


|  |   |
|--|---|
|  <p><b>S P Jain<br/>London School<br/>of Management</b></p> | <b>Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure</b>                |
| Document Type  | Policy and Procedures   |
| Administering Entity   | Dean, Chief Operating Officer, Registrar, Programme Directors |
| Latest Approval/<br>Amendment Date   | 17 January 2024   |
| Last Approval/amendment<br>date  | 19 October 2022   |
| Approval Authority   | Academic Board  |
| Indicative time of Review  | January 2029  |

## 1. Purpose and Scope

- a. SP Jain London School of Management is committed to upholding and protecting the academic integrity of its higher education provision by providing information and support about academic integrity to students and staff, implementing educational strategies that promote academic integrity and limit the opportunities for academic misconduct, and detecting, investigating and penalising academic misconduct where it does occur.
- b. This document identifies activities that constitute a breach of academic integrity (i.e., academic misconduct) and describes the School's processes for investigating allegations of academic misconduct. It also describes the penalties that will apply where allegations are proven. It also sets out the School's approach to the use of generative AI tools by students in assessments.
- c. This Policy applies to all students undertaking assessments on SP Jain London School of Management programmes.

## 2. Principles

- a. The School has adopted the following principles:
  - The School is committed to academic integrity and expects students to understand and respect principles of academic integrity.
  - All academic work submitted for assessment must be the independent work of the student.
  - The School will use authentic assessments where possible which allow students to apply their learning to real world situations.
  - The School will encourage the critical use of generative AI tools where appropriate to enable students to improve their own outputs.
  - The School will take steps to detect academic misconduct including the use of plagiarism detection software.
  - The School will provide students with information and support about what constitutes a breach of academic integrity and how they may avoid a breach.

- The School acknowledges that not all academic integrity breaches are the same and not all will result in the same outcomes or penalties.
- b. The School will deal with cases of academic misconduct consistently and fairly. In dealing with allegations of academic misconduct, the School will observe the following values of procedural fairness:
- Students are presumed to be innocent unless they admit to academic misconduct, or evidence is found or observed of academic misconduct;
  - Students will be given the opportunity to respond to allegations of academic misconduct;
  - Previous instances of academic misconduct will not be taken into account in the determination of whether academic misconduct has occurred.

### **3. Defining academic misconduct**

- a. Academic misconduct is gaining or attempting to gain, or helping others to gain or attempt to gain, an unfair academic advantage in formal summative assessments which contribute to a unit or module mark.
- b. There are many different forms of academic misconduct, all of which may be the subject to the procedures described in this document. They include:
- Plagiarism. Plagiarism occurs when the work of another is represented, intentionally or unintentionally, as the student's own work, without appropriate acknowledgement of the author or the source. This includes the unacknowledged use of GAI tools.
  - Collusion. This is where a piece of work prepared by working closely with one or more individuals or in a group is represented as if it were the student's own, this includes:
    - Writing the piece of work together
    - Determining the method or approach to question and answers or completed assessment tasks
    - Sharing exam preparatory materials before an exam and then copying verbatim these materials when answering exam question(s).
  - Acquiring or commissioning a piece of work, which is not the student's own and representing it as if it were, by:
    - Purchasing a paper/essay from a commercial service, including internet sites, whether pre-written or specially prepared for the student concerned or
    - Submitting a paper written by another person, either a fellow student or a person who is not a student at the School.
  - Submitting one piece of work for more than one assignment or for more than one module
  - Helping or attempting to help another student to cheat including:
    - Doing work for another student
    - Designing or producing a project for another student
    - Providing answers during an exam, test or quiz including by mobile phone
    - Providing a student with an advance copy of a test
    - Leaving relevant materials behind at the exam site
    - Giving exams / other forms of assessments from outside the exam hall
    - Enabling them to copy coursework

- Altering the outcome of results
- Acting dishonestly or improperly in assessment tasks and/or examinations
- Cheating in examinations
- Falsification of or distorting data
- Attending classes or exams on behalf of someone else or asking someone to attend a class or take an exam instead of the enrolled student
- Interfering with the work of others, such as sabotaging laboratory experiments, research or digital files, giving misleading information, or disrupting class activities.

