



UKMC Academic Integrity Policy

| Date | Author | Summary of Changes | Version | Authorised |
|---|---|---|---------|-------------------------|
| 24/06/2025 | Dr Yasser Arfat | New institutional Academic Integrity Policy for franchised higher education programmes across UKMC. | 1 | Academic Board |
| 13/12/2025 | Dr Yasser Arfat | Policy Development in line with frameworks | 2 | Academic Board Dec 2025 |
| Policy/Procedure Management and Responsibilities | | | | |
| Policy/Procedure Owner | <p>The policy is overseen by the Course Directors and reported to the faculty committees and Registry Committees where appropriate.</p> <p>Day-to-day implementation and communication responsibilities are delegated to the Head of Academic Integrity Office.</p> | | | |
| Equality Analysis | EDI Committee TBD | | | |
| Authorised By | Academic Board | | | |
| Effective From | December 2025 | | | |
| Next Review | July 2026 | | | |
| Version | 2 | | | |
| Internal/External | Staff and Student | | | |
| Document Location | UKMC Policies and Legislation | | | |
| Linked Documents Internal | UKMC Strategic Plan 2025-2030 | | | |
| Linked Documents External | | | | |
| Dissemination Plan | <p>The policy will be distributed via communication bulletins, academic team briefings, Course Directors, course coordination committee meetings, student success tutors' trainings, and relevant regulatory faculty meetings and events. Students will have access through course materials.</p> | | | |
| Accessibility | Alternative formats available on request contact Quality@ukmc.ac.uk | | | |

CONTENTS

| | | |
|------|--|----|
| 1 | Introduction..... | 3 |
| 2 | Purpose of the Policy..... | 4 |
| 2.1 | Understanding of academic integrity across UKMC | 4 |
| 2.2 | Expectations, responsibilities, and support mechanisms for staff and students | 4 |
| 2.3 | Clarification of relationship between UKMC’s general policy guidance and partner university procedures | 5 |
| 2.4 | Scope | 6 |
| 3 | Principles and Values of Academic Integrity | 7 |
| 4 | Definition of Academic Misconduct | 8 |
| 4.1 | Acceptable Peer Support vs. Misconduct | 8 |
| 4.2 | Third-Party Involvement and Unacceptable Academic Assistance..... | 9 |
| 4.3 | Shared Responsibility and Consequences of Peer Misuse | 9 |
| 4.4 | Clarification on Good Academic Practice | 10 |
| 4.5 | Prohibited Academic Assistance..... | 10 |
| 5 | Expectations of Students..... | 12 |
| 6 | Expectations of Academic and Professional Staff | 12 |
| 7 | Preventative Measures and Student Support..... | 13 |
| 8 | Partner University Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policies | 14 |
| 9 | Training and Awareness | 18 |
| 10 | Monitoring and Review | 19 |
| | Appendices | 20 |
| | Appendix 1: Academic Misconduct – Categorisation and Definitions | 20 |
| | Appendix 2: Other Considerations..... | 22 |
| | Translation Software or Services..... | 22 |
| | Proofreading..... | 23 |
| | APPENDIX 3: STUDENT TRAINING AND AWARENESS ON ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT | 25 |
| | Core Student Training..... | 25 |
| | Supporting Awareness Modules | 25 |
| | Implementation | 26 |
| 11 | UK Management College: Academic Misconduct Categories and Sanctions | 26 |
| 11.1 | Introduction | 26 |
| 11.2 | Categories and Indicative Sanctions | 26 |
| 11.3 | Repeated Offences | 27 |

1 INTRODUCTION

The UK Management College (UKMC) Academic Integrity Policy outlines the institution’s approach to promoting academic honesty, fairness, and ethical conduct across all higher education programmes delivered through franchise arrangements. Academic integrity underpins the value of UK degrees and is essential to ensuring that all assessments reflect genuine student achievement.

This policy provides a local framework for defining integrity, supporting good academic practice, preventing misconduct, and fostering a shared culture of accountability among students and staff.

As UKMC is not a degree-awarding body, all academic awards are conferred by validating partner universities. Therefore, this policy is aligned with, and subordinate to, the academic integrity and misconduct procedures of those universities.

Partner university policies take precedence over UKMC’s local guidance in all formal matters relating to:

- Definitions of academic misconduct
- Investigation procedures and thresholds
- Misconduct hearings, outcomes, and sanctions
- Appeals and student rights.

Currently, this policy aligns with the academic integrity frameworks of:

- Canterbury Christ Church University (CCCU)
- University of Wolverhampton (UoW)

This policy is designed to be scalable and will accommodate:

- Additional validating partners in the future
- Partner-specific procedures and hyperlinks listed in a dedicated section or appendix.
- Ongoing updates to reflect regulatory or institutional changes across awarding bodies.

UKMC uses this policy to support consistent expectations across its academic community, ensure readiness for compliance with partner regulations, and promote early intervention and support around academic integrity.

2 PURPOSE OF THE POLICY

This Academic Integrity Policy sets out the strategic intent, institutional obligations, and guiding framework through which UK Management College (UKMC) fosters and sustains a culture of academic integrity across its higher education provision. As a franchised teaching institution delivering degree programmes awarded by Canterbury Christ Church University, University of Wolverhampton, and other UK higher education providers, UKMC is committed to embedding the values, expectations, and processes that underpin fair academic conduct and scholarly honesty. This policy has three core purposes:

2.1 UNDERSTANDING OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY ACROSS UKMC

UKMC recognises academic integrity as a foundational principle of ethical learning, assessment, and scholarly endeavour. This policy establishes a unified institutional narrative that academic integrity is not simply about avoiding misconduct, but about cultivating habits of critical thinking, independent authorship, ethical source use, and reflective learning.

It defines academic integrity in line with sector-wide guidance, including the QAA Academic Integrity Charter and our awarding partners' frameworks, and sets out the values of honesty, fairness, responsibility, trust, and respect in the academic context.

