

ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT POLICY – COVENTRY UNIVERSITY BRANCH

Policy Title	Academic Misconduct Policy
Responsible University Offices	Registry Office
Policy Owner	President
Version	V3
Date Approved by TKH	September 2025
Date Approved by Coventry University	October 2025

I. SCOPE OF POLICY

This Academic Misconduct Policy provides the means by which any allegation of academic misconduct at Coventry University at the Knowledge Hub Universities is investigated and addressed. The purpose of the policy is to foster academic integrity and extend understanding of its value to better prepare individuals for both academic and professional lives. Although the common belief is that academic integrity is a moral stance pertinent to academia, it also has an impact on ethical behaviour in general and workplace behaviour in particular. Defining appropriate and responsible use of AI, protecting data privacy and security, acknowledging sources, learning about copyright, and controlling original work are all tied to academic integrity. Developing an understanding of what is appropriate and inappropriate with regard to these issues helps the whole of academia achieve its pedagogic, social and moral obligations.

II. DEFINITIONS

Academic misconduct is defined as any attempt to gain an unfair advantage in an assessment (including examinations). This includes but is not limited to:

- Failing to comply with the Rules of Examinations Conduct, for example by taking prohibited materials into an Examination Hall. Other forms of non-compliance include, but are not limited to:
 - Bringing unauthorised connected and electronic devices into the exam room/assessment space, whether switched off or not.
 - Communicating with another student or anyone other than the invigilator during the exam.
 - Continuing to work after the exam time has finished.
- Fabrication or falsification of data; this is submitting or including data that is not correct and purposefully changed from what was recorded or observed. It can include:
 - Inventing data without collecting it from an experiment or survey.
 - Falsifying or altering data, pictures, documents, reports, and presentations within an assessment and/or submission.
 - This may include submitting falsified or fabricated data, resources citations and or references that have been generated by a third party AI or human.

- Contract cheating; this is when a student employs a third party to complete any assessed work and submits it as if it were their own work.
- Collusion; unauthorised sharing of solutions and working with others when individual work is required; The University will regard this as an offence whether it is deliberate or not. The student could be held accountable for collusion if they allow another student to copy their work or shares the work with others, knowing that it will be copied.
- Assisting another student or receiving assistance from another student to gain an advantage by unfair ways, for example by impersonation or the passing of one individual's work as another's.
- Plagiarism; which is defined as submitting work as the student's own of which the student is not the author. This includes failure to acknowledge clearly the ideas, words or work of another person whether these are published or unpublished. Plagiarism includes, but is not limited to, the following examples:
 - Copying and submitting the work of another student.
 - Creating a piece of work by cutting, copying and pasting sections of text and/or images, or other material found online, into a document without referencing the sources.
 - Copying from a book or journal, with or without referencing, and for example by changing one or two words in a sentence or paragraph, so the text appears to be different.
 - Including pictures, diagrams or charts in the work without explaining where they came from.
 - Resubmitting work that has already been marked or may be being marked in another module at the same time (self-plagiarism).
- Misuse or unethical use of AI software tools. Students are expected to use AI tools **ethically and responsibly** as per the instructions specified in the Assignment Briefs of the module(s) they are registered in.

Ethical and responsible use allows for the use of AI tools as an assistive tool. Inappropriate use of AI tools, on the other hand, considered as seeking and gaining an unfair advantage, or as a way of not producing work by oneself and is subsequently regarded as an academic misconduct.

Misusing generative or transformative AI tools could include but is not limited to:

- Using AI to hide plagiarism such as by the use of grammar checkers, paraphrasers and thesauri or the use of 'forward and back' translation to reduce the similarity percentage between text in the submission and text in the sources that have been consulted when writing the submission.
 - Using AI when specifically instructed not to (for example using tools to debug code when the assessment is testing the ability to code unassisted).
 - Using AI without acknowledging that it has been used in any of the different stages of the work submission/completion, as well as failing to complete the Student Declaration Form.
 - Submitting work entirely or almost entirely written by GenAI/GAI (generative AI; software tools that generate passages of text) for answering exam questions, adding paragraphs or generating content for an assignment or dissertation with minor or no changes.
- Engaging in any other activity likely to give an unfair advantage to any student.

III. POLICY STATEMENT

1. Academic Integrity

All students are expected to be honest, trustworthy, fair, respectful, and to take responsibility for their actions. Though these principles and values are usually adhered to by students, a minority of students might choose to violate this code and, therefore, would need to be reminded of the adverse effects of engaging in misconduct.

According to the [Academic Integrity Charter for UK Higher Education](#) (2020), “students who commit academic misconduct, especially if they deliberately cheat, risk their academic and future careers”. The implications, however, go wider than the higher education context, or the period spent at university. If academic misconduct passes unchecked, graduates could enter the workforce without the necessary skills, knowledge and competency, with potential public health and safety implications.

2. Originality and authenticity of assessments

Assessments are designed to be an integral part of the learning process; they help consolidate students’ understanding and application of what they have learned. The University expects all students to submit and complete assessments on their own and if any contribution is taken from other sources, it should be acknowledged. Moreover, the acknowledgment of this contribution should be done in accordance with the guidelines set within each school, course and module as specified by the Module Leaders in the **Assignment Brief of each assessment**. These sources can include academic sources, contribution of others or the use of artificial intelligence tools. Failure to abide by the appropriate use of AI specified in the Assignment Brief will result in serious consequences and the University employs powerful tools to detect and evidence all forms of academic misconduct. Thus, to remain fair and to maintain our academic standards, it is essential that the University takes steps to identify all academic integrity breaches, then negates any advantages gained unfairly.

