ACADEMIC INTEGRITY REGULATIONS AND PROCEDURES

2026-27

(APPLICABLE FROM SEPTEMBER 2026)

CONTENTS

INAI 1 PRINCIPLES 2

INAI 2 DEFINITION AND FORMS OF ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE 2

INAI 2.1 DEFINITION 2

INAI 2.2 PLAGIARISM 3

INAI 2.3 FALSE AUTHORSHIP 3

INAI 2.4 COLLUSION 3

INAI 2.5 FABRICATION OR FALSIFICATION OF RESULTS 4

INAI 2.6 CHEATING IN EXAMINATIONS AND CLASS TESTS 4

INAI 2.7 PROOFREADING 4

INAI 2.8 ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE & ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE DETECTION SOFTWARE 4

INAI 3 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES 4

INAI 4 ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE IN COURSEWORK AND REMOTE EXAMINATIONS 5

INAI 4.1 ACADEMIC MARKER STAGE 5

INAI 4.2 ACADEMIC INTEGRITY PANEL STAGE 6

INAI 5 ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE IN EXAMINATIONS 7

INAI 5.1 PROCEDURES FOLLOWING DETECTION 7

INAI 5.2 PROCEDURES WHERE THE ACADEMIC INTEGRITY PANEL REFERS A CASE OF ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE IN AN EXAMINATION TO A BOARD OF EXAMINERS 8

INAI 6 RETROSPECTIVE DETECTION 8

INAI 7 APPEALS AGAINST PENALTIES FOR ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE 9

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTEGRITY PANEL - GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE CASES 10

LANCASTER UNIVERSITY INTERNATIONAL STUDY CENTRE ACADEMIC INTEGRITY REGULATIONS AND PROCEDURES 2026-27

INAI 1 PRINCIPLES

INAI 1.1 Lancaster University International Study Centre (the Centre) values a culture of honesty and mutual trust in its academic endeavours (academic integrity) and expects all members of Centre, staff and students, to respect and uphold these core values.

INAI 1.2 The Centre takes suspicions or allegations of academic impropriety seriously and will investigate all such cases. Students who seek to gain unfair advantage through academic malpractice threaten the values and beliefs that underpin academic work and devalue the integrity of the Centre whether or not such actions are intentional.

INAI 1.3 Any decisions taken under these procedures by a member of staff, panel or committee of the Centre shall be made on the basis of the balance of probability and take full account of the principles of natural justice, fairness and equity. Where academic malpractice is proven this may lead to a penalty and that penalty may lead to a student failing to complete their programme.

INAI 1.4 the Centre will provide advice and guidance to students on academic integrity and what constitutes academic malpractice and make students aware of these regulations and the possible outcomes of proven academic malpractice.

INAI 1.5 Students have a responsibility to engage with the Centre's provision which informs and educates on the topic of academic integrity. Through this, students will ensure that they are aware of INTO LU's expectations and the regulations. All members of the Centre are responsible for the academic integrity of their own work.

INAI 1.6 All formative and summative work submitted for assessment by students is accepted on the understanding that it is the student's own effort and without falsification of any kind. Students are expected to offer their own analysis and presentation of information gleaned from research, even when group exercises are carried out. In so far as students rely on sources, they should indicate what these are in accordance with the appropriate academic conventions.

INAI 1.7 All students shall be given the opportunity to submit a defence against an allegation of academic malpractice and have the right to be accompanied by an individual unconnected to the case in any investigative meeting/Hearing.

INAI 2 DEFINITION AND FORMS OF ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE

INAI 2.1 DEFINITION

INAI 2.1.1 It is an academic offence (termed academic malpractice) for a student to commit any act designed to obtain for themselves or others an unfair advantage with a view to achieving a higher grade, mark, or more favourable outcome than they would otherwise secure. Any attempt to convey deceitfully the impression of acquired knowledge, skills, understanding, or credentials, shall represent a contravention of the regulations of INTO LU, and may constitute grounds for exclusion.