Through this policy, UKMC aims to ensure that all members of its academic community, students, lecturers, Student Success Tutor (SST), and wellbeing staff, understand the meaning and importance of academic integrity.

The policy also encourages a shared responsibility model, whereby students are empowered to act with integrity and staff are equipped to foster good academic practices across the learning journey.

Academic integrity is not simply a regulatory requirement; it is the intellectual and ethical standard that sustains the credibility of academic qualifications, the integrity of our institutional reputation, and the lifelong employability of our graduates.

2.2 EXPECTATIONS, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND SUPPORT MECHANISMS FOR STAFF AND STUDENTS

The policy clarifies the respective roles and obligations of students and staff in maintaining academic standards:

- Students are expected to take personal responsibility for producing original work, correctly referencing others' contributions, and seeking academic support where needed. They must not engage in behaviours that confer an unfair advantage, including plagiarism, collusion, contract cheating, and the misuse of generative AI or digital paraphrasing tools. This policy helps students

recognise and avoid these forms of academic misconduct and equips them with clear expectations at the outset of their studies.

- Staff have a duty to model and reinforce good academic practice through assessment design, module delivery, feedback, and formative learning. Academic teams are responsible for proactively educating students about academic expectations, including correct referencing conventions, critical writing, and the limits of appropriate collaboration. This responsibility includes enabling students to self-assess their work using similarity detection tools like Turnitin and offering early intervention support where academic concerns arise.
- UKMC also has a clear responsibility to offer systematic training and guidance, such as through student inductions, module briefings, digital skills support, referencing workshops, and academic development provision led by course teams and Student Success Tutor (SST). Institutional oversight is provided via Quality Assurance and Compliance, which monitors how academic integrity is promoted and embedded across programmes, with reference to awarding partner requirements.
- The policy further outlines procedures for responding to suspected misconduct in a manner that is fair, timely, and in line with partner universities' procedural frameworks. While UKMC does not impose penalties or adjudicate outcomes itself, it is responsible for initiating, documenting, and supporting academic misconduct cases in accordance with its role as a delivery partner.

2.3 CLARIFICATION OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN UKMC'S GENERAL POLICY GUIDANCE AND PARTNER UNIVERSITY PROCEDURES

UKMC delivers validated degrees on behalf of partner awarding institutions. Therefore, while this policy sets out UKMC's general principles and institutional expectations, the specific definitions, investigative procedures, thresholds for determining misconduct, sanction categories, and appeal routes are defined and governed by the relevant awarding university.

UKMC students are subject to the academic integrity and misconduct regulations of the university that awards their degree. This means that in the event of a suspected or alleged breach, the full procedural handling—including any viva, panel hearing, sanction, or appeal—is led by the partner university, in accordance with its own policies and timelines.

As such, this policy does not attempt to reproduce or override the partner's documentation but instead acts as a framing and signposting document. Students and staff are explicitly required to familiarise themselves with the policy of the relevant awarding institution, which is provided through programme handbooks and module-level resources. Direct links to partner policies and procedures are also included in the appendix of this policy.

To assist staff and students in navigating these distinctions:

- UKMC provides contextual advice, academic skills development, and procedural coordination at local level.
- Awarding universities such as CCCU and UoW conduct formal investigations and determine academic outcomes.
- All concerns must be referred to the appropriate partner process at the earliest stage, with UKMC support as appropriate.

For example, CCCU's Student Academic Integrity Policy outlines not only the definitions of misconduct, but also the institutional structures for early resolution, staff training, misconduct panels, and student support rights, including representation by the Students' Association of UKMC. It also provides specific guidance on the use and misuse of AI tools, proofreading, and collusion. Similarly, the University of Wolverhampton's policy includes detailed procedures for suspected misconduct hearings, including viva arrangements where the authenticity of student work is in doubt, and uses a staged misconduct investigation process with defined outcome categories.

Therefore, this UKMC policy is to be read in tandem with—and never as a substitute for—the awarding university's current academic integrity and misconduct documentation. It aims to facilitate understanding, readiness, and consistent local application, while respecting and complying with the lead authority of our validating partners.

2.4 SCOPE

This Academic Integrity Policy applies comprehensively across UKMC's academic provision and operations. The following points outline the breadth of its application, clarifying who the policy covers, the types of provision and assessment included, and the institutional boundaries within which the policy operates. It also sets out how this policy interacts with the procedures of UKMC's validating partner universities.

- Applies to all students enrolled on franchised higher education programmes delivered by UKMC, regardless of whether they are studying full-time or part-time, in-person, online, or through blended modes.
- Includes all undergraduate (UG) and postgraduate (PG) taught provision across all disciplines delivered under UKMC's franchise arrangements.
- Applies to all academic and administrative staff involved in teaching, assessment, marking, academic guidance, and any academic decision-making processes related to student performance and progression.
- Covers all forms of assessment, including written assignments, presentations, in-class tests, exams, practical assessments, group work, and research projects.
- Applies across the full student lifecycle, from induction through to graduation, wherever academic judgement or assessment takes place.

- Includes support services and roles that contribute to the maintenance of academic integrity, such as SST, programme leaders, academic advisors, quality assurance teams, and professional services staff.
- While UKMC provides overarching principles and guidance on academic integrity, specific rules, processes, sanctions, and procedural timelines relating to misconduct are governed by the validating university awarding the degree.
- Students and staff must refer to the academic integrity and academic misconduct regulations of the relevant validating university for operational procedures. A dedicated section at the end of this policy provides links to each partner university's full policies and procedures.

3 PRINCIPLES AND VALUES OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

The foundation of this policy is built upon a clear understanding of the core principles that define academic integrity. The following values inform expectations for ethical conduct across all teaching, learning, and assessment activities at UKMC. These values guide both individual behaviour and institutional practice, fostering a culture of honesty, fairness, and scholarly responsibility.