**4. Avoiding academic misconduct**

- a. Students will be provided with information about academic integrity and what constitutes academic misconduct during orientation by academic staff including an overview of the e-learning system and its detection mechanisms for plagiarism.
- b. Students will be informed and taught how to:
  - provide full citation of all sources (books, articles, web sites, newspapers, images, artefacts, data sources, programme code etc.) which have been drawn on in the preparation of an assignment
  - properly reference the sources of the arguments and ideas in an assignment using a recognised referencing system.

To emphasise the importance of academic misconduct, students are also required to declare that the work is their own prior to each submission.

**5. Use of generative AI**

- a. Students will be encouraged to use generative AI in a positive way to improve their outputs. They will, however, be required to set out how they have used AI to support their critical thinking.
- b. However, presenting assignments that have been created or improved through the use of digital aids (e.g., translators, digital assistants, or artificial intelligence tools like ChatGPT, Bard, Bing, etc.) to an extent where the submitted work no longer reasonably reflects the students' abilities or cannot be deemed an authentic product of the student, unless expressly allowed by the assessment specifications. Such cases will be dealt with under this policy.

**6. Identifying and investigating breaches of academic integrity**

- a. It is the responsibility of staff who are assessing student work or invigilating examinations to identify suspected breaches of academic integrity. Staff who are moderating assessments and external examiners are also entitled, and expected, to raise suspected breaches for investigation through this procedure.
- b. To support staff to identify suspected breaches of academic integrity, students' written work is subject to analysis for similarity with other work using specialist software.

- c. Other flags that might demonstrate plagiarism or use of GAI that are inappropriate
- the writing does make sense/ is inconsistent with academic assignments or is of a nature that would give cause to suspect the use of AI or other issues (such as essay mills for example).
  - the absence of expected concepts, theories, or references, etc. (i.e., those discussed in course readings and lectures).
  - the presence of unexpected concepts, theories, references, etc. (i.e., those not discussed in course readings and lectures or could be obtained by wider reading where these are not adequately explained by the student.
  - there are factual errors in the writing consistent with those found in/made by generative AI
  - the amount of writing produced exceeds a reasonably expected amount given time constraints (e.g., time-limited exams).

## **7 Procedure**

- a. If a person believes that a breach of academic integrity has occurred, they must report the alleged breach to the/or Programme Director using the academic misconduct report form.
- b. When a Programme Director receives a report of alleged misconduct, they must determine if the suspected misconduct is 'minor' or 'serious' by reference to the guidance at Appendix A, and then proceed as follows.

### Poor Academic Practice

- c. Where a student has not properly referenced a piece of work, it may be considered poor academic practice rather than academic misconduct. In this case, an informal warning should be issued. This is only appropriate for a first offence at the beginning of a student's programme.

### Minor breaches

- d. For suspected minor breaches, the Programme Director will be expected to handle the allegation in consultation with the Registrar's nominee for this purpose.
- e. The student must be advised in writing about the nature of the alleged breach and invited to respond in writing and/or to meet the Programme Director and Registrar's nominee to discuss the case.
- f. The penalty decision will be taken accordingly by the Programme Director in consultation with the Registrar's nominee by reference to the guidance at Appendix B and communicated to the student in writing within 14 days.

### Serious breaches

- g. Suspected serious breaches should be referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel, comprising at least two members of academic staff (not including the person who reported the alleged breach in the first instance) one of whom will be designated the Chair.
- h. The student must be advised in writing about the nature of the alleged breach and invited to attend a meeting of the Panel at least 5 working days before the meeting takes place.
- i. The student shall have the right to be accompanied/represented at the meeting by a friend or representative (but not a legal representative).

