

The Courtauld

The Courtauld Institute of Art

Student Academic Integrity and Honesty Policy

Policy Overview

This policy applies to you whenever you submit an assessment or other piece of assessed work while a registered student at The Courtauld and the standards of honesty and integrity expected of you. You should read the policy in full to ensure that you fully understand your obligations.

What we expect from you

Follow these principles and you should never be in breach of the Academic Integrity and Honesty Policy. You should seek support from Library staff if you are unclear about this policy and academic misconduct and require further guidance.

Know the rules

Understand what academic misconduct is and how this can apply to your academic work. This includes:

- Plagiarism and self-plagiarism
- Collusion
- Copying across assessments
- Falsifying data or evidence
- False declaration, and
- Cheating through deception and fraud.

Understand how software, such as Turnitin which checks for similarity with other documents, works.

Understand about poor academic practice, such as inadequate referencing and citing other academic works.

Understand the consequences

If you don't follow the policy, understand the actions that will be taken and the penalties that could apply if you breach the rules.

Full policy follows:

The Courtauld

The Courtauld Institute of Art

Student Academic Integrity and Honesty Policy

Contents

1.1	Introduction
1.2	Scope and Purpose
2.1	Academic Standards
2.2	Academic Judgement
3.1	Academic Misconduct
3.2	Plagiarism
3.3	Self-Plagiarism
3.4	Poor Academic Practise
3.5	Collusion
3.6	Cheating
4.1	Responsibilities
5.1	Procedure for Dealing with Allegations of Academic Misconduct
5.2	Referral
5.3	Investigation
5.4	Appeal
5.5	Assessment Offences Panel
5.6	The Office for the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA)
5.7	Penalties
5.8	Procedure for Dealing with Allegations of Academic Misconduct Timeline

1.1 Introduction

Studying at The Courtauld Institute of Art is challenging and rewarding and we expect all staff and students to embrace the values of academic honesty and integrity. Students are expected to take responsibility for their academic work and to comply with The Courtauld's standards. Students can reflect this by producing assessments in which the work submitted cites the correct sources and is the student's own work.

Students who fail to take responsibility for their academic work are undermining the fundamental values of the academic community to which they belong.

Library staff provide support to students to ensure that they have the necessary understanding and skills to uphold academic standards.

1.2 Scope and Purpose

This procedure is applicable for first degrees, postgraduate taught degrees and diplomas and postgraduate research degrees offered by The Courtauld.

This procedure is concerned with Summative Assessment. Summative assessment is where the mark contributes to the final degree classification as opposed to formative assessment, which does not contribute marks towards the overall award. Misconduct identified as part of formative assessment will be dealt with directly by the academic staff member marking the work.

2.1 Academic Standards

Students at The Courtauld are part of an academic community that values trust, fairness and respect and actively encourages students to act with honesty and integrity.

For some students the cultural shift to university is significant and The Courtauld reminds students that they must take responsibility to familiarise themselves with, and abide by, the rules, regulations and ethical standards of The Courtauld.

2.2 Academic Judgement

Academic judgement is a judgement that is made about a matter where the opinion of an academic expert is sufficient. Courtauld academic staff members have significant knowledge and expertise in detecting acts of academic misconduct.

The majority of students embrace and respect the values of their academic community but there is a small minority who may try to gain an unfair advantage by cheating. An unfair advantage is one that is not available to all students within the confines of a coursework assignment, such as purchasing essays or using prohibited materials.

Academic staff may use electronic software, such as 'TurnitinUK' or other means to assist them in the process of matching text to the original source. Academic judgement combined with the detection software is considered to be a successful way to ensure that acts of academic misconduct do not go undetected.

3.1 Academic Misconduct

Academic misconduct at The Courtauld is categorised into the following areas:

- Plagiarism
- Collusion
- Copying across assessments
- Falsifying data or evidence
- False declaration, and
- Cheating through deception and fraud.

