English Language Centre Academic Integrity Guidelines for Pre-sessional English Courses

A guide to the interpretation of the University of Liverpool's Academic Integrity Policy, as it pertains to the specifics of teaching, learning and assessment on Pre-sessional Courses in the English Language Centre

Directorate of Student Experience and Enhancement

Version 8.0 (Nov 2024)

Table of Contents

Section 1 – ELC CONTEXT

The English Language Centre (ELC) upholds integrity, honesty, and respect in all academic work. Staff and students must adhere to these values.

Pre-sessional English (PSE) students, encompass students from international and diverse educational backgrounds, and require guidance to adapt to UK academic standards. The ELC provides training to help students understand and follow these rules, recognising differences in global academic practices.

This guide, based on Appendix L of the University of Liverpool (UoL) Code of Practice on Assessment (CoPA), outlines how the ELC ensures academic integrity in pre-sessional courses. It supports students in learning correct academic practices and meeting UK standards.

Section 2 – DEFINITIONS AND EXPLANATIONS OF TERMS

This section contains definitions, examples, and explanations of the terms relating to academic integrity on PSE courses.

Poor Academic Practice (PAP)

This involves unintentional breaches of academic conventions that neither advantage the student nor indicate an intent to deceive, as stated in Categories A and B of the UoL CoPA. This may include:

- **Minor errors** (missing quotation marks or minor referencing mistakes)

- **Inadequate practices** (poor paraphrasing or inadequate referencing)
- **Clear overreliance** on prepared scripts/ notes/ texts in spoken assessments

Suspected Academic Misconduct (SAM)

This category covers categories C of the UoL CoPA where intention to deceive cannot be established because the student has not received a prior written warning of misconduct and D, a second subsequent category C when intent to deceive is apparent because a warning has been given. This may include:

- **Copying:** presenting material copied from someone else as one's own without their knowledge.
- **Plagiarism:** misrepresenting someone else's work or ideas as one's own, such as copying verbatim without proper referencing, failing to cite sources, changing the order of presentation, closely paraphrasing with minimal changes.
- **Self-Plagiarism:** resubmitting one's own previous work or published material without proper citation and authorisation from a coordination team member.
- **Collusion:** unsanctioned cooperation between students to produce work that is then presented as independently created.
- **Unsanctioned** use of online tools or Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) software.

Serious Academic Malpractice

This involves any inherently dishonest acts and behaviour with clear intent to deceive and gain unfair advantage. This is covered by category E of the UoL CoPA and includes:

- **The use of purchased coursework or third-party services** (contract cheating) for any submission.
- **Unacceptable proofreading practice** for any submission.
- **Embellishment, falsification, or fabrication of data/ sources**: changing, enhancing, exaggerating, or creating data or sources.
- **Cheating:** engaging in dishonest actions during exams or assessments. Examples include using unauthorised materials or technology, not following instructions, and presenting false extenuating circumstances.
- **The extensive, unacknowledged, or unacceptable use of GenAI** to produce or assist with substantial parts of any submitted assessment task.

The practices in this category are serious enough, even as a first occurrence, to warrant termination of studies.

Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI)

GenAI software, for the purposes of this guide is defined as computer programs that automatically create content such as text, graphs, data, code, images, audio, or video, based on user instructions.

Examples include OpenAI ChatGPT, Google Bard, Google Gemini, Microsoft Bing Chat, DALL-E, and Perplexity.ai. These tools use algorithms to find patterns in large datasets and generate human-like content.

Unacceptable editing and proofreading

For the PSE courses, this refers to the use of GenAI in editing and proofing submitted work.

Acceptable practice includes the identification of typographical, grammatical, or spelling errors, formatting or citation errors or inconsistencies, repetition or duplication of text, ambiguous wording, and mislabelling of graphs, diagrams etc.

Unacceptable practice includes writing, rewriting or adding to content, and checking or correcting facts, data, equations, etc.

Academic Judgement

Academic judgement is the decision-making process, based on experience and expertise, used by academic staff to assess whether a student's work meets the required standards of academic integrity. This includes identifying minor errors, poor practices, or dishonest behaviour.

