have a license. They do not submit or upload work to Generative AI tools generally.

5.7.   Reports produced by similarity-checking software are evidence to which staff apply their academic judgement to detect academic misconduct, as with any other form of evidence. A high similarity score does not automatically indicate that a student has engaged in academic misconduct.

Generative AI

5.8.   The University encourages the ethical use of Generative AI where appropriate to and permitted for an assessment task.

5.9.   Unauthorised use of Generative AI may be a means by which students engage in plagiarism and/or collusion.

The University does not categorise unauthorised use of Generative AI as a separate type of academic misconduct.

5.10. Staff do not attempt to identify whether a student has used Generative AI to complete their work. They attempt to identify where a student's work shows evidence of academic misconduct (see *Types of Academic Misconduct*).

6. Handling academic misconduct in formative assessment

6.1.   Where Unit Convenors identify or are notified of suspected academic misconduct in work submitted for formative assessment, they include this in feedback to students.

6.2.   Feedback to students includes an indication of the likely penalties which would have been applied if the student had engaged in the same academic misconduct in summative assessment.

6.3.   Feedback to students signposts them to the central academic integrity training resources:

- Referencing guide: AI and Plagiarism
- Online academic skills resources

7. Handling academic misconduct in summative assessment

7.1.   Where Unit Convenors identify or are notified of suspected academic misconduct in work submitted for summative assessment, they follow the procedures detailed in [Regulation for Students 19: Conduct of Investigations into Academic Misconduct](#).

Types of Academic Misconduct

1. **Plagiarism**

   Presenting someone else's work or ideas as the student's own.

   This includes paraphrasing without acknowledgement, whether by the student themselves or by a Gen AI tool.

2. **Self-plagiarism**

   Submitting the same work that the student has already submitted for another assessment when this is not permitted and/or without acknowledgement.

3. **Collusion**

   Working with someone else, or a Gen AI tool, on an assessment which is intended to be the student's sole work.

   This includes sharing work and/or answers with other persons.

4. **Taking a copy of another student's work without permission**

5. **Fabrication**

   This includes fabrication of references, data, evidence or experimental results and otherwise false, misleading or negligent representation of information which is included in work submitted for assessment.

6. **Contract cheating**

   Where someone completes work for a student who then submits it as their own.

   This includes buying an assignment in full in part from a person or organisation and buying or otherwise acquiring exam questions, tests, assignments and answers via unauthorized means.

7. **Arranging for someone else to impersonate a student by sitting their examination**

8. **Breaching examination regulations**

   This includes breaches of Rule 2: Conduct in Examinations and rules stipulated in an examination instruction sheet.

Unethical and/or unauthorised use of Generative AI and other artificial intelligence tools is a means by which students may engage in one or more of the types of the academic misconduct listed above. The University does not categorise unethical/unauthorised use of generative AI as a separate type of academic misconduct.

Statement Details

Issue Version:	**4.1**
Date	**November 2025**
Antecedents	*Working Group Report on Plagiarism*
	Senate 　　　　　　Minutes 11123,　　11496 14 April 2010,　　Minute 13110; 1 December 2010,　Minute 13219
	Senate (NFAAR) 9 April 2008　　　Minute 12740; 11 June 2008　　　Minute 12782
	Quality Assurance Committee Minutes 297, 315d,　335, 491(d), 623(1), 1 July 2008,　　　Minute 857(7)(8) 3 July 2009,　　　Minute 976(7) 13 July 2010　　　Minute 1097
	Learning and Teaching Committee 　　　　　Minute 61　　　(3/2/09)
	University Learning Teaching & Quality Committee 8 September 2010,　Minute 4b 9 November 2010,　Minute 25 24 May 2011,　　　Minute 92 iv) 6 November 2012　　Minute 334 9 July 2013　　　　Minute 428 8 July 2014　　　　Minute 552 7 July 2015　　　　Minute 671 11 July 2017　　　Minute 940 6 Nov 2018　　　　Minute 1103 16 July 2019　　　Minute 1197
	Education Quality & Standards Committee 8 January 2021　　Minute 21 15 February 2021　Minute 47 7 May 2021　　　　Minute 62 17 May 2022　　　Chair's Action 25 October 2022　　Minute 244 September 2023　　tbc 20 March 2024　　Minute 332 2 July 2024 2 July 2025

Related Documentations	Student Regulation 19: Conduct of investigations into academic misconduct
	University Rule 2: Conduct of Examinations
	Assessment regulations
	Specific rules of IMCs are outlined in our assessment regulations or in the Individual Mitigating Circumstances and Assessment document. See details of the IMC procedures that apply to specific courses
Authors	Academic Registry
	Secretary to Senate