- Academic integrity is a foundational value in higher education that underpins trust in qualifications, fairness in academic progression, and the credibility of institutional awards.
- It is central to UKMC's academic ethos and is expected of all students, staff, and academic collaborators as part of their scholarly conduct.
- Core values of academic integrity include honesty, trust, fairness, responsibility, and respect. These values are reflected in how individuals produce, present, and assess academic work.
- Honesty involves being truthful about the origins of ideas and acknowledging all contributions made by others, including the use of generative AI or other tools where permitted.
- Trust is maintained when students, staff, and external examiners can rely on the authenticity of submitted work and the transparency of academic processes.
- Fairness means upholding consistent standards and avoiding behaviours that give unfair academic advantage, such as plagiarism, collusion, or cheating.
- Responsibility requires students to learn and apply good academic practices, seek support when unsure, and comply with the rules of referencing and academic conduct.

- Respect involves valuing the intellectual property and work of others, attributing sources accurately, and participating in academic discourse with professionalism and courtesy.
- Students are expected to demonstrate proper referencing using the citation system prescribed by their programme or validating university. Lack of referencing, poor paraphrasing, or reliance on unacknowledged sources will be considered breaches of integrity.
- The use of sources, including academic literature, digital tools, and collaborative platforms, must be ethical, transparent, and clearly acknowledged.
- UKMC supports a community-based approach to academic integrity, with shared responsibility across staff and students, training embedded in curriculum design, and guidance available throughout the academic journey.

4 DEFINITION OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

Academic misconduct refers to any act whereby a student seeks to gain an unfair advantage or to deceive others in the context of academic work, whether intentionally or through negligence. It includes behaviours that compromise the integrity of assessment processes, the validity of academic awards, and the foundational values of honesty, fairness, and respect in scholarly activity.

Academic misconduct is any action or behaviour that compromises the integrity and fairness of academic work and assessment processes. It is defined by UKMC as conduct that misrepresents a student's own efforts, knowledge, or understanding and undermines the academic standards of the awarding body. While intentional dishonesty constitutes a serious breach, it is recognised that some students may unintentionally engage in poor academic practice due to lack of awareness or misunderstanding. UKMC provides support to raise awareness of good academic conduct and offers clear guidance to prevent breaches.

4.1 ACCEPTABLE PEER SUPPORT VS. MISCONDUCT

UKMC encourages a collaborative learning environment, where students may engage in peer-support activities. Acceptable examples of peer interaction include:

- Discussing assignment topics or module content
- Exchanging general ideas and resources
- Offering broad suggestions on how to improve academic work (e.g., referencing style or structure)

Such academic peer support is appropriate and expected in higher education. However, it is not acceptable for peers to:

- Edit or revise another student's work directly.

- Suggest content to insert or delete.
- Rephrase arguments or reword written material.
- Translate or restructure entire sections of academic submissions.

If a peer alters another student's submission in any way, or if a student copies from peer input without proper attribution, this may be treated as **collusion** or **plagiarism**, both of which fall under academic misconduct.

4.2 THIRD-PARTY INVOLVEMENT AND UNACCEPTABLE ACADEMIC ASSISTANCE

Students are expected to complete assessments independently, using permitted sources and support structures provided by UKMC. Third-party assistance—whether from peers, commercial services, generative artificial intelligence tools, or family members—must not interfere with the authenticity of a student's work.

The following activities are prohibited unless explicitly authorised by a SST or covered by formal learning support plans. Students must not use third parties or tools to:

- Translate the work into English or another language in full or in part
- Rephrase or restructure sections of writing to develop ideas or improve fluency
- Modify, expand, or reformulate arguments or academic reasoning
- Contribute new material, evidence, or data to the original submission
- Correct or replace factual information presented in the work
- Rewrite flawed sections of an assignment, especially to improve logic, flow, or coherence
- Make extensive content edits that substantially alter the submission
- Change specific words, phrases, terminology, figures, or notation beyond grammar or spelling corrections
- Rearrange the order of passages, lines of code, visual data, or structured responses
- Rewrite equations, formulae, code scripts, or programming sequences
- Re-label figures, diagrams, or charts included in the work
- Collaborate closely with one or more students on a task that is assessed individually
- Produce, ghostwrite, or commission part or all of an assignment on the student's behalf

These activities undermine the authenticity of academic submissions. Use of services such as essay mills or overreliance on GenAI tools without declaration may lead to academic misconduct allegations.

4.3 SHARED RESPONSIBILITY AND CONSEQUENCES OF PEER MISUSE

If a student requests proofreading or informal assistance from a peer, and that peer subsequently uses or reproduces the content for their own submission—or if the final work submitted appears too similar between parties—then **both students** may be held accountable under academic misconduct procedures.

UKMC, in alignment with validating universities (CCCU and UOW), treats such cases seriously. Shared authorship without acknowledgement, unauthorised assistance, and duplication of ideas or expression all compromises academic integrity.

4.4 CLARIFICATION ON GOOD ACADEMIC PRACTICE

To support students in meeting expectations, UKMC provides:

- Access to workshops on avoiding plagiarism, proper referencing, and writing development.
- Advice on appropriate use of Turnitin and interpreting similarity reports
- Information on ethical and transparent use of proofreading, translation, and AI tools
- Referrals to Student Success Tutors for early intervention support

All students are required to review and follow this guidance when preparing academic submissions. Ignorance of the rules will not be considered a valid defence in cases of suspected misconduct.

4.5 PROHIBITED ACADEMIC ASSISTANCE

Below is a non-exhaustive list of activities that constitute academic misconduct when conducted without formal approval or disclosure. The table below outlines common types of academic misconduct. This is not an exhaustive list but provides illustrative definitions of conduct considered to undermine academic integrity at UKMC. All academic misconduct will be managed under validating university procedures for franchised programmes, or UKMC internal procedures where applicable.