Turnitin

Turnitin (TII) is a tool used to verify the originality of electronic coursework submissions by comparing them against a database of papers, journals, websites, and student work, including submissions from other UK universities. Significant matches may indicate issues such as inadequate paraphrasing or summarisation.

Section 3 – GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

University of Liverpool's GenAI Policy

UoL allows careful use of GenAI to support learning but prioritises academic integrity. Misusing GenAI or relying on it excessively can lead to poor academic practice or academic misconduct. Academic staff must guide students in following academic rules and identify any misuse. Students unsure about using GenAI should consult their tutors.

ELC's GenAI Position for Pre-sessional English Courses

It is ACCEPTABLE for students to use GenAI and similar software for PREPARATORY work for assignments to:

- brainstorm and develop ideas, with acknowledgement

- perform initial scoping searches to identify keywords and concepts but rely on academic and library tools for your literature search
- translate source texts or videos for comprehension purposes
- summarise readings to decide if they are relevant and thus require closer reading
- check the spelling, grammar, and readability of work in draft or practice essays **provided this use is declared in the Academic Integrity Declaration form (see appendix 4).**

It is ACCEPTABLE for students to use GenAI and similar software in their FINAL WRITTEN SUBMISSION for the following:

- proofreading of typographical, grammatical, spelling, formatting and/ or citation errors.

It is NOT ACCEPTABLE for students to use GenAI and similar software in their FINAL WRITTEN SUBMISSION to:

- write, rewrite or add to content or to alter work so extensively that its meaning changes or that the student can no longer understand or explain it. This would be considered **unacceptable proof-reading practice** and thus **academic misconduct**.

It is NOT ACCEPTABLE for students to use GenAI and similar software in FINAL SUBMISSIONS for **oral assessments** or **written/live examinations**.

It is NOT ACCEPTABLE for students to use GenAI and similar software in EITHER PREPARATORY or FINAL SUBMISSION to translate other people's work and submit it as their own OR write any part of an assignment in another language and translate it into English for submission.

It is NOT ACCEPTABLE for students to use GenAI and similar software without completing the academic integrity form and any declaration forms to relevant submissions (see Appendix 4). Failure to do so will be penalised and potentially begin an academic integrity investigation.

The ELC's GenAI position supports student learning, promotes best practices, and upholds academic integrity while ensuring accurate assessment of language and academic skills, as required by receiving departments and UK Visas and Immigration UKVI.

Appendix 1 identifies what the ELC considers best practice when using GenAI, practice which can lead to poor marks or a fail, and practice which would be considered academic misconduct.

Appendix 2 outlines common indicators of possible GenAI Use in written and oral assessment.

Section 4 – UPHOLDING ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Both staff and students are expected to take responsibility for upholding and maintaining academic integrity (see **appendix 3** for details of responsibilities).

Staff are expected to use their **academic judgement** and the information in this guide to decide whether PAP, or unfair and/or dishonest academic practices have occurred.

In **formative assessments, tutors** address **PAP** within the **marking criteria** (MC) for the intended learning outcomes (ILOs).

Tutors address the issue directly in **tutorial**, provide advice on avoiding future problems and warn students about the consequences of repeated occurrences. **Tutors document** the issue, advice, and warning in the **tutorial form summary**.

For **SAM**, **tutors** follow the same procedures, with **feedback** captured in the **tutorial form** and occurrences documented separately in a **SAM log spreadsheet.**

In summative assessments, PAP is addressed through remedial feedback in **the end-of-course report**, which includes guidance on avoiding such issues in subsequent studies. Where necessary, written warnings may also be issued.

Marking tutors report **SAM** on the **SAM log spreadsheet** (this applies to both first and second markers).

The **coordination team** investigates **all reported SAM** cases and checks records for past incidents of academic misconduct. If a student previously warned about misconduct commits another breach in a subsequent assessment, it is treated as a deliberate attempt to deceive or gain an unfair advantage, resulting in more severe penalties.

The **Academic Integrity Committee** (AIC) reviews and finalises penalty recommendations before meeting with the **Board of Examiners** (BoE).