INAI 2.2 PLAGIARISM

INAI 2.2.1 Plagiarism is understood to include, in whatever format it is presented, including written work, group work or oral presentations, the following:

(a) the act of copying or paraphrasing from a source without appropriate acknowledgement (this includes quoting directly from another source with a reference but without quotation marks);

(b) the submission of all or part of another student's work, whether with or without that student's knowledge or consent;

(c) the commissioning or use of work by the student which is not their own and representing it as if it were;

(d) the submission of all or part of work purchased or obtained from a commercial service;

(e) the submission of all or part of work created by another person, whether by another member of the Centre or a person who is not a member of INTO LU;

(f) inclusion of material derived through False Authorship (as defined in INAI 2.3 below);

(g) reproduction of the same or almost identical own work, in full or in part, which has previously been submitted for assessment. This does **not** include programmes of study where the student is permitted or required to develop previously assessed work for example into a final assessed project;

(h) directly copying from model solutions/answers made available.

INAI 2.3 FALSE AUTHORSHIP

INAI 2.3.1 False Authorship is a form of plagiarism where the student has deliberately engaged with a third party and/or software tool to complete an assessment, either in part or whole. This engagement can be direct or through an intermediary. This may include work produced by another individual, an essay mill, a commercial service, or through the use of Artificial Intelligence software. As it is the authorship of work that is contested, there is no requirement to prove that the work has been purchased. The submission of undeclared work which is either generated and/or improved by language model software for the purposes of gaining marks will be regarded as False Authorship and interpreted as an attempt to gain an intentional unfair academic advantage.

INAI 2.4 COLLUSION

INAI 2.4.1 Collusion occurs where a piece of work prepared by a group is represented as if it were the student's own. This can also occur by enabling a fellow student to obtain academic credit to which they are not entitled. This includes providing material or performing all or part of an assigned task so that unfair advantage or credit may be obtained by another student.

INAI 2.5 FABRICATION OR FALSIFICATION OF RESULTS

INAI 2.5.1 Fabrication or falsification of results occurs when a student claims to have carried out tests, experiments or observations that have not taken place or presents results not supported by the evidence with the object of obtaining an unfair advantage.

INAI 2.6 CHEATING IN EXAMINATIONS AND CLASS TESTS

INAI 2.6.1 Cheating in examinations (including remote examinations and oral examinations) and class tests includes those occurrences when a student:

(a) communicates, or attempts to communicate, with anyone about the content of the assessment, including another student or any other individual who is neither an invigilator nor a member of staff;

(b) copies, or attempts to copy, from a fellow student;

(c) attempts to introduce or consult during the examination or test any unauthorised printed or written material, or electronic calculating or information storage device or mobile phone or other communication device;

(d) impersonates another student or allows themselves to be impersonated;

(e) disrupts the assessment of another student.

INAI 2.7 PROOFREADING

INAI 2.7.1 Proofreading should initially be undertaken by students themselves and there is no requirement that students use any form of proofreading service, however, it is recognised that some students may wish to have a third party proofread their work prior to submission or that this may be a recommendation within a student's personalised Inclusive Learning and Support Plan. Proofreaders must not actively edit or create content in a student's draft work, and must not make any intervention that would substantially change the content of a piece of work. It is the student's responsibility to ensure that the work of a proofreader does not also entail instances of academic malpractice. If students have any questions about the proper application of proofreading, they should contact their academic tutor or subject teacher.

INAI 2.8 ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE & ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE DETECTION SOFTWARE

INAI 2.8.1 Students must not submit or upload their own individual assessment submissions to academic malpractice or artificial intelligence detection software. Doing so can create a false positive with individual work being lodged in assignment comparator repositories and lead to suspicions of academic malpractice.

INAI 3 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

INAI 3.1. **Academic Marker:** Each Academic Marker identified as such by the Centre shall be responsible for providing an appropriate mark and feedback for student work. All Academic Markers shall make a positive effort to identify poor scholarship practices or academic malpractice, in all assessment items. They shall ensure that cases of poor academic practice are reported to the the Centre's academic support services staff for recording. The Academic Marker shall report where appropriate on cases for which they

have marking responsibilities to the Academic Integrity Panel and produce evidence in support of such a claim.

INAI 3.2 **Academic Integrity Panel:** shall request the investigation of all cases of alleged academic malpractice referred to it by the Academic Marker and determine if an academic offence has been committed. The Academic Integrity Panel shall act on behalf of Lancaster University's Academic Misconduct Panel and its decisions shall be binding on boards of examiners.

INAI 3.3 **Academic staff:** will normally act as the investigator of cases of academic malpractice referred to the Academic Integrity Panel.