It is Courtauld policy that all allegations of academic misconduct will be thoroughly investigated in accordance with the process laid out in this policy and may result in action being taken under The Courtauld's Code of Student Discipline. If a charge of academic misconduct (assessment offence) is upheld, the penalties range from a formal warning to expulsion, depending on the severity of the act or if it is a repeat offence.

When submitting summative work as part of the requirements for an assessment examination or coursework assignment) which forms part of a degree programme, credit bearing short-course or period of study off campus/abroad that counts towards a degree, it is Courtauld policy that this work should be expressed in the student's own words and incorporate their own ideas and judgments.

3.2 Plagiarism

Plagiarism can be intentional or unintentional (e.g. through negligence, poor scholarship or lack of understanding). The Courtauld defines plagiarism as the taking of another's thoughts, words, results, judgements, ideas, images etc, and presenting them as your own; including take home/online/open book assessments or examinations.

Examples of plagiarism include but are not limited to:

- **Artificial Intelligence (AI)** New technologies can create additional opportunities for plagiarism. Students should be aware that the use of external sources such as emerging AI chatbots and essay writing software are unacceptable and would be considered plagiarism.
- **Copying:** A student should not copy someone else's work or thoughts and pass this off as their own, even if the student has their permission. This includes using images and audio-visual presentations without acknowledgement.
- **Incorrect referencing:** A student should not insert the writing or thoughts of others into their written work without the correct referencing.
- **Copying and pasting:** A student may not copy text verbatim or closely paraphrase a source text and pass this off as their own, without using quotation marks and citing the original source.
- **Inadequate Paraphrasing:** A student should avoid closely paraphrasing someone else's work (e.g. by changing the words or the order of the words slightly) and students must note that paraphrasing is encouraged but this also requires appropriate citation conventions, which may vary according to discipline.

3.3 Self-Plagiarism

Self-plagiarism is submitting material for academic credit which has been submitted, previously or simultaneously, for academic credit to The Courtauld, or any other awarding body; or work produced by the student for other purposes, such as published articles. Previously submitted work may be included if permission to do so has been granted and where such work is properly referenced so that it is clear it has previously been submitted, or where resubmission of previously failed work has expressly been permitted.

Examples of self-plagiarism include but are not limited to:

- Undergraduate or Postgraduate taught essays containing work undertaken at a previous institution, including A-Level work.
- Undergraduate or Postgraduate work submitted during examinations which has been submitted in a previous examination or assessed coursework.
- Master's thesis containing work previously submitted in pursuit of the subject of the thesis (such as from an undergraduate or postgraduate taught research project).
- Undergraduate or Postgraduate work reproduced from work undertaken by the student for other purposes (e.g. published articles, audit or other material in the public domain) but excluding formative work.
- Undergraduate or Postgraduate work previously submitted within another degree programme (where a protocol or an introduction is submitted for one degree and incorporated into a PhD final thesis).

3.4 Poor academic practice

Poor academic practice occurs where a student shows a lack of understanding of scholarly practice and appropriate academic representation. Examples of poor academic practice are sources being cited incorrectly, inadequately or without quotation marks, even though the author is listed in the references.

There are a number of different reasons why someone investigating a case of alleged academic misconduct might decide that the student's actions could be called poor academic practice. These include:

- If it is the student's first offence and they are in their first year of study, and if the conduct relates to a very minor matter of referencing.
- If there is other compelling evidence that the conduct arose from a genuine lack of understanding of academic integrity expectations.

Poor academic practice should only be found where the alleged academic misconduct is not extensive, blatant or does not result from an obvious lack of effort overall.

3.5 Collusion

Collusion is when two or more students collaborate, without permission, to produce individual assessments that when compared significantly overlap in content, order, structure and/or format.

Examples of collusion include but are not limited to:

- Unauthorised collaboration between students to produce the same or substantially similar pieces of work, which they then claim as their own.
- One student submitting another student's work (in part or as a whole) as their own.
- Allowing another student to have sight of a piece of assessed course work before they have submitted that work themselves (where students may be submitting the same course work at different times in the year).