3. Consequences of breaching academic integrity standards

If a student is found to have committed academic misconduct, this can have serious consequences within the university and will result in a penalty. Academic misconduct penalties are determined in accordance with the **Scale of Outcomes for Academic Integrity Breaches** set by Coventry University and are a result of an academic misconduct committee meeting held by the school – School Academic Misconduct Committee (SAMC) – and to which the student under investigation for academic misconduct is invited. The severity of the alleged academic misconduct and hence the penalty imposed can include but is not limited to:

- Receiving a verbal warning.
- Receiving a written warning.
- Receiving a zero grade on an individual assessment and/or a whole module.
- Being temporarily suspended from the course.
- Being expelled from the university.

The SAMC decision is informed by the perceived seriousness of the offence together with the number of times the student under investigation has been found to have committed an academic misconduct offence up to the relevant date.

IV. POLICY GUIDELINES

All cases of suspected academic misconduct are considered by the School Academic Misconduct Committee (SAMC) in the following manner:

1. Investigation

- A case which appears to academic staff to suggest that a student has committed an act of Academic Misconduct shall be reported to the Registry and copied, for information, to the Head of School with evidence.
- If the academic misconduct evidence is clear, it will be presented to the School Academic Misconduct Committee for a decision to be determined.

2. Committee decision

Members:

- a. Head of School (or nominee) as the Chair of the committee
 - b. Two Academic Members
 - c. The Registrar (or nominee)
 - d. The School's Faculty Support Officer to record the AMC minutes
- The student is notified via email that they are under investigation and required to attend the School Academic Misconduct Committee and submit any mitigating evidence.
 - Any decision made by SAMC shall not be overturned posteriorly by neither a MAP (Marks Approval Process) nor PAB (Programme Assessment Board).
 - Taking into consideration all the evidence, and the defence, if any, the SAMC, shall decide whether the candidate is guilty of the offence, and if so, the appropriate penalty.
 - Any mitigating circumstances raised in defence by a student will normally be considered only if supporting documentary evidence is provided.
 - Students have the right during the SAMC to call witnesses for examination at the meeting. Names must be provided in advance to the secretary of the committee.

3. Appealing the decision

The student shall be informed of the decision via email within 5 working days of the meeting. The student also has the right to disagree with the decision of the SAMC and may appeal its decision. The method for lodging the appeal is explained in the [Academic Appeals Policy](#). An appeal might be submitted within 10 working days of the date of the outcomes letter.

4. Offences

- An offence of academic misconduct will be defined as Minor or Major depending on its seriousness.
- A student's history of offences will also be considered.

5. Academic Misconduct Penalties

The severity of the alleged academic misconduct and hence the penalty imposed will be decided upon by the SAMC and be informed by the perceived seriousness of the offence together with the number of times the student under investigation has been found to have committed an academic misconduct offence to date. Penalties may include the student being found innocent, receiving a verbal and written warning, receiving a zero grade on an individual assessment and/or module. In very serious cases then the SAMC may consider expelling the student from the university.

V. **FORMS**

Student Declaration Form of AI Use

Have any AI-based aids or tools been used in the creation of this assignment?

☐

No

☐

Yes

If yes: please specify the aid/tool and area of use below.

Text

☐

Spell checking. Are parts of the text checked by:

Grammarly, Ginger, Grammarbot, LanguageTool, ProWritingAid, Sapling, Trinkai.ai or similar tools?

☐

Text-generation. Are parts of the text generated by:

ChatGPT, GrammarlyGO, Copy.AI, WordAi, WriteSonic, Jasper, Simplified, Rytr or similar tools?

☐

Writing assistance. Are one or more of the report's ideas or approach suggested by:

ChatGPT, Google Bard, Bing chat, YouChat or similar tools?

If yes, use of text aids/tools apply to this submission - please specify usage here:

Codes and algorithms (if applicable)

☐

Programming assistance. Are parts of the codes/algorithms that i) appear directly in the report or ii) have been used to produce results such as figures, tables or numerical values

been generated by: *GitHub Copilot, CodeGPT, Google Codey/Studio Bot, Replit Ghostwriter, Amazon CodeWhisperer, GPT Engineer, ChatGPT, Google Bard* eller lignende verktøy?

If yes, use of programming assistance aid/tools apply to this submission - please specify usage here:

Images and figures (if applicable)

☐

Image generation. Are one or more of the reports images/figures generated by:

Midjourney, Jasper, WriteSonic, Stability AI, Dall-E or similar tools?

If yes, use of image generator aids/tools apply to this submission – please specify usage here:

Other AI aids or tools. Have you used other types of AI aids or tools in the creation of this submission? If yes, please specify usage here:

☐

I am familiar with Coventry University's Policy on Academic Integrity and AI Use. *I declare that any use of AI aids or tools are explicitly stated i) directly in the submission or ii) in this declaration form.*

Signature/Date/Place

Adapted from:

https://i.ntnu.no/documents/portlet_file_entry/1305837853/Deklarasjon+om+KI_en_skjema.pdf/8791