See **appendix 5** for details of roles and procedures for the summer pre-sessional assessments at formative and summative stages

ELC use of Turnitin

The ELC requires summative written assessments to be submitted via Turnitin whenever possible, as it is widely used in UK higher education institutions to promote academic integrity. The ELC provides training for both staff and students on how to use the tool for this purpose.

All Turnitin reports are reviewed during marking, regardless of the similarity score. **Tutors** identify and report SAM based on these reports, and **the coordination team** verifies them against original sources to confirm plagiarism.

While Turnitin helps identify potential issues, the final decision is made by the **ELC PSE senior academic lead, academic lead and coordination team,** following UoL guidelines, which state that plagiarism detection requires academic judgement and cannot rely solely on software. Turnitin is used as a supplementary tool to support this process.

SANCTIONS & PENALTIES

Sanctions and penalties are formally applied only to summative assessments that contribute to final marks including exams, written assignments, presentations, group work, and any other practical assessments. Refer to the table in **appendix 6** for further detail.

APPENDIX 1:
ELC Position on GenAI Use for assessed work in pre-sessional English courses

	You can	You should not	You must not
Idea generation	You can use GenAI to brainstorm and develop your own ideas, with acknowledgement.	Do not use it to replace your own ideas.	You must not use GenAI to present ideas as your own.
Finding sources	You can use GenAI for initial scoping searches to identify keywords and concepts but rely on academic and library tools for your literature search.	Do not rely partly or totally on sources generated by GenAI tools or use irrelevant sources.	You must not use GenAI to generate or cite sources which you have not read or to create non-existent sources.
Summary	You can use GenAI to summarise source texts to decide if they are relevant and then read the original source.	Do not rely on generated summaries as GenAI can be inaccurate.	You must not rely on GenAI-generated summaries and synthesis OR submit them as your own work OR submit work you do not understand.
Translation	You can use it to translate source texts or videos, always checking that the translation is accurate.	Do not assume the translation is 100% accurate.	You must not use GenAI to translate other people's work and submit it as your own. You must not use GenAI to write an assignment in another language and translate it into English for submission.
Editing- proofing	You can use GenAI academic writing tools to check the spelling, grammar, and readability of your work in draft or practice essays **provided this use is declared in the Academic Integrity Declaration form (see appendix 4)**	Do not rely on academic writing tools to re-word your work.	You must not use GenAI to write, rewrite or add to content, or alter work so extensively, that its meaning changes or that you can no longer understand or explain it.

Source: Adapted for ELC from University of Worcester Library Services https://library.worc.ac.uk/artificial-intelligence [accessed 2024/12/19]

Indicators of Possible GenAI Use in Written and Oral Assessment

Context	Indicators of GAI Use	Possible Evidence
GenAI-Produced Writing	Unnatural phrasing or vocabulary	Use of complex, sophisticated words inconsistent with student's usual style
	Lack of deep understanding or superficial analysis	Generalised statements without in-depth analysis or specific examples
	Changes in tense, voice, and style.	Look for repetitive or formulaic language, sudden changes in tense or voice and variation in language use.
	False references or citations	Citations that do not exist, do not link to credible sources, and/ or do not contain the information given
	References not triggering Turnitin similarity matches	Some references might not show up. Cross check unfamiliar sources manually
	Direct speech to the user	GenAI content may include phrases like 'certainly' or sum up how the prompt has been achieved.
Live Discussion	Scripted responses	Responses that sound rehearsed. These include a lack of features of spontaneous speech (such as false starts, hesitations, reformulations), adaptation to conversation (genuine and considered responses) and pronunciation issues linked to reading text aloud
	Use of translation software	Unnaturally structured sentences or misuse of idiomatic expressions
	Delay in responses	Pauses that suggest waiting for generated content
	Overly technical or complex answers for simple queries	Disproportionally detailed responses compared to the question asked
Presentation	Overly polished or uniformly structured content	Slides or speeches that lack personalised insight or adaptation to audience feedback
	Use of advanced vocabulary not typical of the student	Usage of words or phrases that are uncommon in student's field or prior submissions
	Evidence of scripting through GenAI	Delivery that sounds uniformly paced, monotonous, lacking natural speech patterns

Staff and student responsibilities in maintaining academic integrity

Staff responsibilities include:

