

1.3 STUDENT CODE OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

1.3 STUDENT CODE OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Policy No.	1.3
Version Date	14th April, 2026
Approved by	SMT
Policy Group	Operations
Version number	V01
Next review due	April 2027
External Reference points	- Higher Education Commission (HEC) Pakistan – Quality Assurance Framework and relevant policies (where applicable) - Academic Regulations of Partner Universities and Awarding Bodies

Version Control			
Previous Version	New Version	Date	Update/Notes
-	V01	14-04-2026	New policy issued.

POLICY FRAMEWORK

1. This Policy sets out the academic integrity standards expected from all students of IVY Academic Network. It explains what academic integrity means, what may constitute academic misconduct, how suspected cases will be reported and investigated, what outcomes may apply, and how students may appeal a decision.
2. IVY Academic Network is committed to protecting the value, credibility, and fairness of its academic awards and learning experience. Academic integrity is central to this commitment. It requires students to complete their work honestly, acknowledge the work of others, follow assessment instructions, and demonstrate their own learning.
3. This Policy supports fair assessment, student learning, academic standards, and the wider quality assurance expectations of higher education and transnational education provision.

INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT

1. IVY Academic Network will promote academic integrity through clear policy on academic code of conduct, student induction, assessment guidance, staff training, academic skills support, referencing guidance, and consistent case handling.
2. Students will receive guidance on academic integrity at the start of their programme and at appropriate points during their studies.
3. Staff involved in teaching, assessment, supervision, investigation, or decision-making must be familiar with this Policy, sign the Academic Code of Conduct undertaking, and must apply it consistently.



4. Academic integrity guidance will be reviewed regularly to ensure that it remains current, especially in relation to digital assessment, online learning, and generative artificial intelligence.

STUDENT RESPONSIBILITIES

1. Students are responsible for understanding and following academic integrity requirements.
2. Students must ensure that all submitted work is their own unless collaboration is clearly permitted.
3. Students must acknowledge all sources, including books, journal articles, websites, reports, lecture materials, images, datasets, software, artificial intelligence tools, and any other material used in their work.
4. Students must follow the required referencing style and assessment instructions for each module.
5. Students must not share their work with another student in a way that enables copying or misuse.
6. Students must not ask another person, company, website, artificial intelligence tool, or third-party service to produce work that they submit as their own.
7. Students must keep drafts, notes, data, research records, and evidence of their work where required, as these may be requested during an academic integrity review.
8. Students must seek academic guidance before submission if they are unsure about referencing, collaboration, paraphrasing, use of AI, or assessment rules.

STAFF RESPONSIBILITIES

1. Teaching staff must explain academic integrity expectations clearly within their modules and in the classroom.
2. Assessment briefs should state whether collaboration, use of templates, use of editing support, use of software, or use of generative AI is permitted.
3. Staff must provide students with guidance on referencing, plagiarism, paraphrasing, academic writing, and responsible source use.
4. Staff must identify and report suspected academic misconduct through the approved process.
5. Staff must not impose informal penalties outside this Policy where academic misconduct is suspected.
6. Staff involved in academic integrity decisions must act fairly, consistently, and without conflict of interest.

ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

1. Academic misconduct means any action, attempted action, or omission that may give a student or another person an unfair academic advantage, or that may undermine the fairness, reliability, or integrity of assessment.
2. Academic misconduct may occur intentionally, recklessly, or through poor academic practice. Lack of understanding may be considered when deciding the outcome, but it does not automatically remove responsibility.



EXAMPLES OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

1. Academic misconduct may include the following:

- a. Plagiarism: presenting another person's words, ideas, structure, data, images, arguments, code, or creative work as one's own without proper acknowledgement.
- b. Poor academic practice: limited or incorrect referencing, weak paraphrasing, over-reliance on source wording, or unclear acknowledgement where the issue appears to arise from lack of academic skill rather than deliberate dishonesty.
- c. Self-plagiarism: submitting the same or substantially similar work for more than one assessment without permission.
- d. Collusion: working with another student or person where independent work is required, or allowing another student to copy or use one's work.
- e. Cheating in examinations or tests: using unauthorised notes, devices, materials, websites, applications, communication, or assistance during an examination, quiz, test, or controlled assessment.
- f. Contract cheating: arranging for another person, company, website, tutor, friend, family member, or external service to produce work, or part of work, for submission.
- g. Personation: pretending to be another student, asking another person to sit an examination or assessment, or submitting work under another person's identity.
- h. Fabrication or falsification: inventing, altering, or misrepresenting data, results, references, evidence, attendance, assessment records, research findings, or supporting documents.
- i. Misuse of generative artificial intelligence: using AI tools in a way that breaches assessment instructions, submitting AI-generated content as one's own work without permission or acknowledgement, using AI to avoid demonstrating required learning outcomes, or using AI to fabricate references, data, analysis, or evidence.
- j. Unauthorised collaboration: working with others beyond the level allowed in the assessment brief.
- k. Bribery or improper influence: offering, requesting, or accepting money, gifts, favours, pressure, or influence to affect academic judgement or assessment outcome.
- l. Abuse of academic materials: stealing, hiding, destroying, damaging, or restricting access to academic resources, library materials, laboratory materials, software, files, data, or another student's work.
- m. Breach of research ethics: collecting or using data without required approval, failing to obtain consent, misusing participant information, or breaching confidentiality in research activity.
- n. False claims or evidence: submitting false medical evidence, false extenuating circumstances claims, forged certificates, false references, or misleading documents.



