



Academic Integrity Policy and Guidelines for students

Version	1.1
Effective date	September 2024
Date for review	August 2026
Policy owner	Head of Quality
Reference points	Quality Assurance Agency guidelines on Academic Integrity: https://www.qaa.ac.uk/membership/membership-areas-of-work/academic-integrity Quality Assurance Agency Academic Integrity Charter: https://www.qaa.ac.uk/docs/qaa/about-us/academic-integrity-charter.pdf
Audience/handling notes	Academic, Students, Staff, External, Public
Dissemination and implementation plan	This Academic Integrity Policy, with its guidelines for students is intended to set out how LSA complies with academic standards in higher education. It is an externally facing public statement. This policy sits at Academic level, implemented and overseen by a member of the Education Committee. Staff will receive training on this guidance and students will receive this guidance on academic integrity and correct referencing conventions in their Student Handbook. Staff and Students will also be directed to where it is published externally. The Programme Leader will be responsible for the dissemination and implementation of this policy.
Linked Policies, Procedures and Forms	Student Handbook, Assessment (Policy), Academic Appeals, Student Code of Conduct, Student Disciplinary (Policy), Staff Guide on use of GenAI
Date approved	September 2024

1 Introduction

The London Sound Academy (LSA) is committed to upholding academic quality and standards, by ensuring that students do not obtain awards through any form of unacceptable academic practice relating to assessment, including plagiarism, cheating, collusion and impersonation. This is fundamental to securing academic standards.

LSA, in upholding its academic standards, will ensure that appropriate actions are taken whenever formative or summative assessment work causes concerns relating to academic integrity.

LSA acknowledges the collaborative nature of creative industries, and will seek to ensure all group work is graded in a fair and equitable manner.

2 Purpose

This policy explains LSA's requirements for students to submit work for assessments which is original and where it refers to or quotes other work, properly credits the author/owner of that work. LSA students are provided with information on correct referencing at induction, in academic lectures and in the student handbook which covers both intentional and unintentional plagiarism.

This policy supports LSA staff to effectively ensure that no unfair advantage is gained by any student through cheating, plagiarism or other forms of academic misconduct including but not limited to the use of generative AI to complete assessments.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is the passing off of another person's published or unpublished work as the student's own by unacknowledged quotation or wholesale copying. It is not an academic offence if the material is acknowledged by the student as the work of another via the provision of detailed references and a full bibliography, and the accurate use of quotation marks (in the case of written material). Students should follow the guidance provided by LSA on quotation, referencing and the avoidance of plagiarism.

The uncredited use of any published or unpublished material, whether in manuscript, printed or electronic form, is covered under this definition of plagiarism. Plagiarism may be intentional or unintentional. Unintentional plagiarism can also be referred to as poor academic and professional practice.

Plagiarism is a breach of academic integrity and also means that the work submitted has not met the learning outcomes necessary to complete the learning process. Plagiarism is unethical and can have serious consequences for an individual's future career.

Cheating

This can include being party to an arrangement intending to break or avoid the regulations such as obtaining or seeking to obtain access to examination papers prior to an exam, using notes or electronic devices during an exam, or copying another student's work to gain unfair advantage during an exam.

It can also include the soliciting, coercion or employment of another individual to complete an assessment for you; handing in their work instead of your own.

Collusion

This can involve unauthorised collaboration between students, failure to attribute assistance received, or failure to follow precisely regulations on group work projects. It is your responsibility to ensure that you clearly understand the extent of collaboration permitted, and which aspects of the work must be your own.

Impersonation

Impersonation refers to the act of one person assuming the identity of another with the intent to gain an unfair advantage for the person being impersonated, for example, by undertaking an examination on the other's behalf, or a student at LSA completing work on behalf of another LSA student. Both parties, the impersonator and the person being impersonated, would be considered culpable of being in breach of the academic integrity policy.

Poor Academic Practice

Poor academic practice refers to incorrect or incomplete referencing of external references, in line with the preferred referencing conventions currently used by an institution. LSA makes use of the Harvard Referencing System. Repeated instances of confirmed poor academic practice may be considered a matter of deliberate contravention of academic integrity.

Auto-plagiarism

Auto-plagiarism refers to any material which is identical or substantially similar to the student's own material which has already been submitted for any other assessment within LSA or a similar programme or course elsewhere.