- Familiarising themselves with the ELC PSE Academic Integrity Guidelines and additional guidance from [the UoL CoPA and Academic Integrity Policy](#)[Appendix L](#)
- Informally addressing minor issues of PAP during regular T&L activities to enhance awareness and understanding of academic integrity.
- Reporting and documenting SAM on the relevant documents and spreadsheets in a timely manner so that any warning communications can be sent out within the required period.
- Informing students of any PAP in tutorials and tutorial forms and ensuring all students engage with the in-house resources, academic integrity tutorials and lectures, or if applicable, the KnowHow module on Academic Integrity.
- Providing additional support such as directing students to library resources such as CiteThemRight.
- Ensuring that information provided to students about academic integrity is clear, accurate, and easily accessible.

Student responsibilities include:

- Familiarising themselves with information provided in their student handbooks, study materials, and other ELC sources.
- Asking for clarification on any uncertainties related to academic standards and integrity, including the (un)authorised uses of GAI particular to their course and assessment briefs.
- Fully engaging with T&L resources on AI available as directed.
- Responding to feedback on any PAP or SAM issues such as referencing errors flagged in draft assignments and/or overreliance on scripts/ notes/ texts.
- Acting with integrity and honesty, respecting the academic community by not engaging in or supporting dishonest actions.
- Signing a declaration with assessed work as required, affirming that the work is their own.

NB: Ignorance of PAP and SAM categories is not an acceptable justification for breaches of academic integrity.

DECLARATION OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

NAME (Print)	
STUDENT ID NUMBER	
MODULE	
SUBMISSION	

This form should be completed by the student and appended to any piece of work that is submitted for written summative assessments. The form can be adapted depending on the submission. For spoken assessments, students complete an adapted version and submit to the ELC.

STUDENT DECLARATION

I can confirm that:

	Yes
I did this work myself.	
I have been honest, ethical, and professional while preparing and submitting this assessment.	
I have read and understood the information from the ELC about academic honesty and good study practices.	
I understand that breaking the rules of academic honesty can lead to penalties, such as losing marks, failing the assessment, or failing the course.	
I have not copied from another source, cheated, or used a professional writing service or GenAI tools to write or add new content to this assessment.	
I have used AI/ GenAI tools **only** to check spelling, grammar, or improve clarity in proofreading,	
and I have not used GenAI to add to content or rewrite any content or to extensively alter my work	

SIGNATURE………………………………………...……………

DATE………………………..…......

Table 1: Procedures at the Formative Stages for Written Assessments (paragraphs, drafts, and final drafts, and provisional outline (summer only))

Issue	Responsibilities and Actions
Minor errors/ PAP	**Tutors** address with the student **verbally and in writing** by: ◊ highlighting issues and advising on corrections/ corrective measures ◊ giving a reminder on the importance of academic integrity and information on the consequences ◊ signposting to resources where appropriate e.g. course materials, CiteThemRight, and in-house e-learning tutorials etc ◊ explicitly documenting the above in writing in the tutorial form
SAM	**Tutors:** • record incidents on SAM log spreadsheet • if the coordination team advise PAP(see below) follow the same procedures for PAP as directed above
	Coordination team: • investigate reported SAM • advise tutors via SAM spreadsheet on next steps • in cases of any clear academic misconduct/ malpractice formally meet the student (and require resubmission where applicable) • where SAM/ malpractice has occurred, record on SAM log spreadsheet as a first occurrence in case of future incident • email the SAM formative written warning (first occurrence) to the student(s), copying in tutor • any future misconduct will be dealt with as a repeated occurrence.

Table 2: Procedures at the Summative Stage (Written Assessments)

Issue	Responsibilities and Actions
	Tutors: • use their academic judgement to apply penalties to the relevant ILO as noted in the MC