- j. At the committee meeting, if a student admits academic misconduct in the work under consideration and/or other submitted work, the meeting shall be adjourned for the committee to consider the appropriate outcome.
- k. If the student contests the alleged breach, then the committee should consider the student's comments and then adjourn to determine whether academic misconduct has taken place, and to consider the appropriate outcome. The standard of proof under this procedure will be the balance of probabilities. This means that the committee must be satisfied that, on the evidence available, academic misconduct was more likely to have occurred than not to have occurred.
- l. In reaching its decision on whether academic misconduct has occurred, the committee should disregard the student's previous record of academic misconduct.
- m. If the student does not appear before the committee, or chooses not to attend but to submit documentary evidence, the committee may proceed to hear the case if it is satisfied that proper notice of the hearing has been given to the student, and there are no grounds for believing that the student might have good and proper reasons for not attending.
- n. The outcomes available to the committee are:
  - where the student does not accept academic misconduct and the panel determines that academic misconduct is not proven, no further action;
  - where the student accepts academic misconduct, or where the panel determines academic misconduct is proven, either to:
    - issue an informal warning or,
    - recommend to the relevant Examination Board that a penalty be applied by reference to the guidance at Appendix B.
- o. The student should be informed in writing of the outcome of the committee meeting within five working days.
- p. Where the alleged breach of academic integrity involves collusion between more than one student enrolled at the School, the students should be invited to attend separate committee meetings and decisions should not be made until all meetings have been held.
- q. Consideration of intent will be given to each allegation of academic misconduct, i.e. whether it was due to carelessness or was unintentional (minor breach) or whether it was an act of deliberate dishonesty or intentional (serious breach).

## 8. Appeals

- a. A student may appeal in writing within 14 days of receiving written confirmation that they have been found to have engaged in academic misconduct. The appeal should be made to the Registrar and include detail of the grounds on which the appeal is being made in accordance with the Appeals Policy.

## Appendix A

| Minor breach  | Serious breach  |
|---|---|
| <b>Plagiarism</b>   |   |
| Small amount of work reproduced without appropriate acknowledgement.  | Significant amount of work reproduced without appropriate acknowledgement.  |
| Unlikely intent was to deceive.   | Likely/proven intention to deceive.   |
| No previous formal offence.   | Previous formal offence.  |
| First semester/stage of the programme.  | Later stages of the programme.  |
| <b>Collusion</b>  |   |
| Collaborative work is apparent in a few areas, but possibly due to lack of student's/students' awareness.                         | Collaborative work reflects significant similarities, and is probably due to deliberate attempt to share.                         |
| <b>Falsification</b>  |   |
| Substantial part of the data is original to the student.  | A significant amount of data is found to be fabricated.   |
| <b>Duplication</b>  |   |
| A small amount of work already submitted as part of a previous assessment is being passed off as new work for another assessment. | A significant amount of work already submitted as part of a previous assessment is passed off as new work for another assessment. |
| <b>Acquisition or commissioning</b>   |   |
| Not a minor breach.   | Work acquired or commissioned from another person or entity and submitted as the student's own.                                   |
|   | The student is knowingly and willingly impersonated by another.   |
| <b>In-person assessments</b>  |   |
| Communicating with someone other than the invigilator during an examination or in-class assessment on unrelated matters.          | Communication during examination or in-class assessment in order to seek academic advantage.                                      |
| Unauthorised material is not relevant or intentionally used.  | Use of unauthorised notes or other material (including in electronic format) to seek academic advantage.                          |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | Attempting to copy from another student in the examination or in-person assessment.                                    |
|  | Misuse of examination or in-person assessment briefs, for example gaining prior knowledge of contents of unseen paper. |
|  | Taking material away from examination or test when instructed not to.  |

## **Appendix B**

### **Guidance on penalties for breaches of academic integrity**

The penalties are in ascending order of severity. The choice of penalty should be informed by the extent of any intent to deceive, any previous offences and the level at which the student is studying. In general, lesser penalties should be recommended where the student has not intended to commit misconduct and/or where the student has not committed misconduct before and/or where the offence has occurred at Level 4; whereas more severe penalties should be considered if the student has intended to deceive and/or has committed misconduct before and/or is studying at Level 5 or above.

Informal warnings should not be issued where an offence that would normally be classed as serious has occurred or where a prior informal warning and/or academic misconduct has been recorded.

#### **Penalties for minor breaches**

- No penalty and informal warning
- Resubmission of the specific assessment component with an uncapped mark. The assessment brief for the resubmission may differ from the original
- Requirement to complete an alternative additional assessment
- Mark assessment component but cap at pass mark

#### **Penalties for serious breaches**

- Resubmission of the specific assessment component with a capped pass mark. The assessment brief for the resubmission may differ from the original.
- Overall module mark capped at the pass mark.
- Fail module with no further attempts. Student can continue for interim award
- Fail module (if applicable) and programme with immediate effect with or without an interim award
- Recommend expulsion of student, with or without an interim award