

COURTAULD

The Courtauld Institute of Art

Student Academic Integrity and Misconduct 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 Practice
3.5	Collusion
3.6	Cheating
4.1	Responsibilities
5.1	Procedure for Dealing with Concerns of Academic Misconduct
5.2	Referral
5.3	Consideration of the Suspected Misconduct
5.4	Penalties
5.5	Appeal
5.6	The Office for the Independent Adjudicator (OIA)
5.7	Academic Misconduct Timeline

1.1 Introduction

Students studying at the Courtauld Institute of Art are expected to take responsibility for their academic work and to comply with The Courtauld's standards. Students are expected to produce assessments in which the work submitted cites the correct sources and is the student's own work.

This Policy applies to students when they submit summative assessment(s) or other pieces of assessed work whilst as a student of the Courtauld.

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.

It is the responsibility of the Courtauld to prove the concern against the student and on the balance of probabilities, the civil standard of proof.

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. 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.

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.

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 the Courtauld policy that all concern 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 Student Code of Conduct Policy. If an academic misconduct concern is upheld, the penalties range from a formal warning to expulsion, depending on the severity of the act or if it is a repeat concern.

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 the 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 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 suspected academic misconduct might decide that the student's actions could be called poor academic practice. These include:

- If it is the student's first case 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 defined as the act of dishonestly or unfairly gaining an advantage in academic work. It involves violating the integrity of the learning process by misrepresenting one's own knowledge, effort, or performance.

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.

3.7 Artificial Intelligence and Generative AI

The use of generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools (such as large language models, chatbots, or AI-assisted writing software) must comply with the Courtauld's published guidance for students on the use of generative AI and any specific instructions set out in the relevant assessment brief. Depending on the circumstances, misuse of generative AI may constitute plagiarism, cheating, false declaration, or another form of academic misconduct.

The following may constitute academic misconduct:

- Submitting AI-generated text, images, analysis or other content as if it were your own work.
- Using generative AI to produce part or all of an assessment without acknowledgement where declaration is required.
- Using generative AI in a manner that exceeds the level of use permitted for that assessment.
- Using generative AI to fabricate references, data, citations or evidence.
- Outsourcing the substantive intellectual work of research, analysis, evaluation or writing to AI tools.

Permitted and declared use of generative AI, where consistent with the assessment brief and institutional guidance, will not in itself constitute academic misconduct.

4.1 Responsibilities

It is the Courtauld's policy that all students commencing their programme of study familiarise themselves with this 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 upholding academic integrity.
- 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. Any student will be presumed to be innocent of an alleged misconduct until the opposite is established on the balance of probabilities, based on the available evidence.

5.1.1 Preliminary Consideration

Where a marker has a specific concern that academic misconduct may have occurred, they should first consider whether there is sufficient material evidence to support a referral under section 5.2.

Where there is clear material evidence, the matter should proceed directly to referral.

In cases where the concern relates to possible misuse of generative AI, material supporting evidence may include, but is not limited to:

- The presence of fictitious sources (hallucinations)
- The inclusion of first-person “call-to-action” phrases, such as “Would you like me to explore this in more depth?”

All evidence must be considered proportionately and in context, in line with the balance of probabilities.

Where concerns are based primarily on academic judgement and there is insufficient material evidence at that stage, a Pre-Referral Exploratory Meeting may be convened.

5.1.2 Pre-Referral Exploratory Meeting

A student may be invited to attend an exploratory meeting to provide an opportunity to:

- demonstrate authorship and understanding of the submitted work;
- explain how the work was produced;
- provide drafts, notes or other evidence of development where appropriate.

Attendance at an exploratory meeting does not in itself constitute a formal allegation of academic misconduct. The purpose of the meeting is to determine whether sufficient evidence exists to justify a formal referral under section 5.2.

The meeting will normally be convened by the marking tutor. A representative of the Programme Administration Team will attend as note-taker. The record of the meeting must accurately reflect the student’s statements and clearly distinguish these from observations made by staff.

If, following the meeting, there remains insufficient evidence to support a referral, the matter will not be progressed.