Fabrication

Fabrication refers to the presentation of qualitative or quantitative data or findings in surveys or reports, which has either not been undertaken or fully completed and where the data or results have, in whole or in part, been deliberately invented or falsified.

GenAI

Generative artificial intelligence tools or services can be used to generate text, video, audio and image content in response to questions or instructions, often referred to as prompts. They can give responses to data that is input into them too, such as code or text. The most common example of a GenAI tool is ChatGPT.



4 Acceptable and unacceptable uses of Generative AI

The use of GenAI (unless otherwise specified by staff) in coursework is not academic misconduct in-and-of itself, unless used in such a way that it becomes unethical or is used to generate complete assignments that students then attempt to pass off as their own work.

Likewise, ineffective or poor use of GenAI, such as students not fact-checking or critically evaluating the statements it produces, or providing long swathes of text for which they provide a reference, is not misconduct, but it may constitute poor academic practice.

Acceptable uses include:

- Educational and Research Purposes: Students may use AI technologies for legitimate educational and research purposes, such as data analysis, natural language processing, or machine learning projects, under the guidance and supervision of faculty members.
- Collaborative Learning: Students can leverage AI tools for collaborative learning, such as virtual study groups, peer-to-peer knowledge sharing, or group project collaborations.
- Personal Productivity: Students may use AI-powered assistants or tools for personal productivity purposes, such as task management, note-taking, or time management, provided they do not infringe on intellectual property rights or violate privacy regulations.
- Accessibility Support: AI technologies can be used to enhance accessibility and support students with disabilities, such as text-to-speech or speech-to-text tools, provided they comply with relevant laws and regulations.
- Idea Generation and Brainstorming: Students can use AI language models to generate ideas or structure suggestions for their assignments, as long as they apply their own original thinking and analysis to refine and develop the content.
- Code Generation and Data Analysis: Students may use AI tools to assist with code generation or data analysis tasks, but they must understand the underlying logic and decision-making processes and ensure that the outputs are accurate and aligned with their understanding of the concepts. Whether such use of generative AI is permissible in a specific assignment must be clarified through careful reading of the assessment brief and/or consultation with the member of staff/Module leader responsible for the assignment.

Unacceptable uses include:

- Using AI tools to generate assignments, essays, or other academic work without proper attribution or with the intent to misrepresent authorship is strictly prohibited and considered academic misconduct.
- copying and pasting information created by GenAI straight into documents for publication or submission
- asking GenAI to write or rewrite a piece of work or part of a piece of work on your behalf
- Students must not use AI tools to plagiarize copyrighted materials or pass off generated content as their own original work.
- AI technologies must not be used to harass, threaten, or discriminate against individuals or groups based on race, gender, religion, or other protected characteristics.
- Students should use AI resources responsibly and avoid excessive or unauthorized consumption of computing resources that may impact the availability of these resources for others.
- sharing the materials and resources from module tutors in a GenAI tool - you do not have permission to share these materials openly because they belong to LSA

5 Severity

The severity of matters relating to the academic integrity of a student's submission of work is divided between four categories:

1. Minor Offence
2. Moderate Offence
3. Serious Offence

Minor Offence

An offence is considered to be in the category of a Minor Offence when the transgression is the first and sole offence:

- (a) The offence occurs within FHEQ Levels 4, and would therefore not affect a Bachelor's Degree final classification, or;
- (b) Where the offence occurs at Level 5 or above, and the component of assessment contributes a relatively small percentage of the overall module assessment;

What is Minor Misconduct?

- Reproducing an existing concept or idea unintentionally.
- Failure to adequately reference sources, including incomplete or incorrectly cited bibliographies, footnotes and/ or quotations.
- Several sentences of direct copying without acknowledging the source.
- Several instances of inappropriate or unacknowledged paraphrasing.

Key Indicators

- The student has not yet learnt about the importance of referencing or has misunderstood the referencing or paraphrasing principles.
- The student's behaviour appears unintentional.
- The student's behaviour might be intentional, but is on an insignificant scale.
- The student is in their first year of higher education.

