



Academic Integrity Policy

Publication:	External (public)
Date approved:	17 June 2026
Approving body:	Senate
Date of next review:	June 2027
Review frequency:	Every 3 years
Policy/Regulation Owner:	Simon Lancaster (Associate Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Quality of Education) and Christina Chan (Head of Academic Registry Services)

1. Overview and Purpose

- 1.1 The University of East Anglia expects that all its members, both staff and students, to adhere to the principles of academic integrity:
- 1.2 a commitment to the values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility to ensure that my work is a true expression of my own understanding and ideas, competencies and skills, giving credit to others where their work contributes to mine.
- 1.3 It is important that you develop essential academic skills and can demonstrate where you find your ideas and take responsibility for your own learning because:
 - 1.3.1 It threatens the credibility, integrity and standards of the University's awards if students gain credit for work which is not their own, or which does not demonstrate how and what they have learnt;
 - 1.3.2 We must uphold the values of personal integrity and commitment to ensure that students do not gain an unfair advantage by plagiarism, collusion, mis-use of resources or other means to deceive.
- 1.4 Breaches to principles of academic integrity equate to breaches to General Regulation 18 of the University's [General Regulations for Students](#) where disciplinary action may be taken in accordance with [University Disciplinary and Investigative Procedures and Powers](#) (UDIPP)

2. Scope

- 2.1 This policy applies to all students registered at the University. From now on, we will refer to students as 'you' and the University as 'we/us'.
- 2.2 At any point of your course, whether allegations of not having academic integrity are discovered before or after graduation, these will be investigated and dealt with appropriately and proportionately in line with the University Disciplinary and Investigative Procedures and Powers (UDIPP).
- 2.3 If you breached this policy, but have since graduated, the Senate has the authority to reduce the classification of a conferred Degree, or to revoke a Degree, Diploma or Certificate or other distinction conferred by the University.
- 2.4 If you are or were registered on a programme leading to an award at undergraduate or postgraduate taught levels, or undertaking the taught components of professional doctorates, we will follow the procedure explained in Appendix B if you are found to be in breach of this policy. Penalties for academic misconduct (see below) can range from

failing the assessment to expulsion from the University, depending on the nature and severity of your offence.

- 2.5** If a breach to this policy is found relating to the research work of a postgraduate research degree candidate or graduate, this should be brought to the attention of the Associate Director – PGR and will be handled under [Procedures for Investigating Allegations of Research Misconduct Made Against Students](#)

Adherence to approved policy and regulations is fundamental to the effective operation of the University. This policy has been developed in alignment with sector best practice to promote consistency, accountability, and compliance with relevant standards. Observing the policy ensures that decisions and actions are informed, equitable, and aligned with institutional values.

3. Definitions

- 3.1** A failure to follow this policy or demonstrate academic integrity amounts to academic misconduct. Academic misconduct is defined as (i) a failure to demonstrate that your work is your own and/or (ii) the submission of work that does not reflect a true expression of your own understanding and ideas, competencies and skills, which may include:

Term	Definition
Plagiarism	Taking another's work or ideas without sufficient acknowledgment
Collusion	Working with one or more people in an unauthorised manner
Contract cheating	Where someone else completes an assessment for you or you are creating opportunities for other person(s) to complete the work on your behalf
Inappropriate use of Generative AI or AI-assisted tools	Failing to comply with the guidelines for an assessment brief, therefore failing to produce work that is a true expression and reflection of your own understanding and ideas, competencies and skills relative to the task's learning outcomes

- 3.2 Plagiarism** occurs when, in any assessment, you use or reproduce material without any or without sufficient attribution to the original source. This means that you must acknowledge (by referencing) material that is not your own, or which you have used. Put simply, you must reference the sources you use.

- 3.3 Collusion** is when you and someone else work together to produce work that you or they submit for an assessment. This might involve interacting (in person, by phone, email, messaging, social media, or any other way) with another person (or company) to complete the assessment task, such as by sharing answers or parts of answers. It can

also involve attempts to collude with another person (or company) even if no collusion happens in the end.

3.4 Contract cheating occurs when your assessment has been completed for you partially or wholly by a third party. The third party might be a friend or family member, another student or an academic or a commercial provider sometimes referred to as an 'essay mill'. It is contract cheating whether you pay them or not, and whether you acknowledge this source or not. Contract cheating is when some or all of an assessment is created on your behalf, without authorisation, by another person or people (not using artificial intelligence, see 3.6 below).

3.5 Contract cheating may also involve a student uploading an assessment question to a website so that it can be answered, partly or wholly, by others; or where such answers are capable of providing an academic advantage to any student. Even if your question is not actually answered, it would still be contract cheating as you have intended to cheat. Uploading a question in this way would also breach General Regulation 16 (Intellectual property, data protection, and copyright) of the [General Regulations for Students](#).