Table 1 common types of academic misconduct

| Type of Academic Misconduct | Definition |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Cheating | Cheating is when someone acts dishonestly or unfairly before, during, or after an examination or summative assessment, in a way that gives one student an unfair advantage over others. This includes copying during exams, accessing unauthorised materials, or impersonating another student. |
| Collusion | Collusion occurs when two or more students collaborate in producing an assessment that is submitted as the work of an individual. The resulting work falsely appears to be the effort of |

| | |
|--|--|
| | one student. This can be intentional or unintentional and includes excessive sharing of ideas or draft content. |
| Contract Cheating (also referred to as Commissioning) | Contract cheating involves outsourcing academic work to another individual or service, including the use of generative AI, to produce assessment submissions on a student's behalf. This may be through paid services (e.g. essay mills) or unpaid arrangements with friends or relatives. This is illegal under the Skills and Post-16 Education Act (2022) when services are offered commercially. |
| Duplication (also referred to as Self-Plagiarism) | Duplication refers to the reuse of one's own previous work that has already been submitted for academic credit. Submitting the same or substantially similar material in multiple modules or assignments without explicit permission is considered misconduct. |
| Falsification or Fabrication | This includes the manipulation, invention, or distortion of data, evidence, sources, citations, or approvals. For example, fabricating research participants, misreporting experimental results, or inventing references are all considered falsification. |
| Plagiarism | Plagiarism involves presenting another person's ideas, words, data, or arguments as one's own without proper citation. It may involve copying, close paraphrasing, or representing the work of another (including from GenAI tools) without acknowledgement. Plagiarism includes self-plagiarism, unattributed use of AI-generated text, and improper citation practices. |
| Misuse of Digital Tools to Enhance Work | This involves using AI or other digital tools (free or subscription-based) in ways that misrepresent a student's original academic ability. Examples include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Using GenAI to restructure work beyond a student's comprehension – Paraphrasing without understanding the content – Generating false references or inflating vocabulary levels – Copying content from AI tools such as ChatGPT, Gemini (Bard), Grammarly, Quill Bot, Claude, Co-pilot, etc., without attribution or permission. |
| In Examinations | Examination misconduct refers to any behaviour intended to gain unfair advantage in time-constrained or formal assessments. Examples include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Offering or receiving bribes related to the exam process – Bringing unauthorised items into the exam room – Communicating with others during an exam – Accessing notes, apps, or websites when not permitted |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Impersonating another candidate – Altering submitted exam scripts post-assessment. |
|--|---|

5 EXPECTATIONS OF STUDENTS

To maintain a fair and honest academic environment, UKMC outlines clear expectations for student behaviour in relation to academic integrity. The following points define the responsibilities of students in upholding these values throughout their academic journey, from the preparation and submission of assessments to their engagement with support and guidance.

- Students are expected to uphold the principles of academic integrity in all forms of assessment, including coursework, examinations, presentations, and research.
- Students must avoid any practices that result in an unfair academic advantage, such as plagiarism, collusion, contract cheating, or misuse of digital tools including generative AI.
- Students must understand and consistently apply the referencing conventions appropriate to their academic discipline, using guidance provided by their tutors or module handbooks.
- Students should take full responsibility for producing their own work, ensuring that all submitted assessments are original and accurately acknowledge the contributions of others.
- Students are encouraged to engage with academic support services, including academic skills workshops, Student Success Tutor (SST), and referencing resources such as the Learning Skills Hub, especially when unsure about how to meet academic integrity requirements.
- Students must be honest in declaring the authenticity of their work upon submission and must not present work completed wholly or partly by others as their own, regardless of intent or payment.
- Students should proactively seek support if facing pressures (e.g., personal, academic, or external) that may compromise their academic integrity and must alert staff early to receive appropriate guidance.
- Students are also expected to support their peers in understanding and maintaining academic integrity and report concerns where they suspect breaches may have occurred.

6 EXPECTATIONS OF ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL STAFF

Academic and professional staff at UKMC play a central role in fostering and upholding a culture of academic integrity. The following expectations clarify the responsibilities of staff in designing assessments, educating students on good academic practices, and responding appropriately to concerns or suspected cases of academic misconduct.

- Academic and professional staff are expected to model academic integrity in all aspects of assessment design, delivery, feedback, supervision, and academic support.
- Staff must ensure assessments are designed in a way that promotes originality and academic honesty, discouraging opportunities for misconduct such as collusion or contract cheating.
- Staff are responsible for educating students on good academic practice, including the appropriate use of sources, referencing systems, and the ethical use of digital tools and AI technologies.
- Lecturers, module leaders, and Student Success Tutor (SST) must signpost students to institutional and university-partner policies and guide them on how to interpret similarity reports from Turnitin and other systems.
- Staff should be proactive in identifying suspected academic misconduct, addressing it in accordance with UKMC's internal procedures and referring it to the awarding university's formal procedures where required.
- In collaborative provision, staff must be aware of the specific Academic Misconduct Policies and Procedures of the partner university and ensure students are directed to those documents for detailed procedural matters such as appeals, outcomes, and sanctions.
- Staff must communicate clearly where to access institutional and partner-specific forms, policies, and further support services. Any such documents should be indicated clearly in the policy in bold and hyperlinked where possible.
- All academic staff involved in student support must contribute to cultivating a community of integrity and transparency in learning and teaching, reinforcing the values of honesty, trust, fairness, responsibility, and respect.

7 PREVENTATIVE MEASURES AND STUDENT SUPPORT

UKMC adopts a proactive, supportive approach to promoting academic integrity, embedding prevention and awareness into the student experience from induction through to graduation. The following measures describe how training, resources, and academic development activities are provided to help students understand, apply, and maintain good academic practice throughout their studies.

- UKMC is committed to developing students' academic integrity skills early and consistently throughout their academic journey, with structured support embedded in academic programmes and co-curricular provision.
- All students are provided with training in academic writing, referencing conventions, and research ethics as part of their induction and module-based academic development, supported through the Learning Skills Hub and Skills Development Programme.