Standard penalties for a minor offence

- Tutorial support and guidance to help the student understand what is and is not acceptable and
- Written advice for the student on where they can seek help.
- Failure at module level, identified through the use of grade 'P'.
- If a first attempt, to resubmit work by a given deadline with maximum grade capped at a passing grade of 40.
- If a second attempt, any retake of this, or a replacement, module to receive a maximum capped grade of 40.
- Written warning that further offences will have serious consequences for the student's final qualification.

Moderate Offence

An offence is considered to be in the category of a Moderate Offence when:

- The transgression occurs at any FHEQ Level;
- It is a first infringement offence, with documented and agreed mitigating circumstances.

What is Moderate Misconduct?



- Several paragraphs of direct copying without acknowledging the source.
- Several paragraphs of unacknowledged paraphrasing of another person's thoughts, ideas or text.
- An assignment which has been translated into English by another person.
- An assignment which has been edited by another person.
- Deliberately submitting the same piece of work for assessment for more than one assignment.
- Repeated Minor Misconduct, particularly if the student has been previously reprimanded.

Key Indicators

- The student's behaviour appears intentional, but is on a small scale.
- The student's behaviour will not have a significant impact on their final award (e.g. the student is in the 1st year).

Standard Penalties for a moderate offence

- (a) A failing grade for the module affected.
- (b) If a first attempt, to resubmit work by a given deadline with maximum grade to be granted for the module of a pass grade capped at 40.
- (c) If a second attempt, or if external requirements apply, or for substantial plagiarism in a project or dissertation module, to retake the module involved, with reregistration for the module and a new project title (where applicable), with a maximum grade of 40.

Serious Offence

- May occur at any FHEQ Level.
- No documentary mitigating circumstances.
- Includes offences such as: impersonation, cheating, a second or subsequent offence, substantial plagiarism in a dissertation.

What is Serious Misconduct?

- Submitting an assignment purchased or downloaded from the internet.
- Commissioning another person to produce a piece of work.
- Large sections of text that have been copied from another author, without acknowledgement.
- Large sections of unacknowledged paraphrasing of another person's thoughts, ideas or text.
- Presentation of the work of other students without acknowledgement.
- Presentation of the work of commercial or industry practitioners without acknowledgement.
- Conspiring or colluding with others to commit any of the above.
- Repeated Moderate and/or Serious Misconduct, particularly if the student has been previously reprimanded.

Key Indicators

- The student's behaviour is intentional and on a significant scale.
- The student has intended to deceive the person marking the work.
- The student would benefit substantially from the offence.
- The student's behaviour would significantly compromise the integrity of the University's awards.
- The student may have been warned and/ or reprimanded for previous attempts to deceive.

Standard penalties for a serious offence

- Normally a mark of Fail for that module with the opportunity to retake the module. All retaken modules will be charged full fees.
- The reduction of a degree by a class and/or award a lower level qualification; or
- repeat of academic level in which the offence occurred; or
- Termination of the student's enrolment on the LSA course or programme, which incorporates failure of any and all assessment taken that academic year, or academic level as applicable.

Disciplinary Offences (Gross Misconduct)



What are Disciplinary Offences (Gross Misconduct)?

- Theft of the work of other students.
- Theft of the work of commercial or industry practitioners.
- Copyright Theft.
- Fraud, including Impersonation and Misrepresentation of Identity
- Acts of violence or vandalism.
- Conspiring or colluding with others to commit any of the above.

Key Indicators

Any offence, including allegations of criminal behaviour, in which the offender commits physical violence, malicious abuse, theft, fraud or other fundamental breach of trust or negligently endangers staff or students or visitors, will be regarded as gross misconduct and may therefore lead to immediate suspension pending a disciplinary hearing and possible expulsion.

Standard penalties for gross misconduct

- Immediate suspension from the programme.
- Exclusion.
- Revoking a previously awarded degree.

All cases sit on a sliding scale of severity. There will be occasions when the misconduct is normally considered minor, but the extent of the deliberation and intention to deceive is such that it fits the criteria of serious misconduct. As a result, the examples given should be used as a guide to help staff identify procedures, but there will always be an element of academic judgement in determining the level of misconduct.

6 Fee and delivery implications

Requirement to retake a module, or substitute module may incur additional fees and possible disruption to student's original delivery schedule. Interruption or termination of enrolment to programme of study may also incur issues with regard to student loan access and/or funding. Students should refer to the Student Finance Policy for details regarding fee liability.