Minor errors/ PAP	- if tutors cannot use their academic judgement to decide if the issue is PAP or SAM, report on the SAM Log spreadsheet - give clear feedback on the end-of-course report.
	Coordination team: - investigate and ensure marking penalties have been applied to the relevant ILO as noted in the Marking Criteria - check if this is a first or second occurrence - confirm scores/ penalties applied in the MC or adjust scores as necessary on the results spreadsheet (and inform the tutor) - invite student(s) to a live group session on avoiding future issues as appropriate - inform student(s) of outcome on Teams with the follow-up template.
	Operations team: - email students with the post-BoE outcome template
SAM	**1st and 2nd markers:** - record on SAM log spreadsheet and mark at face value using the Marking Criteria
	Coordination team: - investigate to decide on appropriate course of action. - note if this is a first or second occurrence - schedule a Teams mini viva with the student and two members of the academic management team (in summer) to discuss the writing process using the mini viva script - record the interview and save in the coordination channel - record the outcome on SAM log spreadsheet - inform the student on Teams with the follow-up template.
	AIC: - Discuss the SAM cases and finalise recommended outcomes.
	PSE SAL (or alternate): - update the SAM log spreadsheet with any penalties and inform Operations (D&S).

	D&S: • apply any penalty and amend the mark on assessment results spreadsheet Coordination team: • inform tutors who add the information to the end-of-course reports.
	Operations: • email student with outcome after the BoE.

Table 3: Procedures for Lecture and Seminar Discussion (summer)/ Presentation Assessments

Stage	Responsibilities and Actions
Formative	Tutors: • Record individual or group PAP or SAM on the SAM log spreadsheet • in cases of PAP, highlight the seriousness of the issue in the feedback Coordinators: • in cases of SAM, inform students that feedback cannot be given • email L&SD/PRES formative warning on Teams.
Summative (summer SD1)	Tutors: • flag individual or group SAM on the SAM log spreadsheet. Coordination team: • investigate each case. • where SAM has occurred, record as a first occurrence in case of future infraction in SD2. • inform tutors of the outcome. • apply any penalties to the assessment results spreadsheet.

	Operations: • email L&SD/PRES SAM written warning to students within the same week of the investigation.
Summative (summer SD2)	Tutors: • report individual or group SAM on the SAM log spreadsheet Coordination team: • investigate each case ready to recommend any penalties at the AIC, noting if this is a first or second occurrence.
	AIC: • discuss the SAM cases and finalise recommended outcomes PSE SAL (or alternate): • update the SAM log spreadsheet with any penalties and inform Operations (D&S) who update assessment results spreadsheet Coordination team: • inform tutors who add the information to the end-of-course reports
	Operations: • email students with L&SD/PRES SAM post-BoE outcome

APPENDIX 6
Sanctions and Penalties for Summative Assessments

Stage	Penalty/ consequences		
	Written assessments	**L&SD**	**PRES**
Minor errors and PAP	• Penalty as outlined in the assessment MC and feedback given on avoiding such issues/ further training.		
SAM (First offence)	Penalty to be applied as normal in line with assessment criteria. If assessment still passes, then assessment mark capped at student's pass mark overall.	Groups who use a prepared script will be reported as SAM and reviewed by the AIC. The penalty which the AIC can award is 0% for everyone in the group. If established in SD1 or SD2, assessment removed from 'best score stands' for that individual, meaning that L&SD can only be assessed by the remaining SD.	If established in the rehearsal, students receive no formative feedback with the warning template. If established in the final assessment, the student is penalised within the marking criteria.
Serious Academic Malpractice or repeated occurrences with a written warning issued to the student at any point during the PSE course.	AIC and BoE to agree which of the consequence(s) below to apply: • cap the research project at the mark immediately below the student's pass mark OR • 0% for the assessment OR • suspension or termination of studies/ academic offer AND • report of investigation and written warning issued	If SAM has already been confirmed in SD 1, the final score for L&SD can only be assessed by SD2 with AIC and BoE to agree which of the consequences below to apply: • cap assessment at the score immediately below the student's pass mark for the whole discussion OR • 0% for the assessment OR • suspension or termination of studies/ academic offer	If a warning has already been issued, the AIC and BoE to agree to which of the consequences below to apply: • cap assessment at the score immediately below the student's pass mark for the presentation OR • 0% for the assessment OR • suspension or termination of studies/ academic offer AND

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>

AND in addition to the above, one or both actions below:

- a note added to the student's academic record which may follow them onto other programmes of study in the future

AND/OR

- requirement for student to re-take academic integrity e-learning materials

</td>
<td>

AND

- report of investigation and written warning issued

AND in addition to the above, one or both actions below:

