

UNIVERSITY OF ST ANDREWS
POLICY ON GOOD ACADEMIC PRACTICE

Contents

- 1. High Principles**
- 2. What Constitutes Good Academic Practice?**
- 3. Processes**
- 4. Sanctions**
- 5. Record Keeping and Anonymity**
- 6. Appeals**

1. HIGH PRINC

It is important that within this community all members are judged on their individual academic abilities, an

Falsification is the fabrication or alteration of data – for example, by changing data in order to confirm a hypothesis not supported by the actual data, or the invention or fab

the output of an AI technology, such as a large language model (LLM) or paraphrasing application, as their own work without acknowledgment. This does not apply to assessments which specifically permit or encourage the use of such tools.

The University adopts the following principles on the Use of AI in assessment:

1. The University is committed to upholding academic integrity, including the prevention of the misuse of Generative AI, whilst acknowledging that skills in selectively utilising Generative AI as a resource will be required in the future.
2. The University does not seek to outright prohibit the use of Generative AI by students and recognises that there may occasionally be academically justifiable applications of Generative AI in the process of educational research and enquiry.
 - Students may choose to use Generative AI to generate notes, study aids, or other materials that they consider helpful in their learning. This type of usage is not prohibited.
 - Students should not use Generative AI for work that will be submitted and assessed unless told otherwise.
3. The University's default position regarding students who submit content produced by Generative AI as their own work is as follows:
 - If a student submits content produced by Generative AI as their own work **without** acknowledgment, this will be considered academic misconduct.
 -

c)

If the AMO finds there is no case to answer, no further action is taken, and the allegation can form no part of any future investigation into academic misconduct. BT/F1 12 Tf1 0 0 1 130.05 795.22 Tm0 g0

If academic misconduct has been upheld in the case of a research student prior to final submission of the thesis

School Board level. This would be the most likely route of action if a student has one recorded offence of academic misconduct of one particular form, and a subsequent allegation is raised

The student must also be informed in the summons t

If the Board of Adjudication upholds an allegation of misconduct, it must recommend a sanction to the Dean (see Section 4) and provide minutes of the hearing, using the *pro forma* provided. The student must not be informed of the sanction, nor should the sanction be discussed with the student, until it has been approved by the Dean. The Dean will ordinarily accept the Board's recommendation but may propose an alternative sanction.

Where time permi

4.1. Sanctions for UG/PGT Students

Issuer	Available Sanctions Marks/grades referred to are on the Common Reporting Scale
Academic Misconduct Officer	<u>Relating to piece of assessment</u> Written warning issued through MMS
School Board of Adjudication	<u>Relating to piece of assessment</u> Written warning issued through MMS or Piece of assessment capped at 7 or Zero for piece of assessment
University Board of Adjudication	<u>Relating to piece of assessment</u> Written warning issued through MMS or Piece of assessment capped at 7 or Zero for piece of assessment
<i>University Boards are able to award a sanction to both a piece of assessment and the related module</i>	<u>Relating to module</u> Module capped at 7 or Zero for module with a) the right to retake the module for credit only, (this sanction allows a student to retake a compulsory module)

<p>Sanctions available to University Board (former research students)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Thesis not accepted in its present form but the student given the opportunity to revise and resubmit the thesis within 6 months. Candidate must resubmit the thesis and pay a resubmission fee. Student must retake GAP and Research Integrity modules before being allowed to graduate. Academic misconduct noted on the student record. 4. Thesis not accepted in its present form but the student given the opportunity to amend the affected portion only for resubmission for the degree of MPhil only. Candidate must pay a resubmission fee. Student must retake GAP and Research Integrity modules before being allowed to graduate. Academic misconduct noted on the student record. Student has no right to pursue additional degrees at St Andrews. 5. Thesis rejected and no degree awarded. Academic misconduct noted on student record. Student has no right to pursue additional degrees at St Andrews. 	<p>The academic misconduct is such that the originality of the thesis is called in to question, but the examiners and/or University Board feel there is still enough original contribution to warrant a PhD upon revision and re-examination. Only available after the thesis has been submitted.</p> <p>To be applied in serious cases of academic misconduct where there is not enough original content to warrant a PhD. Only available after the thesis has been submitted.</p> <p>Originality of the thesis has been significantly and detrimentally compromised and undermined by the misconduct, and no remedial work will be able to resolve the concerns highlighted during the investigation and University Board.</p> <p>Reserved for cases of serious academic misconduct where there is not proof of enough original content to warrant any postgraduate research degree. Only available after the thesis has been submitted.</p>
---	---	--

1.