- Dedicated workshops and e-learning modules are delivered across the academic year, covering topics such as plagiarism avoidance, paraphrasing, referencing (including Harvard, APA, and discipline-specific systems), critical analysis, and AI ethics in academic writing.
- All students are strongly encouraged to complete foundational online modules on “Academic Integrity and Plagiarism,” “Introduction to Referencing,” and “Using Turnitin” as a requirement of academic induction or within early-stage modules.
- Student Success Tutor (SST) play a proactive role in developing students’ awareness of academic integrity expectations, signposting to support, and offering timely advice on referencing, study planning, and dealing with academic pressures.
- Module leaders provide discipline-specific guidance on citation, referencing, ethical research, and professional standards expected within the field, ensuring that assessment briefs are clear about what constitutes individual versus collaborative work.
- Students have access to formative Turnitin submission points for selected modules, giving them the opportunity to upload draft assessments, review similarity reports, and reflect on how to improve the academic integrity of their work before final submission.
- Lecturers/SST will support students in interpreting Turnitin similarity reports, explaining the difference between acceptable similarity (e.g., correctly cited sources) and problematic patterns (e.g., poor paraphrasing or unattributed copying).
- Additional drop-in sessions and one-to-one academic skills appointments are available through the Academic Development and Learning Support teams, enabling students to receive personalised help in referencing, ethical sourcing, and academic writing.
- Where students disclose personal, cultural, or educational barriers impacting their understanding of academic conventions, staff will make reasonable efforts to provide appropriate academic adjustments and culturally sensitive support.
- All UKMC students are made aware of the serious implications of academic misconduct and are encouraged to seek help at the earliest point if they feel under pressure to breach academic integrity principles.
- UKMC adopts a preventative, educative approach that values early intervention and community-building around integrity, while remaining aligned with the procedural and disciplinary frameworks of awarding partner institutions.

8 PARTNER UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AND MISCONDUCT POLICIES

Understanding and referencing these policies is essential for all students and staff involved in teaching, learning, and assessment. While UKMC provides general guidance on academic

integrity through its internal policy, the procedures for investigating and resolving cases of academic misconduct—such as allegations of plagiarism, contract cheating, or misuse of generative AI—are led by the relevant partner university in accordance with their own formal frameworks.

The purpose of this table 2 is to provide direct access to each validating university’s core academic integrity documentation, ensuring that students and staff are fully aware of the specific definitions, procedures, and support services applicable to their programme. All academic conduct cases must be handled in accordance with the awarding institution’s rules, and students are expected to familiarise themselves with these policies from the outset of their studies. Staff must also refer to these documents when advising students, delivering academic skills training, or initiating a case referral. The list below includes titles and direct links to Canterbury Christ Church University (CCCU) and University of Wolverhampton (UoW) academic integrity policies. This section will be updated to include additional validating partners as UKMC expands its provision.

Table 2 Partner Universities Policies

Canterbury Christ University

| Partner University | Policy or Resource Title | Direct Link |
|---|---|---|
| Canterbury Christ Church University (CCCU) | CCCU: Academic Integrity Overview (Webpage) | https://www.canterbury.ac.uk/learning-and-teaching-enhancement/policies/academic-integrity.aspx |
| | CCCU: Academic Integrity Toolkit (PDF) | https://www.canterbury.ac.uk/learning-and-teaching-enhancement/docs/plagiarism/Academic-Integrity-Toolkit.pdf |
| | CCCU: Student Academic Integrity Policy 2024 (PDF) | https://www.canterbury.ac.uk/learning-and-teaching-enhancement/docs/Student-Academic-Integrity-Policy-2024.pdf |
| | CCCU: Contract Cheating Poster (PDF) | https://www.canterbury.ac.uk/learning-and-teaching-enhancement/docs/Contract-cheating-infographic-poster.pdf |
| | CCCU: Third-Party Academic Misconduct Guidelines (PDF) | https://www.canterbury.ac.uk/learning-and-teaching-enhancement/docs/Third-Party-Academic-Misconduct-Guidelines-and-Responsibilities-for-Markers-adapted-November-2024.pdf |
| | CCCU: Academic Misconduct Procedures for Staff and Students (PDF) | https://www.canterbury.ac.uk/asset-library/policy-zone/Student-Academic-Misconduct-Procedures-staff-students.pdf |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | CCCU: Turnitin Guidance (Webpage) | https://telstaffkbcccu.co.uk/2023/06/06/turnitin/ |
| | QAA: Academic Integrity Guidance (Webpage) | https://www.qaa.ac.uk/sector-resources/academic-integrity |
| | CCCU: Early Resolution and Case Handling (Webpage) | https://cccu.canterbury.ac.uk/Student-Resolution-and-Student-Protection/Early-Resolution-and-Case-Handling.aspx |
| | CCCU: Student Conduct and Discipline (Webpage) | https://www.canterbury.ac.uk/our-students/ug-current/support-services/health-and-safety/student-conduct |
| | CCCU: Learning Skills Hub (Webpage) | https://www.canterbury.ac.uk/learning-skills-hub |
| | CCCU: Types of Academic Misconduct (Webpage) | https://www.canterbury.ac.uk/learning-skills-hub/academic-integrity-and-plagiarism/types-of-academic-misconduct |