3.6 Cheating

Cheating is adopting working methods that are outside the spirit of The Courtauld's Regulations and involve acting in a dishonest way to gain an unfair advantage compared to other students.

Examples of cheating include but are not limited to:

- Making up or falsifying data for an assignment, such as a research project.
- Falsifying medical conditions or evidence to gain an advantage (e.g. deadline extension).
- Contract cheating: when a student submits a summative assessment that they have commissioned, which has been written by a third party or obtained from a professional writing 'service'.
- Taking unauthorised material into an examination.
- Not complying with the instructions on an examination paper.
- Not complying with the instructions of an invigilator.
- Copying someone else's work during an examination.
- Talking to other students whilst under examination conditions.
- Using unauthorised aids (e.g. a mobile phone) during an examination when not expressly permitted.

The Courtauld only allows the use of proof-reading to check spelling and basic grammar.

Examples of Contract Cheating include but are not limited to:

- Purchasing or commissioning an assessment from a professional writing service or third party and presenting it as your own work.
- Commissioning a third party to translate an assessment from one language to another.
- The use of a professional writing service or third party to edit an assessment or parts of it to cause changes to the structure or content.

4.1 Responsibilities

It is The Courtauld's policy that all students commencing their programme of study familiarise themselves with the Student Academic Integrity and Honesty Policy and the measures which students should take to avoid plagiarism and collusion in their work. Accordingly, it is expected that staff will:

- Make use of the guidance on how to deal with plagiarism and collusion.
- Familiarise students with the specific citation conventions required.
- Provide students with access to help on plagiarism.

It is The Courtauld's policy that students take responsibility for their academic work and comply with programme standards and assessment requirements. Accordingly, it is expected that students will:

- Respect their academic community by behaving with academic integrity and honesty.
- Seek help if they are unsure what is meant by the terms plagiarism and collusion. The Courtauld Library provides comprehensive support and guidance for students.
- Make use of the specific guidance for students that can be found on The Courtauld Virtual Learning Environment which includes advice on study skills, time management and citation conventions.
- Sign a declaration with each assessment that the assignment submitted is their own work.

5.1 Procedure for dealing with allegations of academic misconduct

Instances of academic misconduct will be investigated in accordance with the following procedure, which describes The Courtauld's response to allegations of offence in any form of assessment that contributes to the award for which the student is registered. Any student will be presumed to be innocent of an alleged offence until the opposite is established on the balance of probabilities, based on the available evidence.

5.2 Referral

If an academic judgement is made at programme level when an assignment has been marked and moderated that an offence has been committed by a student [as defined under Sections 4-9] a referral will be made to the Programme Administration Manager for investigation under the procedure. Referrals for assignments must be made within 15 working days of the submission deadline for the assignment for which the alleged offence was committed.

Examination allegations are most often made by an Invigilator during the examination. If an allegation of an examination offence is made the student will be informed by the Invigilator. The Invigilator will complete an Incident Report, which the student will be asked to read and sign, which will be referred to the Programme Administration Manager. If the student declines to sign the Incident Report the investigation will still take place. Examination allegations may also be made by an examiner, marker or another student. Referrals for written examinations must be made within 20 working days of the date the exam was sat for which the alleged offence was committed.

In both cases of an alleged assignment related offence or a written examination related offence the student will be informed by the Programme Administration Manager that a referral has been made and the nature of the alleged offence. The student will be invited to submit a written statement to support their case.

5.3 Investigation

Following a referral, any pending assessment results related to the alleged offence will be automatically withheld from the student under investigation until the outcome of the investigation is concluded.

The investigation will be handled by the Programme Administration Manager. The investigation will verify existing evidence, likely to include the initial referral and evidence from Turnitin, obtaining further evidence if required and/or a statement from the student and any relevant third parties. The investigator may refer for further academic judgement.

If it is determined that there is sufficient evidence to pursue the allegation, the student will be presented with details of the allegation and supporting evidence relevant to the case and will be invited to provide an explanatory statement within 10 working days. If the statement is not provided the case will be considered without it.