- o. Complicity: helping, encouraging, enabling, or attempting to enable another student to commit academic misconduct.
 - p. Breach of assessment instructions: failing to follow specific rules for an assessment where this affects fairness, authenticity, or academic standards.
- 2. The above list is not exhaustive. IVY Academic Network may consider any conduct that undermines academic integrity under this Policy.

USE OF GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

- 1. IVY Academic Network recognises that generative artificial intelligence may support learning when used responsibly and where permitted.
- 2. The use of AI must always follow the assessment brief, module guidance, and institutional instructions.
- 3. Students must not use AI tools to replace their own academic thinking, analysis, judgement, writing, calculation, design, coding, or research where the assessment requires personal demonstration of learning.
- 4. Where AI use is permitted, students may be required to acknowledge the tool used, explain how it was used, retain prompts and outputs, and confirm that the final submission reflects their own understanding.
- 5. Where AI use is not permitted, any use of AI to generate, rewrite, translate, solve, analyse, summarise, or substantially improve submitted work may be treated as academic misconduct.
- 6. AI detection tools may support academic judgement, but they will not normally be used as the only evidence of misconduct. A decision must be based on the overall evidence, including the assessment brief, student explanation, writing pattern, sources, drafts, viva evidence, document history, and any other relevant material.
- 7. The Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) expects providers to establish clear approaches to technologies that affect teaching, learning, and assessment, including generative AI, and to communicate both permitted use and misuse clearly to students and staff.

LEVELS OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

Poor Academic Practice

- 1. Poor academic practice may be found where a student has made limited or inconsistent use of citation, paraphrased weakly, misunderstood academic conventions, or made a minor referencing error without clear evidence of intent to gain unfair advantage.
- 2. Poor academic practice will normally be handled through guidance, academic skills support, resubmission guidance, or a warning, depending on the assessment rules.

Minor Academic Misconduct

- 1. Minor academic misconduct may include limited plagiarism, unauthorised collaboration of limited scale, inappropriate AI use of limited scale, or repeated poor academic practice.
- 2. Minor misconduct may lead to a formal warning, mark reduction, capped resubmission, requirement to attend academic integrity training, or other proportionate outcome.



Major Academic Misconduct

1. Major academic misconduct may include substantial plagiarism, contract cheating, personation, cheating in examination, falsification of evidence, serious AI misuse, repeated misconduct, or conduct that damages the fairness of assessment.
2. Major misconduct may lead to failure of assessment, failure of module, suspension, exclusion, withdrawal of award recommendation, or referral to the relevant academic or external authority.

REPORTING SUSPECTED ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

1. Any staff member who suspects academic misconduct must report the concern through the approved academic integrity process.
2. The report should include the student's work, assessment brief, similarity report where available, source evidence, AI concern evidence where relevant, examination incident report, witness statement, or any other relevant material.
3. The Academic Coordinator, Programme Manager, or authorised academic officer will conduct an initial review to decide whether the matter should be treated as poor academic practice, minor misconduct, major misconduct, or no case to answer.
4. Students may also report suspected academic misconduct where they have reasonable concerns. Such reports will be handled confidentially.

INITIAL REVIEW

1. The initial review will determine whether there is sufficient evidence to proceed.
2. If there is no reasonable evidence, the matter will be closed and no academic misconduct record will be created.
3. If the matter appears to be poor academic practice, the student may receive guidance, academic support, or a warning.
4. If the matter appears to be minor or major academic misconduct, the case will proceed to formal consideration.
5. Previous academic integrity history may be checked when deciding the appropriate route, but it must not be used as evidence that the current allegation is true.

FORMAL PROCEDURE

Notification to Student

1. The student must be informed in writing of the allegation, and asked for an explanation.
2. The notice should include the nature of the concern, the assessment involved, the evidence available, the relevant section of this Policy, the possible outcomes, the date of any meeting or hearing, and the student's right to respond.
3. The student should be given reasonable time to prepare a response.

Student Response

1. The student may respond in writing, attend a meeting, submit evidence, provide drafts or notes, explain their research process, and request support or reasonable adjustment.