- a note added to the student's academic record which may follow them onto other programmes of study in the future

AND/OR

- requirement for student to re-take academic integrity e-learning materials

</td>
<td>

- report of investigation and written warning issued

AND in addition to the above, one or both actions below:

- a note added to the student's academic record which may follow them onto other programmes of study in the future

AND/OR

- requirement for student to re-take academic integrity e-learning materials

</td>
</tr>
</table>

CORRESPONDENCE TEMPLATES

Comment for withholding of feedback where unacceptable use of GenAI / translation software is suspected (1)

This submission is being considered for suspected academic misconduct (SAM) based on tutor suspicion of unacceptable use of Gen AI as outlined in the Academic Integrity Guidelines. In this case, tutor feedback is being withheld. In this week's tutorial, you will be able to talk to your tutor in detail about your research project title, the research you have done and how this research has enabled you to produce the written work. Please take this opportunity to discuss your work and writing process so you tutor may reconsider the judgement and give you feedback.

SAM formative written warning (first occurrence) template (2)

Dear [student],

Email subject line: SAM formative written warning (first occurrence)

I am writing to summarise the issues I noted with your [name of PSE module] as discussed in your 1-1 tutorial [today/ this week]. In the tutorial, we talked about the academic integrity issues related to your [name of submission] and that, to avoid [name of issue] in the future, I advised you to [corrective measure] for your next submission.

You should note that this has been recorded as the first occurrence of an academic integrity breach. **Any** repeated occurrences of any category of academic misconduct in **any** of the pre-sessional assessments will be considered as a repeat offence as outlined in the Pre-sessional Academic Integrity Guidelines, and the consequences more severe.

However, if you consider this as a learning opportunity, there should be no further issue with your work. If you have any questions related to this or any other matter on the PSE course, please let me know.

Kindly acknowledge receipt of this email to confirm your understanding of its contents.

Best wishes

[name of tutor]

SAM formative written warning (specifically collusion) (3)

Dear [Student's Name],

I am writing to summarise the serious academic integrity issues discovered in your Provisional Outline submission. It has come to my attention that you, along with two other students, have engaged in collusion by submitting identical content in your Provisional Outlines.

During the classes and training sessions on this course, we have discussed the gravity of academic integrity breaches and the importance of submitting original work. To rectify this issue and prevent future incidents of collusion, I strongly advise you to ensure independent effort and proper citation practices for all future submissions. This incident has been formally recorded as your first instance of academic misconduct.

Please be aware that any further instances of academic misconduct, including collusion or any other form, will result in escalated consequences as outlined in the Pre-sessional Academic Integrity Guidelines. This could include a failing grade for this assessment and potentially further disciplinary actions.

I encourage you to view this as a learning experience and an opportunity to reaffirm your commitment to academic honesty. Should you have any questions regarding this matter or any other aspect of the course, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kindly acknowledge receipt of this email to confirm your understanding of its contents.

Best wishes

[name of tutor]

SAM formative written warning (repeat occurrence) template (4)

Dear [Student's Name],

I am writing to address the issues identified in your [name of PSE module] as discussed during our recent 1-1 tutorial [today/this week/last week]. During our meeting, we discussed significant academic integrity concerns regarding your [name of submission]. To prevent recurrence of these issues in the future, I have advised you on corrective measures to be implemented for your next submission.

Please be informed that this incident has been recorded as a repeated occurrence of an academic integrity breach, which is considered a repeat offence under the Pre-sessional Academic Integrity Guidelines. Consequently, there may be penalties imposed, the details of which are yet to be determined.

I urge you to view this as a crucial learning opportunity and commit to submitting work that strictly adheres to academic integrity guidelines, including proper citation and referencing practices taught in the course.

If you have any queries regarding this matter or any other aspect of the PSE course, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kindly acknowledge receipt of this email to confirm your understanding of its contents.

Best wishes

[name of tutor]

Invitation and follow-up email (PAP) templates (5)

PAP invitation

Dear [full name of student]

Re: poor academic practice

I am writing to you with regards to your [Research Project/ Seminar Discussion] final submission/ assessment. During the marking stages, we have noted an issue/ issue with poor academic practice, and we would like to invite you to a video call on Teams to discuss this.