All evidence including the student's explanatory statement will be reviewed by a panel consisting of a senior manager nominated by the Academic Registrar, the Academic Skills Tutor and the Chair of the appropriate Board of Examiners. The review will determine whether the evidence supports the allegation or not. It may be decided that further investigation is required before a decision can be made.

Consideration will be given to the student's assessments to date, any proven prior assessment offences and any mitigating circumstances that apply to the alleged assessment offence in question. Due consideration will also be given to the impact on the student's progression or eligibility for the award when determining whether a penalty is to be applied. If precedent exists the outcome will be determined accordingly. The student will be informed in writing of the decision and any penalties applied (see section 11.7) within 25 working days of receipt by the Programme Administration Manager of the referred allegation. Where precedent does not exist or if a decision cannot be determined the case will be referred to the Assessment Offences Panel.

If it seems possible that a response will be delayed the student will be told why e.g., the complexity of the case, staff unavailability through illness or professional commitments etc... and the student will be kept informed of progress.

5.4 Appeal

Students are permitted to appeal within 10 working days of the date of the written notification of the outcome of the investigation/Letter of Outcome. Students may appeal by completing the Appeals Form and submitting it to the Academic Registrar. Students may appeal on the following grounds:

- The procedures were not followed correctly.
- The student has new material evidence that was not available for valid reasons earlier in the process.
- There was bias or a reasonable perception of bias during the procedure.

- The penalty imposed was disproportionate, or not permitted under the procedure.

Appeals made after 10 working days or without relevant supporting evidence will not normally be accepted.

The Academic Registrar will determine whether an appeal has been made on valid grounds and can be accepted for consideration. If the appeal is not accepted the student will be informed in writing by the Academic Registrar within 10 working days of receipt of the appeal and a Completion of Procedure (COP) Letter will be issued. The student may then refer to the OIA (see section 5.6). If the appeal is accepted, it will be considered at the next meeting of the Assessment Offences Panel.

5.5 Assessment Offences Panel

The Assessment Offences Panel will meet to consider the outcomes of cases where an appeal has been accepted for further consideration or if precedent does not exist and a decision could not be made by the investigation. The Assessment Offences Panel will consist of a Chair appointed externally on an annual basis, an appropriate subject specialist and a representative of the Students' Union (either the SU President or a member of the SU Executive Committee). No member of the Panel will have any prior knowledge of the student or personal involvement in the case.

The Panel will be provided with full details of the case including all relevant documentation and evidence considered earlier. The student will also be provided with a copy of all documentation to be considered by the Panel and will be invited to submit a further written statement for consideration.

With reference to an appeal, the Panel will determine whether the appeal submitted should be upheld. Appeals can be upheld resulting in a change of outcome, upheld with no change to outcome or not upheld. If the Panel upholds the appeal but there is a change of outcome the penalty may be revoked, a lesser penalty may be imposed or a more serious penalty may be imposed. If the Panel determines that an appeal is upheld but there is no change to the outcome or an appeal is not upheld, the outcome previously determined by the investigation will stand.

With reference to a referred case where the investigation could not make a decision or precedent does not exist the Panel will determine after consideration of the evidence if the allegation is proven. Consideration will be given to the student's assessments to date, any proven prior assessment offences and any mitigating circumstances that apply to the assessment offence in question. The Panel, giving due consideration to the impact on the student's progression or eligibility for the award for which they are studying will determine whether a penalty is to be applied.

The student will be informed of the outcome in writing by the Chair and the letter will provide clear reasoning for the outcome within 25 working days of receipt by the Programme Administration Manager of the Appeal Form. The decision of the Assessment Offences Panel is final and will conclude The Courtauld's consideration of the matter. The student will also receive a Completion of Procedures (COP) Letter. Supply of a COP letter is a requirement of our membership of the Office for the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA).