INAI 3.4 **Lancaster University Students' Union (LUSU):** if a student has joined LUSU, appropriate staff may act as a representative of the student in any meetings or correspondence with the Centre, an Academic Marker or the Academic Integrity Panel. Students who wish to utilise the services of LUSU in this respect are advised to do so when they are first aware of an investigation concerning academic integrity, to allow for resource to be allocated where available.

INAI 3.5 **The Centre management** shall be responsible for ensuring that all cases of poor academic practice and all alleged and detected cases of academic malpractice, including plagiarism in coursework and cheating in examinations are recorded. This responsibility may be delegated to **Academic Support staff.**

INAI 3.6 **Academic Managers:** shall provide information and other support to the Centre staff to assist them in discharging their duties; communicating information about academic malpractice as appropriate; and offering assistance and advice about procedures and best practices.

INAI 3.7 Where the procedures require, as detailed in these regulations, The Academic Integrity Panel shall be responsible for instigating investigations.

INAI 4 ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE IN COURSEWORK AND REMOTE EXAMINATIONS

INAI 4.1 ACADEMIC MARKER STAGE

INAI 4.1.1 Academic Markers shall, when a concern is identified, use their judgement to decide if some form of **poor academic practice** or some form of **academic malpractice** has occurred.

INAI 4.1.2 Where it is decided that student work displays some form of poor academic practice but not academic malpractice the academic marker will deal with this as part of the normal feedback and assessment procedures.

INAI 4.1.3 The academic judgement of the Academic Marker may be that the poor academic practice should lead to a significant reduction in the mark awarded or that the affected work should be set aside, and the remaining work marked as normal.

INAI 4.1.4 The student must be informed of the nature of the problem and why it is unacceptable and a record of 'poor academic practice' shall be made.

INAI 4.1.5 Where the student work displays some form of poor academic practice as above, but the student has not taken note of previous advice of similar problems, then the matter will be referred to the Academic Integrity Panel which may determine that an **'**academic warning' shall be recorded for that student.

INAI 4.1.6 Where a student has previously received a note of poor academic practice on their record, the Academic Integrity Panel must check that the feedback given predates the submission of the assessment being marked. Only if the student had opportunity to have seen the earlier feedback to inform the later submission can the subsequent instance be treated as a separate case.

INAI 4.1.7 Students receiving an academic warning will be offered additional support in their academic practices.

INAI 4.1.8 Where the Academic Marker decides that the quantity of affected text is too great to be dealt with by setting the text aside as this would result in a mark of failure or not meeting learning outcomes, or that there is suspicion of some form of academic malpractice, then the case shall be referred to the Academic Integrity Panel as the first step in an investigation. The Academic Marker will provide the panel and the student with the details of the alleged malpractice that may include, for example, the Turnitin report, annotated assignment, and any other relevant information.

INAI 4.2 ACADEMIC INTEGRITY PANEL STAGE

INAI 4.2.1 Where a case is referred to the Academic Integrity Panel, the chair will instruct that the matter be investigated, normally by an academic member of staff.

INAI 4.2.2 The Academic Integrity Panel will be presented to by the investigator, and the student and/or their representation will be invited to make a statement. Following consideration of the evidence, the Panel shall have the authority to impose one of the following penalties:

(a) decide that no further action is required;

(b) decide that the matter should be considered as a matter of poor academic practice and dealt with as described in INAI 4.1.2-4;

(c) to permit the student to repeat the work;

(d) to permit the student to repeat the work, subject to receiving only the minimum pass mark appropriate to the piece of work;

(e) to award zero or equivalent grade for the work in question;

(f) to award zero or equivalent grade for the whole coursework;

(g) to award zero or equivalent grade for the module;

(h) to exclude the student permanently from the Centre, where the offence is detected before the final assessment is completed;

(i) not to make the award of International Foundation Certificate/International Graduate Diploma, with a recommendation as such to the board of examiners where the offence is detected after the final assessment has been completed.

INAI 4.2.3 The Academic Integrity Panel should inform the student of its decision as soon as possible and at the latest in writing within seven days. Where appropriate the record of 'poor academic practice' or 'academic malpractice' shall be recorded for that student.