2. The student may be accompanied by a supporter, such as a parent, guardian, student representative, or another appropriate person approved by the institution.
3. If the student does not respond or attend without good reason, the case may proceed based on the available evidence.

Academic Integrity Panel

1. Major or disputed cases should be considered by an Academic Integrity Panel.
2. The Panel should normally include a senior academic representative, a Quality Assurance representative, and a relevant programme or assessment representative who has not been directly involved in the allegation.
3. The Panel must consider the evidence, the student's response, the assessment requirements, and any relevant mitigating or contextual information.
4. The Panel will decide the case on the balance of probabilities.
5. The decision and reasons must be recorded in writing.

Evidence

1. Evidence may include submitted work, assessment brief, similarity report, source material, examination report, invigilation report, witness statement, document metadata, drafts, notes, version history, viva record, student explanation, AI-use declaration, AI-related evidence, email records, and any other material relevant to the case.
2. Formal legal rules of evidence do not apply. However, evidence must be relevant, reliable, and fairly considered.
3. Similarity reports are indicators only. They must be interpreted through academic judgement.
4. AI detection reports are indicators only. They must not be treated as conclusive proof on their own.
5. Previous misconduct may be considered when deciding penalty if the current case is proven. It must not be used to prove that the current misconduct occurred.

Outcomes and Penalties

1. Outcomes must be proportionate to the nature, seriousness, scale, and impact of the misconduct.
2. The following outcomes may be applied:
 - a. no case to answer;
 - b. academic guidance only;
 - c. formal warning;
 - d. requirement to attend academic integrity training;
 - e. requirement to revise and resubmit, where permitted;
 - f. mark reduction;
 - g. capped mark for assessment;
 - h. zero mark for assessment;



- i. failure of module;
 - j. requirement to repeat assessment or module;
 - k. suspension from studies for a defined period;
 - l. exclusion from the programme or institution;
 - m. withdrawal of an academic recommendation, result, or award where allowed by the applicable regulations;
 - n. referral to the Student Code of Conduct where wider misconduct is involved;
 - o. referral to external, regulatory, professional, or awarding authority where required.
3. In deciding the penalty, the Panel or authorised decision-maker will consider:
 - a. the seriousness of the misconduct;
 - b. the amount of work affected;
 - c. whether the misconduct appears deliberate, reckless, or due to poor academic practice;
 - d. the student's level and stage of study;
 - e. whether the student had received prior guidance;
 - f. whether the case involves repeated misconduct;
 - g. whether the student cooperated with the process;
 - h. the impact on assessment fairness;
 - i. the need to protect academic standards;
 - j. any relevant mitigating circumstances.
4. Serious cases such as contract cheating, personation, examination cheating, falsification of evidence, or repeated misconduct will normally attract a stronger penalty.

SETTLEMENT OR EARLY RESOLUTION

1. Where the concern is minor and the evidence is clear, the student may be offered an early resolution route.
2. Early resolution may be used only where the student accepts the finding, understands the consequence, and agrees to complete any required academic integrity support.
3. The student must not be pressured to accept early resolution.
4. If the student does not accept the finding or penalty, the matter must proceed through the formal process.
5. Early resolution must be recorded in the student file and monitored for repeat cases.

MONITORING, REPORTING, AND ENHANCEMENT

1. The Quality Assurance Department will monitor academic integrity cases to identify patterns, risks, training needs, assessment design concerns, and student support needs.
2. Academic integrity data should be reviewed at least once each academic year.
3. The annual review should consider:
 - a. number and type of cases;
 - b. programmes and levels affected;



- c. repeated issues;
 - d. outcomes and penalties;
 - e. appeal outcomes;
 - f. AI-related cases;
 - g. examination-related cases;
 - h. student training needs;
 - i. staff development needs;
 - j. assessment design concerns;
 - k. policy improvement actions.
4. Findings from academic integrity monitoring must be used to improve assessment design, student guidance, staff training, induction, academic support, and quality assurance reporting.

TRAINING AND AWARENESS

1. IVY Academic Network will provide academic integrity guidance to students during induction and at appropriate points during the academic year.
2. Academic integrity guidance should cover plagiarism, paraphrasing, referencing, collusion, contract cheating, examination conduct, research ethics, use of AI, and consequences of misconduct.
3. Staff involved in teaching, marking, supervision, invigilation, academic support, and misconduct panels must receive appropriate training.
4. Training should be refreshed regularly to reflect changes in assessment practice, digital learning, AI tools, and quality assurance requirements.

REVIEW OF POLICY

1. This Policy will be reviewed annually by the Quality Assurance Department in consultation with academic departments, programme teams, student support services, campus leadership, and senior management.
2. The Policy may be reviewed earlier where required by regulatory change, programme change, academic integrity trends, partner requirements, serious case review, student feedback, or quality assurance findings.
3. Approved changes will be communicated to staff and students through appropriate institutional channels.