5.6 The Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA)

If the student has exhausted all the internal process at The Courtauld regarding the appeal and is still dissatisfied with the outcome, the student can contact the Office for the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA).

The Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA) runs an independent scheme to review student complaints. The Courtauld Institute of Art is a member of this scheme. If the student is unhappy with the outcome the student may be able to ask the OIA to review the case. Further information can be found here: <https://www.oiahe.org.uk/students>. Normally the final stage of the procedure must be completed before a complaint can be made to the OIA. When there are no further steps that can be taken internally The Courtauld will issue a student with a Completion of Procedures Letter automatically. If the allegation is upheld or partly upheld, a student may ask for a Completion of Procedures Letter. More information about Completion of Procedures Letters and when a student should expect to receive one are here: <https://www.oiahe.org.uk/providers/completion-of-procedures-letters>.

5.7 Penalties

Where more than one referral for the same student is made simultaneously, these will be considered the same offence with respect to being a first, second or third offence.

Where a student has had a first offence related to one form of academic misconduct e.g. plagiarism and the second offence is a different form of academic misconduct such as collusion this will count as a second offence. The same principle applies to a third offence.

Penalties that may be applied for cases where academic misconduct are proven include:

- No further action.
- The student is referred to the Academic Skills Tutor for further training.
- The student is formally reprimanded and reminded of the need to strictly follow the regulations.
- A mark of 0 is awarded for the assignment and will be considered as an attempt.
- A mark of 0 is awarded for all papers and assignments for the whole module and will be considered as an attempt.
- A mark of 0 is awarded for all papers and assignments the student sat in the academic year the offence occurred in and will be considered as an attempt.
- The student cannot re-enter for any or all of those assignments before the expiry of a stated period of time.
- No award will be granted before the expiry of a stated period of time.
- The student to be excluded from future assessments for awards.

Category	Outcome
Allegation not upheld or unproven	No further action
First offence (Minor): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor academic practise and referencing (see section 3.4) • Minor plagiarism (see sections 3.2 and 3.3 - a small amount of paraphrasing, quotation or use of diagrams, charts etc... without citation. If the plagiarised sections contain critical ideas which are key to the assignment, then this would constitute a major case) 	Student referred to the Academic Skills Tutor for further training.
First offence (Major) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plagiarism (see sections 3.2 and 3.3 - extensive amount of paraphrasing, quotation or use of diagrams, charts etc... without citation) • Collusion (see section 3.5) • Cheating (see section 3.6) 	0 mark for assignment/formal reprimand
Second offence	0 mark for whole module/formal reprimand
Third offence	0 mark for all modules taken within the academic year/formal reprimand/further sanctions

*Proven allegations for offence on KCL modules, will be taken into account for second offences.

5.8 Academic Misconduct Referral, Investigation and Outcome Procedure Timeline

Ref	Stage	Action	Working Days
1	Referral	Case of alleged academic misconduct identified and referred to Programme Administration Manager for investigation.	15 from submission deadline for written assignments and 20 from date of exam for written examinations.
2	Investigation	Programme Administration Manager reviews the allegation and evidence. If it is determined that there is sufficient evidence to pursue the allegation, the student will be presented with the details and invited to provide an explanatory statement	25

3	Decision	All evidence, including the student's explanatory statement will be reviewed by a panel consisting of a senior manager nominated by the Academic Registrar, the Academic Skills Tutor, and the Chair of the appropriate Board of Examiners.	
4	Student response to outcome	If the outcome is not accepted the student may appeal against the decision.	10
5	Appeal not accepted	If the appeal is not accepted the student will be informed by the Programme Administration Manager. The student will also receive a Completion of Procedures letter.	10
6	Assessment Offences Panel	An Assessment Offences Panel will be convened to review the allegation, make decision and notify the student in writing of the outcome. The student will also receive a Completion of Procedures letter.	25
7	Referral to Office for the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA)	If the student does not accept the outcome of the Assessment Offences Panel, referral may be made to the OIA.	(12 months from receipt of Completion of Procedure Letter)

---- ENDS ----