If sufficient evidence is identified, a referral may be made under section 5.2. Notes of the meeting may be included as supporting evidence.

A student may request that reasonable adjustments are considered as part of this process.

5.1 Procedure for dealing with concerns of academic misconduct

Instances of academic misconduct will be investigated in accordance with the following procedure. Any student will be presumed to be innocent of misconduct until the opposite is established on the balance of probabilities, based on the available evidence.

5.2 Referral

If during the marking and moderation process a marker, through the use of their academic judgement, suspects that an academic misconduct has occurred they will submit a referral form and all supporting evidence to the Programme Administration Team. Referrals for assignments will normally be made within 15 working days of the submission deadline for the assignment.

Examination concerns are most often made by an Invigilator during the examination. If an examination concern is raised, the student will be informed by the Invigilator. The Invigilator will complete an Incident Report, and it will be sent to the Programme Administration Team. Examination concerns may also be made by an examiner, marker or another student. Referrals for written examinations will normally be made within 20 working days of the date the exam.

5.3 Consideration of the Suspected Misconduct

Following a referral, any pending assessment results related to the misconduct will be automatically withheld from the student until the matter has been concluded.

The Programme Administration Team may request additional information or clarification from the person making the referral. The matter may not be progressed if there is insufficient evidence to support the suspected academic misconduct.

The Programme Administration team will complete a review of the information and if there is sufficient evidence they will notify the student, providing the student with the copy of the referral form and any supporting documentation. The student will be invited to provide an

explanatory statement within 5 working days of the email. If the statement is not provided the matter 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, and 2 members of the academic community. The Panel will review the evidence and confirm if it supports the concern or not.

If the Panel find the concern proven, they will consider the level of study, seriousness of the misconduct and consider any proven prior academic misconducts and any mitigating circumstances that may apply to the misconduct in question, when determining which penalty to apply. The student will be informed in writing of the decision and any penalties applied normally within 5 working days of the Panel.

5.4 Penalties

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

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

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 issued a formal warning and reminded of the need to follow the Policy and uphold academic integrity.
- 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 submitted in the semester which the misconduct took place 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 misconduct 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 allegation (Minor): • Poor academic practice and referencing • Minor plagiarism (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 Misconduct (Major) • Plagiarism (extensive amount of paraphrasing, quotation or	0 mark for assignment/formal reprimand

use of diagrams, charts etc... without citation) • Collusion • Cheating	
Second Misconduct	0 mark for whole module/formal reprimand
Third Misconduct	0 mark for all modules taken within the academic year/formal reprimand/further sanctions

Proven allegations of misconduct on KCL modules taken as part of a programme of study at The Courtauld, will be taken into account and considered as proven misconduct when consideration is given to an allegation of misconduct and the penalty awarded if proven.

5.5 Appeal

Students are permitted to appeal within 10 working days of the date of the written notification of the 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 Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA). If the appeal is accepted it may result in one of the following outcomes:

- Referred back to an Academic Misconduct Panel; or
- A lower penalty being applied.

If the matter is referred back to an Academic Misconduct Panel, this will be formed of members who have had no prior involvement and the student will receive the notification and information as per 5.3.

5.6 The Office of the Independent Adjudicator (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 Academic Misconduct Timeline

Ref	Stage	Action	Working Days
1	Referral	Academic misconduct concern is identified and referred to Programme Administration team to review and contact the student.	Normally within 15 from submission deadline for written assignments and 20 from date of exam for written examinations.
2	Academic Misconduct Panel	All evidence, including the student's explanatory statement will be reviewed by a panel.	The student will have 5 days to respond to the allegation and the Panel will normally be scheduled within the next 10 working days.
4	Student response to the outcome	The student will be provided with the outcome of the Academic Misconduct Panel.	5
5	Appeal	If the appeal is not accepted the student will be informed by the Programme Administration team. The student will also receive a Completion of Procedures letter.	10
7	Referral to Office for the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA)	If the student does not accept the outcome of the Academic Misconduct Panel, referral may be made to the OIA.	(12 months from receipt of Completion of Procedure Letter)

---- ENDS ----