University of Wolverhampton

| Partner University | Policy or Resource Title | Direct Link |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| University of Wolverhampton (UoW) | UoW: Academic Integrity Policy (Webpage) | https://www.wlv.ac.uk/about-us/corporate-information/wlv-policies/academic-integrity-policy/ |
| | UoW: Regulations and Procedure for Academic Misconduct (PDF) | https://www.wolverhampton.ac.uk/media/departments/office-of-the-dean-of-students/documents/Regulations-and-Procedure-for-the-Investigation-of-Academic-Misconduct.pdf |
| | UoW: Skills for Learning Support (Webpage) | https://www.wlv.ac.uk/lib/skills-for-learning/ |
| | UoW: Academic Integrity Policy (Word Document) | https://view.officeapps.live.com/op/view.aspx?src=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.wlv.ac.uk%2Fmedia%2Fdepartments%2Foffice-of-the-dean-of-students%2FAcademic-Integrity-Policy-v2.5.docx&wdOrigin=BROWSELINK |
| | UoW: Procedure for Viva in Suspected Academic Misconduct (Word Document) | https://view.officeapps.live.com/op/view.aspx?src=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.wlv.ac.uk%2Fmedia%2Fdepartments%2FRegistry%2Fdocuments%2FProcedure-for-the-Management-of-a-Viva-in-Cases-of-Suspected-Academic-Misconduct.docx&wdOrigin=BROWSELINK |
| | UoW: Review of Academic Misconduct Hearing Form (Word Document) | https://view.officeapps.live.com/op/view.aspx?src=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.wlv.ac.uk%2Fmedia%2Fdepartments%2Foffice-of-the-dean-of-students%2Fdocuments%2FReview-of-AM-Hearing-Form-NEW.docx&wdOrigin=BROWSELINK |
| | UoW: Student Conduct and Appeals (Webpage) | https://www.wlv.ac.uk/current-students/conduct-and-appeals/student-conduct/ |
| | UoW: Fitness for Practice Policy and Procedure (Word Document) | https://view.officeapps.live.com/op/view.aspx?src=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.wlv.ac.uk%2Fmedia%2Fdepartments%2Foffice-of-the-dean-of-students%2FUniversity-Fitness-for-Practice-Policy-and-Procedure.doc&wdOrigin=BROWSELINK |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | UoW: Academic Appeals Procedure (PDF) | https://www.wlv.ac.uk/media/departments/office-of-the-dean-of-students/documents/Regulations-and-Procedure-for-Academic-Appeals---procedure-only.pdf |
| | UoW: Academic Appeal Form (Word Document) | https://view.officeapps.live.com/op/view.aspx?src=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.wlv.ac.uk%2Fmedia%2Fdepartments%2Foffice-of-the-dean-of-students%2Fdocuments%2FAcademic--Appeal-Form---new.-docx-(3).docx&wdOrigin=BROWSELINK |
| | UoW: Stage Two Academic Appeal Form (Word Document) | https://view.officeapps.live.com/op/view.aspx?src=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.wlv.ac.uk%2Fmedia%2Fdepartments%2Foffice-of-the-dean-of-students%2Fdocuments%2FSTAGE-TWO-Academic--Appeal-Form-NEW-(2).docx&wdOrigin=BROWSELINK |
| | UoW: The Pitfalls and How to Avoid Them: A Guide | https://www.wlv.ac.uk/media/departments/office-of-the-dean-of-students/documents/MaC2374---Write-Right-Booklet-FINAL.pdf |
| | UoW: Students' Union Misconduct Support Page (Webpage) | https://www.wolvesunion.org/advice/getadvice/academic/misconduct/ |

9 TRAINING AND AWARENESS

UKMC is committed to fostering a culture where academic integrity is understood, valued, and consistently reinforced. To achieve this, the College provides structured training and ongoing awareness activities that are integrated into the student and staff experience from induction onwards. These initiatives ensure that everyone involved in teaching, learning, and assessment understands the expectations surrounding academic conduct and has access to the necessary resources and support to uphold those standards.

To promote a culture of academic integrity, UKMC delivers structured and ongoing training and awareness activities for both students and staff. These measures ensure that expectations are clearly communicated and that all academic community members are equipped with the knowledge and tools needed to uphold integrity in academic work.

- Mandatory training is provided for all academic staff at UKMC, including full-time, part-time, and sessional lecturers, focused on identifying, preventing, and managing academic misconduct. This includes detection of contract cheating, use of generative AI, and interpreting Turnitin similarity reports.

- All new UKMC academic staff members are required to complete academic integrity induction training within their first teaching term. Refresher training sessions are held annually and updated in line with changes in validating university policies.
- Additionally, external training sessions are arranged and delivered by staff from the respective partner universities (such as CCCU and UoW) directly on campus. These sessions ensure alignment with university-level policies and provide deeper insights for UKMC staff.
- Orientation and induction sessions for new students at UKMC incorporate academic honesty training. These sessions include interactive workshops, case-based discussions, and activities that explore referencing standards, plagiarism avoidance, and proper collaboration etiquette.
- Study skills and learning development sessions embed academic integrity as a core theme, particularly within academic writing, research methods, and dissertation preparation modules.
- Online resources—including video guides, toolkits, and checklists—are made available via the UKMC Virtual Learning Environment (VLE), ensuring ongoing access to integrity training materials for all students and staff.
- Academic integrity is explicitly embedded in student handbooks, module guides, and assessment briefs. Clear expectations and referencing requirements are articulated in all formative and summative assignments.
- Institutional campaigns, including Academic Integrity Week and targeted communications during assessment periods, are implemented to maintain high levels of awareness and engagement.
- Students with additional learning needs, those from international backgrounds, or those with limited experience in UK academic practices are offered tailored integrity briefings through support staff, including the Academic Support Officer and Student Success Tutors (SSTs).
- Peer mentoring and student ambassador schemes are also used to promote a positive culture of ethical learning among student cohorts.

10 MONITORING AND REVIEW

UKMC is committed to maintaining high standards in academic integrity and conducts regular oversight and review to ensure its policies and practices remain effective and aligned with the expectations of its validating universities and sector regulators such as the QAA.

- Oversight of academic integrity policy implementation and case management is the responsibility of the Head of Academic Integrity Office, with reports submitted to the Academic Board via Course Coordination Committee.
- A central register of academic misconduct cases is maintained to enable institutional tracking, risk analysis, and trend identification. This register includes anonymised data on the type, level, and outcomes of academic misconduct cases handled across programmes and partners.