This call will be scheduled for [day/ date and time] (UK time) and will be attended by the Coordination Team and other students whose [Research Project/ Seminar Discussion] has similar issues. This meeting is compulsory and so if you are unable to attend, please let us know so that we can reschedule. The meeting must take place before [day, date].

Please reply to this message as soon as you receive it by saying you can or cannot attend.

Kind regards,

The PSE Coordination team

PAP follow-up message

Dear [full name of student]

Re: poor academic practice

Thank you for meeting us today/ this week. In the meeting, we highlighted some examples of poor academic practice and the potential future implications for students if this type of issue is repeated at the University when studying on your academic programmes.

The cases of poor academic practice will be discussed at the Academic Integrity Committee on [Wednesday 6th September]. A penalty may be applied to your work if the Board judges that this is a case of academic misconduct.

You will be informed of the outcome of this judgement by [day, date] but you will not receive your final results until w/c [date].

Best wishes,

PAP outcome (summative) (post BoE)/ no penalty

Dear [full name of student]
Re: poor academic practice
I am writing to inform you that the Board of Examiners met today and approved the recommendation from the Academic Integrity Committee not to apply any penalty to your Research Project.

We hope that this experience has highlighted the seriousness of poor academic practice and potential academic misconduct and the need to avoid it when studying at a UK university. As the Pre-sessional English course is developmental, you should use this as a learning curve as your future academic departments are likely to apply much more severe penalties.

You will receive your final results on [day, date].

Kind regards,

PAP outcome (summative) (post BoE)/ cap applied within the MC

Dear [full name of student]
Re: poor academic practice
I am writing to inform you that the Board of Examiners met today and approved the recommendation from the Academic Integrity Committee to apply a cap to your Research Project for ILO3 (Use of academic sources and adherence to academic conventions).

The reason for the cap is [reason for capping ILO 3 as highlighted in the PAP meeting] in your Research Project. We advise that [brief advice based on their issue(s)].

While this cap has been applied, the remaining three ILOs have been marked as normal. This decision is final and cannot be changed.

We hope that this has highlighted the seriousness of academic misconduct and the need to avoid it when studying at a UK university. As the Pre-sessional English course is developmental, you should use this as a learning curve as your future academic departments are likely to apply much more severe penalties.

You will be emailed your final results on [day, date].

Yours sincerely,

Invitation and follow-up email (SAM) templates (6)

SAM invitation

Dear [full name of student]
Re: suspected academic misconduct

I am writing to you with regards to your [Research Project/ Seminar Discussion] final submission.

During the marking stages, we have noted an issue/ issue with suspected academic misconduct, and we would like to invite you to a video call on Teams. The purpose of this meeting is to discuss this and give you an opportunity to talk to us about your work.

This call will be scheduled for [time and date] and will be attended by two members of the Coordination Team. This meeting is compulsory and so if you are unable to attend, please let us know so that we can reschedule. The meeting must take place before Thursday 10th August.

Please reply to this message as soon as you receive it by saying you can or cannot attend.

Kind regards,

SAM follow-up message

Dear [full name of student]

Re: suspected academic misconduct

Thank you for meeting us today/ this week and explaining how you wrote the research project. You highlighted that [description of the student's explanations], and we responded by explaining that [potential future implications for students on an academic programme with the SAM issues reported here].

As outlined in the meeting, your case, including the information you provided, will be discussed at the Academic Integrity Committee on [Thursday 10th August]. A penalty may be applied to your work if the Committee judges that this is a case of academic misconduct.

You will be informed of the outcome of this judgement by [day, date] but you will not receive your final results until w/c [Monday 21st August].

Kind regards,

SAM outcome (summative) (post BoE)/ cap applied within the MC

Dear [full name of student]

Re: suspected academic misconduct

I am writing to inform you that the Board of Examiners met today and approved the recommendation from the Academic Integrity Committee to apply a cap to your Research Project for ILO4 (communicative competence).

The reason for the cap is collusion with software due to over-relying on translation tools to produce whole sentences in your Research Project. Although you are allowed to use online software to proofread your written work, in future, you must ensure that the work you produce is 100% your own.