7 Appeals

If a student wishes to appeal a decision made by LSA regarding academic integrity, they should follow the Student Appeals policy and procedure.

8 Responsibilities and Accountabilities

Students will be provided with information about what constitutes good academic practice during their classes and via their student handbook, and will be reminded of this in advance of assessment periods.

It is the responsibility of Programme Leaders to ensure that all students and teaching staff are made aware of this policy and the consequences of breaches of academic integrity.

The responsibility for raising concerns about possible poor academic practice lies with the assessment marker in the first instance. However, all LSA staff members and students should raise any concerns they may have regarding the academic integrity of an assessment with the relevant Programme Leader.

LSA's Quality Assurance of assessment processes, and External Examiners provide additional points of scrutiny. Once the facts have been established, it is the responsibility of the Programme Leader to judge the seriousness of the situation and exercise discretion accordingly, taking into consideration any precedent or extenuating circumstances where appropriate.

9 Appropriate Academic Conduct

Academic Staff are responsible for informing students:

- that they are only permitted to submit their own original work for assessments.



- they should not allow others to see the text they have produced for their assignments and should exercise caution about sharing their ideas and draft copies with other students;
- Students should not allow others access to electronic versions of their work;
- Students should take care to ensure the originality of their own assessment submissions and should always be able to demonstrate that work is their own and correctly sourced and referenced.

10 Enforcement, Monitoring and Review

The policy lead is responsible for the cyclical monitoring and review of the policy.

Decisions and appropriate actions in support of the implementation of the Policy will be authorised by the following designated staff:

- Chief Executive
- Head of Quality
- Programme Leaders

Every two years, the Academy must review this policy to ensure that:

- it remains up to date and continues to meet the expectations of the UK Quality Code and Office for Students, applicable legislation or guidance;
- areas of improvement, or any concerns, raised by students, relevant external colleagues, or professional bodies have been addressed; and
- opportunities to reduce unnecessary bureaucracy have been taken.

11 Guidelines for Students

What is Academic Misconduct?

Academic Misconduct refers to any form of academic cheating.

Plagiarism is the form of academic misconduct you may hear referred to most often. It is defined as stealing another person's ideas and presenting them as though they were your own; 'cheating'. Examples include:

- Submitting assignments downloaded from the internet or written/researched using generative AI
- Commissioning another person to produce a piece of work for you, without acknowledgement
- Cheating in examinations
- Copying from a websites, news articles, text-books, journal articles, theses, or other essays and including their words as your own, without providing adequate reference to the author
- Reproducing original artwork, designs, film, sound or performance and presenting them as though they were your own
- Copying another student's work eg. essay, programme, database, webpage or multimedia presentation, without acknowledging their work.

But you ask us to read other sources and integrate those into our work?

Yes, we do. During your studies, you will be encouraged to reference credible sources of information about the music industry either from industry reports and sources, text books, the work of other artists, writers, designers or performers in your work. Your lecturers will expect to find a reference list at the end of each assignment and also see references within the text to demonstrate that you have engaged with wider reading and study on the subject. This is an essential and valuable part of your education. As long as the source of the ideas is acknowledged, this is not plagiarism. In fact, we encourage you to formulate your ideas based on experts, industry data, academic theory and thinking and the work of experienced and credible voices within the field.

How to avoid academic misconduct and plagiarism

LSA and its collaborative partners all take cases of cheating and academic misconduct very seriously.

Such an offence is likely to lead to failure of that assignment and/ or unit and serious or repeated offences may lead to failure of the whole stage of the course, suspension or even expulsion. In addition, a breach of copyright may lead to legal action.

Make sure that, for any assignment, you refer to LSA's Referencing Guide. The Referencing Guide lists the



correct way to reference any source, from books, journals and essays to works of art, industry reports, apps and web pages. You can find examples of how to do this below.

Quick guide to referencing

- Always acknowledge anyone else's ideas that you use in your work by quoting the source of the information:
- In an essay or assignment, when quoting another person's words "put their words in quotation marks" and properly reference the author within the text and in the bibliography
- If you are using an idea only and refer to it without quoting, you must make sure you put the Surname and the date of the article/textbook/website so that we know what prompted you to use that theory or idea
- When using a photograph or screenshot, put a caption against the object, e.g. "original photograph by Cartier-Bresson"
- If using a strategy of 'appropriation' (i.e. the deliberate and conscious use of the style and images of another artist) make sure you tell your lecturers what you are doing and why and acknowledge the strategy when submitting work for assessment
- In a group project, make sure all the members of the group are listed. If individuals undertake specific work within the project, make sure that this is acknowledged
- In examinations do not copy another person's work. Do not quote passages from a text-book or journal without acknowledging the source.