INAI 5 ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE IN EXAMINATIONS

INAI 5.1 PROCEDURES FOLLOWING DETECTION

INAI 5.1.1 If a student is suspected of an academic offence as defined under these regulations the invigilator shall at once contact the the Centre Support Services team who will immediately go to the examination venue to investigate and will also inform the student's Academic Manager.

INAI 5.1.2 The student will be permitted to continue the examination in which they are suspected of malpractice, but the invigilator will request that the student remains behind at the end of the examination for interview by the Director of Support Services (or nominee). If the student is a member of Lancaster University Students' Union (LUSU), a representative of LUSU shall be invited to be present and written notes will be made.

INAI 5.1.3 If after this preliminary interview it is clear that no offence has taken place then the investigating officer(s) shall take no further action.

INAI 5.1.4 If it is decided to carry out a formal investigation the student shall be informed of this but also told that they will be permitted to complete all the examinations they would normally take at that stage in their course.

INAI 5.1.5 The invigilator shall, as soon as possible after the examination, provide the Director of Support Services with a written report giving full details of the alleged offence and enclosing any material evidence relevant to the case.

INAI 5.1.6 On receipt of the report, the Director of Support Services (or nominee) shall investigate the alleged offence, making such enquiries as they see fit and with access to all relevant documents. The student shall be interviewed and asked whether they wish to say anything or to provide any information relevant to the alleged offence. If after preliminary investigation the Director of Support Services (or nominee) is not satisfied that there is a clear case to answer, they shall inform the student and the other parties concerned, and the matter shall end there.

INAI 5.1.7 If the Director of Support Services (or nominee) is satisfied that there is a clear case to answer, they shall formally notify the student in writing of the charge and inform them that the case will be referred to the Academic Integrity Panel at which Hearing the student (accompanied if desired) shall have the right to be heard. Where required the Academic Manager shall attend the Academic Integrity Panel Hearing on behalf of the department.

INAI 5.1.8 The Academic Integrity Panel, having considered the evidence, shall have the authority to impose one of the following penalties:

(a) decide that no further action is required;

(b) require the student to resit the examination in which they cheated and if deemed appropriate other examinations or assessments;

(c) require the student to resit the examination in which they cheated and if deemed appropriate other examinations or assessments, subject to receiving only the minimum pass mark appropriate to the piece of work;

(d) award a mark of zero or equivalent grade for the examination;

(e) award a mark of zero or equivalent grade for the entire module;

(f) in addition to one of (b) to (e) temporarily exclude the student from INTO LU;

(g) permanently exclude the student from the Centre without an award;

(h) exceptionally not impose a specific penalty but refer the case to the appropriate board of examiners with a full statement of findings together with suggestions for appropriate action (see INAI 5.2).

INAI 5.1.9 The Academic Integrity Panel should inform the student of its decision as soon as possible and at the latest in writing within seven days. Where appropriate the record of 'academic malpractice' shall be recorded for that student.

INAI 5.2 PROCEDURES WHERE THE ACADEMIC INTEGRITY PANEL REFERS A CASE OF ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE IN AN EXAMINATION TO A BOARD OF EXAMINERS

INAI 5.2.1 Any student found by the Academic Integrity Panel to be guilty of an academic offence as defined under these regulations and whose case is referred to a board of examiners, shall have the right to submit to the board a written plea in mitigation but they shall not have the right to appear or to be represented by another before the board. Boards of examiners have absolute discretion to take into account, in making their decisions, such evidence as they may consider relevant to a student's academic performance and to decide whether to call for further oral or written evidence. They may also take into account, but shall not be bound by, the suggestions of the Academic Integrity Panel. In considering the suggestions of the Academic Integrity Panel, the decisions of boards of examiners shall be subject to ratification by the Committee of the Senate.

INAI 6 RETROSPECTIVE DETECTION

INAI 6.1 Retrospective detection is defined as the discovery of alleged academic malpractice in work that has been subject to final moderation, including by a relevant board of examiners.

INAI 6.2 the Centre shall reserve the right to review work retrospectively and to apply the appropriate procedures and, where reasonable, the appropriate penalties.

INAI 6.3 Approval by an examination board of an award shall not prevent the reasonable application of retrospective review.

INAI 6.4 Where there are reasonable grounds to review work, the matter will be referred to the Academic Integrity Panel which shall have the right to require the student to resubmit work that has been finally assessed and will decide on an appropriate sanction.