3.6 Inappropriate use of Generative AI or AI-assisted tools is the unauthorised use of artificial intelligence systems to create some or all of an assessment, or using it in a way that falsifies the expression of your own understanding and ideas, competencies and skills. It includes automatic generation of content in response to prompts (written or spoken). The generated content can include text, software code, images, videos and music. Generative AI models learn the patterns and structure of the data they are trained with. They then generate new data that has similar characteristics. If you fail to acknowledge the nature or extent of any AI generated content that you submit for assessment, and/or fully explain the use of any AI-assisted software in the writing process (even if you were using it to formulate your ideas), this counts as academic misconduct even if the assessment brief permitted some use of generative AI or AI-assisted tools

4. Roles and Responsibilities

4.1 Integrity Officer: The Head of each School shall appoint an Integrity Officer (who shall not be the Head of School) who is responsible for investigation into potential breaches of this policy. The Integrity Officer must consider alleged cases of academic misconduct offences by students enrolled on the module(s) offered by the Integrity Officer's School.

4.2 A Deputy Integrity Officer may also be appointed and when we refer to Integrity Officer in this policy we mean that person too.

4.3 Where an allegation of academic misconduct concerns a module not in a School in which the student is registered, the Integrity Officer of the School 'owning' the module shall deal with the allegation and, during the investigation, will keep the Integrity Officer in the

School in which the student is registered informed of the status and outcome of the case.

- 4.4** The Integrity Officer shall receive the information from the marker or other referrer and make such further investigations as may be required. The Integrity Officer must call an investigative meeting in cases where there is a reasonable suspicion that there has been a breach of this policy deemed to be of medium or high level as defined in the grid in Appendix B, or if they believe that a mark reduction penalty may be appropriate, or if they do not have sufficient information to decide.
- 4.5** If the alleged case may constitute a medium or high-level offence, the Integrity Officer may also collect other work that you have completed, whether produced for modules located in their own School or produced for modules delivered by other Schools. This work may be screened using software irrespective of whether or not the whole batch of the past assessment papers was screened at the time. If the outcome of the investigation is reasonably considered to be medium or high level, the Integrity Officer shall offer an investigative meeting to you.
- 4.6** The Integrity Officer is responsible for determining the outcome of alleged cases of academic misconduct after any investigative meetings with you and completion of tasks as set out in Appendix B. This includes any referrals and presentations to a Senate Student Discipline Committee if applicable.
- 4.7 Marker.** If a marker suspects academic misconduct, they should continue to mark the work as if they had no such suspicions, keeping a separate copy of the annotated work as evidence. The marker should return the marked work to the Academic Registry (or for students on professional doctorates, the professional doctorates team in the PGR service) with a note that the matter has been referred to the Integrity Officer.
- 4.8** The marker should then notify their School Integrity Officer and provide a note of the reasons for the suspicion and any supporting evidence already to hand, such as a text-matching report and/or copies of sources plagiarised. This is to help the Integrity Officer to decide whether an investigative meeting is required. If there is no supporting evidence, this does not preclude a referral as the Integrity Officer can then seek evidence and run a text-matching programme.
- 4.9 Module Organiser.** The Module Organiser is responsible for providing information on whether group work, sharing of resources or use of Generative AI or AI assisted tools will be permitted in the assessment briefing.

5. Policy Statement

- 5.1** We take academic integrity seriously and will take appropriate disciplinary action if you breach this policy in any summative assessments.

5.2 Formative work is an opportunity for you to understand how to properly use sources and reference your work. However, the nature of formative work in some Schools is such that they may choose to apply this policy to formative work. If they do this, it will say so in your assessment brief. Moreover, where your course is regulated by a Professional Statutory or Regulatory Body, that body might require us to include formative work in this policy and this information should be in your assessment brief.

5.3 It is your responsibility to demonstrate academic integrity in all your assessments whether these were set as formative or summative work. This means that when you submit work, it is on the basis that it is your work, the product of your own intellectual efforts without any form of falsification or fabrication.

5.4 Plagiarism

5.4.1 If you do not reference correctly, you have plagiarised. You should either quote directly from the source (with a footnote or in-text citation giving the source) or rewrite it in your own words (again, with a footnote or in-text citation). It is not enough to swap out some, perhaps many, words or paraphrase closely. Words can have nuanced meanings and paraphrasing in this way leads to poor quality work, as well as being 'paraplagiarism'.