Using Gen AI

At the London Sound Academy, we aim to develop our teaching, learning and assessment to ensure that an education prepares you to be:

- critically digitally literate
- a responsible, ethical, skilled user of GenAI
- ready for work and life in an AI-enabled world

You may have access to the generative AI tool CoPilot within Microsoft Office365. You'll also have seen Google's Gemini in your search results and most likely ChatGPT.

GenAI tools can be enormously useful in supporting your studies by generating ideas, or by checking or editing work. However, they often get things wrong, include biased information, and create generic, bland text that does not show the knowledge, understanding and critical thinking your university studies give you. They can also generate academic citations and references that are fictional.

You are allowed to use GenAI tools like ChatGPT to develop your learning and support your studies. However, you should never submit work that has been created or part-created by GenAI for assessments that you claim as your own work.

Work submitted as your own should genuinely be your own work. If you submit work that has been created by someone other than yourself (including GenAI), then this breaks our rules on Academic Misconduct, and you can view our policy online. We will take disciplinary action that may result in penalties on your marks.

Always talk to your module tutor to check how to use GenAI to support your studies in their subjects. How far, and in what ways, you can use generative AI will depend on the particular task or learning you are carrying out and what capabilities you are expected to demonstrate.

This includes situations where you may not be allowed to use GenAI tools because learning outcomes indicate you need to develop and demonstrate your own individual skills and knowledge. In other cases, you may be asked to complete a declaration statement that describes how you have used generative AI. For some learning activities your tutor will build use of GenAI into teaching and give guidelines on how to use the tools.

Know the limitations of Artificial Intelligence

The use of AI has clear limitations. For example, available AI tools can:

- Only simulate understanding – the answers it gives aren't written by an expert, it's a guess based on your prompt.
- 'Hallucinate' to create plausible sounding but factually incorrect answers – its aim is to create something



that 'sounds right' but it GenAI doesn't mind if it actually is correct. (We do)

- Inherit bias and viewpoints from the training material – for every brilliant source on the internet, it's also scraping from informal and inaccurate sites too. You cannot use its results without checking and questioning first.
- Invent citations that seem plausible – it's the easiest way for us to spot use of GenAI, we put a citation into a Google search and it doesn't exist. GenAI will do this to you all the time.
- Use information that is not always up to date – as above. For every great set of information it uses, it is referencing just as many bad sources. Like Wikipedia, GenAI can give you a good idea where to look and how to express it, but you still need to do the work and most importantly, check the work.

AI tools are not reliable sources! The information they provide might be taken from any number of inaccurate, misleading, or misremembered sources, made to sound convincing.

Submitting work generated by an AI tool and misrepresenting it as your own is always Academic Misconduct. As a result, submission of such work may result in having to redo your work with a penalty to your mark or even withdrawal from the programme.

What will happen if I am suspected of academic misconduct?

If a lecturer marking your work suspects cheating in an assignment, they will make a report to the Programme Leader, who will determine how serious the offence is. If the misconduct is moderate or serious, you will be asked to meet with the Programme Leader to discuss the allegation.

You will then be invited to attend a misconduct hearing. You may take a friend along with you for support. The panel is made up of 2 members of staff who have experience of dealing with Academic Misconduct cases (one academic member of staff and one member of Student Services). The panel will ask you questions about your work and its authenticity, and you will also be able to bring evidence for the panel to consider.

The Panel must come to one of two conclusions:

- The Panel is satisfied that misconduct has taken place or
- The Panel is not satisfied that misconduct has taken place. If the Panel is not satisfied, you will be sent a letter confirming that your case is closed.

If the Panel is satisfied that misconduct has taken place, the Education Committee will agree the level of the offence and an appropriate penalty. Depending on the severity of the offence, you may be asked to resubmit the work, repeat the module or even the whole year. All resubmissions and repeats will be capped. A repeat unit or year requires payment of full fees.