	<p>officer is satisfied with the amended thesis. Research misconduct proceedings may be triggered.</p> <p>2. Written warning that degree may be withdrawn. Individual given 12 months to correct the affected content for review by the original internal examiner (or investigating officer where the examiner is no longer a member of staff at the University). Research misconduct proceedings may be triggered. Award of degree may be upheld or original degree may be revoked and a lesser degree awarded. Student record updated to reflect academic misconduct.</p> <p>3. Withdrawal of degree</p>	<p>The academic misconduct is such that the originality of the thesis is called in to question, but the examiners and/or University Board feel there may still be enough original contribution to warrant a postgraduate research award upon revision and re-examination.</p> <p>Reserved for cases of egregious academic misconduct where the originality of the thesis has been compromised.</p> <p>Originality of the thesis has been significantly and detrimentally compromised and undermined by the misconduct, and no remedial work will be able to resolve the concerns highlighted during the investigation and University Board.</p>
--	---	---

4.3. Mitigation in sanction determination extenuating circumstances

In line with High Principle No. 9, extenuating circumstances that the student considers to have affected them at the time they committed academic misconduct may be presented to the Board for the purpose of sanction mitigation. Students must provide evidence to support a claim of extenuating circumstances (e.g., medical evidence or support from Student Services), and unsubstantiated claims of extenuating circumstances will not be taken into account. If students under investigation require further time to produce evidence to substantiate their claims of extenuating circumstances, they can request time from the Board in order to do so. This is at the Board's discretion, and the student must explain to the Board the exact reasons why there is a delay and why they require more time (e.g., they a49(mo)-6(re)14()JTETQ36.025 190.8 455.18 13.775 ref#0.00000887 0 593-6()-138((e)-6

5. RECORDS OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT SANCTIONS

The Proctor's Office will keep records of sanctions issued for academic misconduct. The main reasons for record keeping are to allow identification of repeat offenders and to allow the effectiveness of the University's procedures to be monitored. Records help the University identify long-term trends, for instance as part of academic monitoring. A record of past decisions helps Board members and the Dean to determine appropriate sanctions and so to ensure that similar offences attract similar sanctions from one School to another.

In addition, the University may provide information on academic misconduct to third parties, on request, when providing references for students. The University may also need to disclose information on academic misconduct where students are involved in joint/collaborative degree programmes or on study abroad/exchange programmes. Students will be explicitly informed when such information is disclosed. For UG/PGT students, the information provided will be sanctions that have been applied at module level only. Module-level sanctions are also recorded on the academic transcript. Information on sanctions above a written warning will be given and recorded for PGR students.

The information recorded will be:

- a) Student name;
- b) Matriculation number;
- c) UG, PGT, or PGR;
- d) Nature of the academic misconduct;
- e) First or repeat offence (and number of repeat offence);
- f) Individual or group case;
- g) Type of Board;
- h) Date of hearing;
- i) Sanction applied;
- j) Dean's approval;
- k) Date sanction has been applied.

This information and minutes of meetings of School/University Boards of Adjudication will be retained in accordance with relevant data protection legislation.

Access to the full record will be restricted to designated members of the Proctor's Office. Details of any previous case(s) of misconduct and sanctions applied will be made available to the AMO, Board and student and circulated to the panel with the paperwork. This information is not considered when deciding whether an allegation should be upheld, but may be considered in determining an appropriate sanction.

The Dean will produce an annual monitoring report for the Academic Monitoring Group, detailing the number of cases arising during the year, the Schools involved, a summary of misconduct types and a summary of outcomes. All monitoring will be anonymised and will not identify individual cases.

In cases of students on the Register who remain at or return to the institution to undertake a further programme of study, their records of misconduct will remain on the central Register throughout that further programme.

6. ESCALATIONS AND APPEALS

6.1. Escalation to a higher Board

A student who receives a written warning from an Academic Misconduct Officer has the right to ask for their case to be brought instead to a School Board of Adjudication. Such a request should be made to the Academic Misconduct Officer within five working days of the written warning being issued. The student should be aware that while the School Board may decide that the allegation should not be upheld, it may also uphold the original decision, and may apply the full range of sanctions available to School Boards.

Similarly, a student who receives a sanction from a School Board of Adjudication has the right to ask for their case to be brought instead to a University Board. Such a request should be made to the convener of the School Board within five working days of the original decision being issued. The student should be aware that while the University Board may decide that the allegation should not be upheld, it may also uphold the original decision, and may apply the full range of sanctions