5.4.2 Self-plagiarism is when you reuse material that you've already submitted for a summative assessment here or at another institution, or you submit for a summative assessment some material that you have previously published. The effect of self-plagiarism is to mislead the reader into thinking that your work is new, when in fact it is (or part of it is) old. That would be dishonest and constitutes academic misconduct.

5.4.3 It is not self-plagiarism to cite or refer to your own published work. However, the copyright in academic publications is more likely to be held by the publisher than the writer, meaning that it can breach their intellectual property to actually reuse any material from that work – even if you wrote it.

5.4.4 Some Schools may allow students to resubmit work that they've previously submitted, for example by giving students the ability to revise and resubmit. If your assessment brief states you are allowed to revise and resubmit, then doing so would not constitute self-plagiarism.

5.5 Collusion

5.5.1 Some students have reasonable adjustments or specialised help to access learning because of a disability or specific learning difficulty. It is important to distinguish this from collusion. When we consider whether something is collusion, we will ask ourselves whether your submitted assessment is the product of your own intellectual efforts, following a learning process showing a true expression of your own understanding and ideas; or whether you have tried to obtain an advantage

dishonestly by submitting work that is partly or wholly done by someone else or the product of their intellectual efforts.

5.5.2 In some modules, group work or the sharing of sources will be allowed. If it is allowed, then your module organiser will let you know in the assessment briefing. Unless you are told explicitly by your module organiser that you can work with another person(s) then doing so would be collusion. Module organisers may use their assessment briefs to set out what level of collaboration is permitted. It is **your** responsibility to check what is and is not permitted

5.5.3 It is possible to commit both plagiarism and collusion. For example, if you copied another student's work and they knew you might do that, this would be plagiarism by you, and collusion by you both.

5.6 Contract cheating: The University treats contract cheating as an especially serious form of academic misconduct because engaging a third party to complete your assessment can only be interpreted as a deliberate, intentional act to deceive. Allegations of contract cheating will result in you being referred to the Senate Student Discipline Committee and if you are found in breach, the normal starting point penalty will be expulsion from the University and a mark of zero in the relevant assessment component.

5.7 Where a student is alleged to have committed academic misconduct in an online examination or assessment, this policy will apply.

5.8 You must not invent or fabricate references because it is a dishonest act (in terms of giving the false impression that you have used the references) and constitutes academic misconduct and a breach of this policy.

5.9 If the use of Generative AI or AI assisted tools is allowed, then your module organiser will let you know in the assessment briefing. Unless you are told explicitly by your module organiser that you can use artificial intelligence systems, then doing so would constitute an inappropriate use of AI.

5.10 Use of software to screen for Academic Misconduct

5.10.1 We may use text-matching software to help us find evidence of academic misconduct in undergraduate, postgraduate and taught doctoral assessments. This is software that searches submitted work for matches against text contained in its databases or identifies work that is likely to have the characteristics of something not written by a person. Your work may at any time be subject to screening in this way.

5.10.2 We do not use this software to screen any parts of the thesis or research work of postgraduate research students except where this is explicitly approved via a concession request submitted via the Postgraduate Research Service to the

Associate Pro Vice Chancellor UEA Doctoral College, for example in certain cases of alleged misconduct in research.

5.10.3 Where a School wishes to use batch screening for a module, it shall screen all summative submissions and not simply a sample. This does not prevent a particular student's work being screened as part of an investigation into whether they have breached this policy where this is already suspected. Such screening may include past submissions.

5.10.4 Module organisers can make it possible for you to submit a draft submission for the purposes of screening, so that you can eliminate any problematic material before summative submission. If a module organiser decides to do this, then you shall be provided with information on how to interpret the reports. However, module organisers may choose not to allow draft scans in this way.

5.11 We may consider allegations of academic misconduct from a number of sources, for example through reports from other students, placement providers or employers invigilating online assessments for apprentices.

6. Compliance and Monitoring

6.1 It is your responsibility to demonstrate your compliance to the values of honesty, fairness, respect and responsibility to ensure that your work is a true expression of your own understanding and ideas, giving credit to others where their work contributes to your assessments.

6.2 Integrity Officers and markers have shared responsibility to check that you have complied with this policy. Integrity Officers must also complete data collection tasks, to contribute to the monitoring of compliance to this policy.

6.3 The number of academic misconduct cases and any emerging trends will be monitored by the University's Learning and Teaching Committee and be reported to Senate for approval in line with the University's governance requirements.

7. Related Documents

7.1 Guidance for students

7.2 Guidance for staff

8. Revision History

Version number	Approval date	Approval mechanism	Details of change
1	17/06/26	LTC and Senate in June 2026	Please see change log for full details Definition of Generative AI/AI assisted tools; change of format to the new policy template