- Termly monitoring reports are prepared by the Head of Academic Integrity Office, summarising the number and nature of academic integrity cases, patterns of concern, and actions taken.
- These reports are reviewed as part of UKMC's semester-based Monitoring and Review (AMR) processes and are shared with validating partners to ensure transparency and collaborative learning across institutions. They also contribute to the Course Performance Plan and the Academic Integrity Office's performance planning, supporting the achievement of internal KPIs. This is based on each semester review report submitted to Course Coordination Committee meetings and individual Course Committees.
- The Academic Integrity Policy is formally reviewed every 2 years, or earlier if required due to regulatory change or significant revision of validating university procedures.
- Stakeholder engagement is integral to the review process. Course Directors gather feedback from Class Representatives, including input from Module Leaders, SSTs, Lecturers, and the wider academic team via the Student Experience Committee meetings. This also includes feedback from students, academic and support staff, external examiners, and validating university representatives.
- Recommendations from academic misconduct panels, course performance plan review (CPP), strategic partner committee self-report and student feedback mechanisms are considered in each policy cycle to enhance effectiveness and relevance.
- Where urgent or interim updates are needed—such as in response to regulatory directives from CCCU or UOW—UKMC will implement changes immediately under delegated authority from the Academic Board, with retrospective confirmation at the next meeting.
- Evaluation of the impact of preventative strategies (e.g., training, assessment redesign) is included in the monitoring framework, ensuring that academic misconduct is not only penalised but actively reduced over time.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT – CATEGORISATION AND DEFINITIONS

This appendix presents a consolidated table of the categories of academic misconduct recognised by UKMC. It is intended to support both staff and students in understanding the types of behaviours that may compromise academic integrity. While some instances of misconduct may arise unintentionally, UKMC is committed to offering clear guidance, preventative training, and supportive academic practices to reduce their occurrence. All definitions below are aligned with guidance from the QAA and validating partner universities, and all misconduct will be addressed using the appropriate awarding university procedure.

| Category | Definition | Examples / Additional Notes |
|----------|------------|-----------------------------|
|----------|------------|-----------------------------|

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| Cheating | Attempting to gain unfair academic advantage through dishonest means. | Includes copying from others in an exam, stealing or submitting someone else's work, impersonation, and use of unauthorised materials or devices during assessments. |
| Essay Mills | The use of online or offline services that provide students with bespoke written work. | Now illegal under the Skills and Post-16 Education Act 2022. Use may also risk blackmail or identity theft. Submitting such work constitutes academic misconduct. |
| Collusion | Unauthorised collaboration between students or third parties in assessments that are intended to be completed individually. | Examples include copying each other's work, preparing joint content for a solo task, or allowing another person to produce or edit substantive parts of a submission. |
| Plagiarism | Presenting another's ideas, words, or work without appropriate referencing or acknowledgment. | Includes copying text or data from books, journals, the internet, other students, or AI tools without proper citation; includes both intentional and unintentional plagiarism. |
| Use of Generative AI (GenAI) | Using GenAI tools in a way that misrepresents authorship or understanding of the student. | Includes generating full responses, paraphrasing without comprehension, inventing sources, or restructuring ideas without attribution. Use of GenAI must always be transparent and properly cited in accordance with institutional guidance. Some assignments may prohibit GenAI entirely. |
| Fabrication | Creating or inventing data, evidence, citations, or documentation and presenting them as genuine. | Examples include inventing research results, false participant data, or fabricated ethical approval. Can also include data or artefacts generated falsely using GenAI. |
| Falsification | The manipulation or distortion of real data, results, or records. | Includes misrepresenting numbers, statistics, charts, lab results, or edited images. Also includes selective reporting to skew results or analysis. |

| | | |
|------------------------------------|--|---|
| Misrepresentation | Knowingly presenting inaccurate, incomplete, or false information for academic gain. | Includes false claims of authorship or qualifications, suppression of data, flawed interpretations, and omission of material conflicts of interest. |
| Misuse of Proofreading | Inappropriate use of a person or tool (e.g., Grammarly, Co-pilot) to alter content, meaning, or structure of the work. | Proofreading should only highlight areas needing correction. Changes must be made by the student to retain authorial voice. Overreliance on grammar tools or peer editing that rewrites material may constitute misconduct. |
| Misuse of Translation Tools | Using machine-based tools to translate large portions or entire assignments from another language for submission. | Acceptable for understanding or quoting non-English sources. However, it is misconduct to write in one language and translate full assignments using software without referencing. Translated materials and the tools used must be cited according to institutional referencing guidelines. |

APPENDIX 2: OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Translation Software or Services

The use of translation tools—whether human or software-based—has increased alongside wider digital innovation, including the development of GenAI. While such tools can be helpful in supporting students’ comprehension, their inappropriate use may result in academic misconduct.

Translation tools can assist during the preparatory stage of writing, for example by helping students understand material published in a different language. However, it is not acceptable to write an entire assignment in one language and use translation software or services to convert it into English (or vice versa) for the purpose of submission.

As with proofreading and GenAI tools, the following expectations apply:

- Translations should not change the meaning, structure, or voice of the original content.
- Translation software should not be used to disguise authorship or artificially improve language to a level beyond the student’s capability.
- If used to support the incorporation of a translated quote or idea, both the original author and the translation tool must be cited using *Cite Them Right* referencing conventions.

Students are reminded that assessments should reflect their own voice, reasoning, and understanding. Misuse of translation software in a way that misrepresents academic ability may constitute a breach of academic integrity. UKMC's academic development services and language support workshops are available to assist students in developing these competencies without inappropriate reliance on translation tools.

Proofreading

Proofreading is defined by UKMC as the careful review of a document to identify and correct surface-level issues in spelling, grammar, or punctuation. While students and staff are expected to take ownership of proofreading their own work, UKMC recognises that it may be helpful for individuals to seek a second opinion, either from a trusted peer or through use of approved software.

A proof-reader may be a fellow student, a staff member, a friend, or a family member, and machine-based tools such as Microsoft Editor, Grammarly, Co-pilot, or Google Gemini may also be used. However, proofreading support must not extend to rewriting, restructuring, or significantly altering the content or ideas of the work. The responsibility for academic authorship must always remain with the student.

The following guidelines apply when seeking proofreading assistance from a person or a tool:

- The proof-reader should be asked to highlight areas of potential error or improvement, rather than rewriting them.
- The proof-reader may explain why a word or sentence may be unclear or grammatically incorrect, but the student must make the final changes.
- At no point should the proof-reader or tool rewrite paragraphs, restructure arguments, or substitute vocabulary in ways that change the meaning, tone, or authorial style of the work.