INAI 6.5 The Academic Integrity Panel shall, in addition, have the right to require retrospective review of any assessed work of students referred to it under the Lancaster University International Study Centre Academic Integrity Regulations and Procedures.

INAI 6.6 Failure by the student to produce the required material shall normally be treated by the Academic Integrity Panel as leading to the assumption that academic malpractice had taken place.

INAI 6.7 Lancaster University has the power to revoke an award under the procedures defined in its Charter and Ordinances: *Provisions to deprive persons of degrees, diplomas, certificates and other academic distinctions.* and reserves the right to do so as recommended by the the CentreAcademic Integrity Panel.

INAI 6.8 Where a student who has progressed onto a degree at Lancaster University has been found to have committed an academic offence following the retrospective detection of academic malpractice on a Lancaster University International Study Centre award, Lancaster University reserves the right to refer such cases to the University's Academic Misconduct Panel, with a recommendation that they be excluded from the university.

INAI 7 APPEALS AGAINST PENALTIES FOR ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE

INAI 7.1 A student who has been judged to have committed academic malpractice by the Academic Integrity Panel or other appropriate body shall have the right to appeal against the judgement under the Centre's Academic Appeals regulations. A student's right to have their appeal heard by an Academic Appeal Panel is conditional upon them fulfilling the criteria for a *prima facie* case for appeal.

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTEGRITY PANEL - GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE CASES

1. The Academic Integrity Panel shall hear cases:

   (a) referred to it by (or nominees of): an Academic Marker, Invigilator, Director of Support Services or senior member of the academic management team.

   (b) relating to alleged multiple offences after the course end/deadline for the final submission of coursework. The Panel's decisions shall be informed by the seriousness of the offence rather than by the time of year.

2. The Academic Integrity Panel shall consist of at least three members of academic staff (including the Chairperson) drawn from the Centre team. In cases where a member of the Academic Integrity Panel has been involved in the student's studies at modular level, then the member must remain neutral and not be involved in decision making for that case.

3. All Hearings shall be held in private (in-person or remotely) and a written record shall be kept of the evidence submitted to the Panel, the Panel's decision and the reasons for arriving at the decision.

4. If the Panel do not believe that there is a case for the student to answer to after reviewing the evidence provided, all relevant parties will be informed that the case is closed as soon as possible without a Hearing taking place.

5. Where a Hearing is necessary, The Academic Integrity Panel, will be convened with all possible speed. Once the time, date and place of its meeting are known the referred student shall be informed in writing:

   (a) that they will be called to a Hearing;

   (b) of the nature, date and time of the alleged offence;

   (c) that they may present evidence in their defence orally at the Hearing and/or in writing;

   (d) that they may be accompanied by a friend or representative if desired who will normally be a member of the University but unconnected to the case being heard (e.g. a College Advisor, Student Union Representative - if a member of LUSU);

   (e) that they may call witnesses to support their case (whose identity must be notified to the secretary of the Committee prior to the Hearing in order that their attendance can be assured).

6. Academic representation in attendance will normally be the Academic Marker, Academic Manager or investigator who will present the case to the Panel.

7. The Panel shall have the power to adjourn, continue or postpone an investigation at its discretion but shall always endeavour to complete its examination of the matter at the earliest opportunity. If the student does not appear on the date and time or at the place

appointed, reasonable notice having been given, the Panel may proceed to investigate the matter in the student's absence.

8. If the student wishes to admit the charge, they may do so in writing to the secretary of the Panel. In this event the student will be advised that they should still appear before the Panel for the formal presentation of evidence by the department representative and for examination of the evidence by the Panel.

9. If the student wishes to deny the charge, they shall so inform the secretary of the Panel once notice of the Hearing has been received. If no letter of admission is received, it will be assumed that the charge is denied.

10. The Panel may hear evidence in any way it sees fit. This includes the testimony of witnesses, and the production of documents or other relevant material evidence. The department representative and the student (or the person accompanying the student) shall be entitled at the Hearing to make an opening statement, to give evidence, to call witnesses, to cross examine witnesses and to address the Panel.

11. The Panel will find the charge proven if all or all but one of its members agree, on the evidence before it, that the offence was committed. If the Panel does not find the charge proven, it shall inform the student and all parties concerned immediately, and the matter shall end there.