Students should avoid requesting help using vague commands such as “fix my grammar” or “correct all errors,” especially from automated tools. Instead, feedback should be used to improve one's writing independently and to build academic skills. Excessive reliance on these tools or individuals can lead to concerns over authorship, especially if a student's writing ability appears inconsistent with in-class performance or verbal expression in assessments.

Students are strongly advised to retain draft copies of their work as evidence of development and authorship. If questioned, this documentation may be used to demonstrate originality.

When using any online or machine-based tool, students must always check the Terms and Conditions and privacy policies of the platform. Particular caution must be taken when dealing with sensitive, personal, or identifiable information, which must not be uploaded to external, non-secure platforms. UKMC recommends that students only use University-licensed and data-secure tools (e.g., Turnitin, MS Co-pilot) for academic work.

The College provides ongoing training on developing one's academic writing and authorial voice through:

- Module-based tutorials and embedded writing instruction
- Academic English and writing development workshops.
- Skills for Learning resources
- Staff-student one-to-one writing sessions
- Guidance on proper use of GenAI and proofreading tools

Where GenAI or proofreading tools are used for checking grammar or phrasing, their use must be fully acknowledged and cited using *Cite Them Right* referencing conventions, in the same way as any other academic resource.

APPENDIX 3: STUDENT TRAINING AND AWARENESS ON ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

UKMC is committed to proactively educating students on academic integrity and the expectations surrounding academic conduct. This training supports students in understanding what constitutes academic misconduct, how to avoid it, and the consequences of breaching academic standards.

All students are expected to engage with the following core training modules and resources, which are designed to equip them with the knowledge and skills needed to maintain academic honesty throughout their studies:

Core Student Training

| Training Module | Description |
|--|---|
| Academic integrity and plagiarism | Explains what academic integrity means, why it matters, and how to avoid plagiarism and other dishonest practices. |
| Introduction to referencing | Provides guidance on proper referencing methods, citation styles, and how to acknowledge sources appropriately. |
| Academic Integrity (authorship) | Covers broader expectations around original authorship, submission ethics, and proper academic behaviour. |
| Welcome to your generative AI guidance | Educates students on the responsible and transparent use of generative AI tools, including potential risks and institutional restrictions on their use. |

Supporting Awareness Modules

| Training Module | Description |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Understanding Information | Develops skills in evaluating and using sources critically and ethically, to avoid unintentional misconduct. |
| Digital Skills (ethics and fake news) | Helps students identify credible sources, understand digital responsibility, and navigate ethical challenges in online research and study. |
| Writing Skills | Provides techniques for planning, drafting, and refining written work independently, reducing reliance on inappropriate support or rewriting by others. |
| Research Skills | Encourages ethical research practices, proper data handling, and transparency in reporting findings. |
| Data Literacy | Supports students in using and presenting data accurately, avoiding falsification or misrepresentation. |
| Academic English Language Support | Offers language development opportunities to help students express their ideas clearly and confidently, minimizing unintentional errors that may lead to concerns. |

Implementation

- Training is delivered through mandatory induction workshops, online modules on the Virtual Learning Environment (VLE), and semester-based refresher sessions.
- Practical case discussions and interactive activities are included to strengthen understanding.
- Participation is tracked; completion may be required before submitting major assessments.
- Additional academic skills support is offered to students who need further development.

11 UK MANAGEMENT COLLEGE: ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT CATEGORIES AND SANCTIONS

11.1 INTRODUCTION

This schedule defines the categories (levels) of Academic Misconduct and outlines indicative sanctions. It aims to ensure fairness, transparency, and educational integrity within UK Management College while aligning with partner university standards. The severity of misconduct, intent, and previous history will be considered when determining sanctions.

11.2 CATEGORIES AND INDICATIVE SANCTIONS

| Category | Type of Academic Misconduct | Indicative Sanction(s) |
|------------------------|---|---|
| Minor | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Plagiarism involving poor citation or close paraphrasing without proper referencing.- Duplication/self-plagiarism of previously submitted work.- Minor unauthorized collaboration. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Formal Reprimand recorded on the student file.- Assessment marked on academic merit if minor and unintentional.- Possible requirement to undertake an Academic Skills or Academic Integrity training session. |
| Moderate | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Substantial plagiarism (e.g., large sections taken from sources without acknowledgment).- Use of generative AI content presented as own work without citation.- Collusion (work produced jointly presented as individual work). | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Failure of the assessment task in question (e.g., mark of 0%).- Eligibility to resit the assessment at the next available opportunity; resit mark capped at pass grade (e.g., 40% UG, 50% PG).- Possible requirement to attend Academic Skills training; upon completion, capping may be reconsidered in specific cases. |
| Serious (Major) | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Cheating or serious misconduct in exams (e.g., using unauthorized materials, impersonation, script | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Failure of the entire module (e.g., mark of 0%).- Eligibility to retake the module with |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | substitution). - Contract cheating or commissioning work (e.g., ghostwriting, essay mills, AI-generated full papers). - Fabrication or falsification of data (e.g., invented lab results, unethical research conduct). | overall mark capped at pass grade (40% UG, 50% PG). - Possible reduction of award or classification. - In severe or repeated cases, exclusion from the College, and award of exit qualification where appropriate. |
|--|--|--|

11.3 REPEATED OFFENCES

| Occurrence | Sanction |
|---------------------------------|---|
| First offence | As per category-specific sanction above. |
| Second offence | Escalation to failure of the entire module or higher sanction, depending on severity. |
| Third offence or serious repeat | Exclusion from the College, with consideration for conferral of any eligible exit award or credits. |

11.2 ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

- Students may be required to engage in Academic Integrity workshops or support sessions to prevent recurrence.
- Any record of Academic Misconduct will be retained for the duration of the student's registration at the College.
- For offences involving professional practice elements, further professional conduct reviews and sanctions may apply.