While this cap has been applied, the remaining three ILOs have been marked as normal. This decision is final and cannot be changed.

We hope that this has highlighted the seriousness of academic misconduct and the need to avoid it when studying at a UK university. As the Pre-sessional English course is developmental, you should use this as a learning curve as your future academic departments are likely to apply much more severe penalties.

You will be emailed your final results on [day, date].

Kind regards,

Mini viva script (7)

As mentioned in the invitation, you have been asked to attend this video call to discuss issues reported with your Research Project. We will need to record this meeting.

(start recording)

This is meeting conducted on (date) to discuss issues reported with a Research Project. The members of the coordination team are (name) and (name) and the student number is (student number).

- Can we just check is anyone in the room with you? Are you using any translation or transcription software? If you are using the transcript on Teams, please turn it off.
- Ok, can you first begin by telling us about the writing process? [rephrase if necessary]

When we were marking your work, we noticed that [description of the issue – choose from below]

- Let's look at your reference list. You have not included weblinks or dates of access. Can you explain why?
- Your research project did not include any citations or references to sources. Can you explain why you did not include any sources?

- The paragraph on [x] did not include any citations. Where did you find this information, and can you explain why there is no reference to any sources?
- This paragraph was reported as having a very high similarity with [another source – say which]. Why do you think it is similar?
- You can also see the colours in the similarity report on the reference list. The ELC template at the start and none of the paragraphs were reported as having no similarity. Why do you think there are no similarities?
- There was one paragraph which had no grammar errors at and a very high level of language. Can you explain why this is different from the other paragraphs?
- The language used in this paragraph was very academic. Can you explain why you used the word [X] and what it means using your own words?

(prompting if necessary)

- You said you used some tools to make your work more accurate. Can you tell me more about this?
- You said a friend / peer / another student helped you with your writing. What kind of help did they provide?

Rounding off:

Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the steps and processes you followed when you were writing your Research Project?

Thank you for meeting us today and explaining how you wrote the research project. Your case, including the information you provided today, will be discussed at the Academic Integrity Committee this week. A penalty may be applied to your work if the Committee judges that this is a case of academic misconduct. We will let you know the outcome of this judgement by [day, date] , but you will not receive your final results until w/c [day, date].

L&SD/ PRES SAM summative written warning (first/ second occurrence) template (8)

L&SD/Pres SAM summative written warning

Dear [full name of student]
Re: suspected academic misconduct

I am writing to you with regards to your Seminar Discussion/ Presentation assessment. During the [first or second] marking stages, we have noted issues with your performance. These include the following in **one or both** of your assessed discussions.

From the recording we can see you clearly using a script and that, as a result, you were unable to participate in the seminar discussion without an overreliance on technology. This was evidenced by one or more of the following:

- eye movement showing that you were reading a text on the screen
- typing while listening to others
- no features of spontaneous speech which usually includes false starts, hesitations, reformulations, genuine and considered responses to others' contributions
- pronunciation issues linked to reading out a text word for word
- sophisticated or complex language structures that are not typical of spoken English

As a result, we will only be able to assess your performance for L&SD on SD1 [or SD2].

Your case will be/ has been discussed at the Academic Integrity Committee on (day and date) and we may recommend to the Board of Examiners that a penalty be applied to the mark awarded for the Seminar Discussion assessment.

Adapt as appropriate:

It is not until after the Board has met and confirmed the appropriate penalty that we will be able to provide more information about the severity of the penalty. The outcome of this will be ratified at the Board of Examiners on the (day and date) Following this Board, your results will be emailed to you week commencing (day and date).

Kind regards,

SAM outcome (summative) (post BoE)/ cap applied within the MC

Dear [name of student],

Re suspected academic misconduct

I am writing to inform you that the Board of Examiners met today and approved the recommendation from the Academic Integrity Committee to apply a penalty to your Lecture and Seminar Discussion assessment.

As mentioned in the previous email, the reason for the penalty is collusion with software and your clear overreliance on technology and/ or a pre-prepared script. This decision is final and cannot be changed.

Your results will be emailed to you week commencing the [day, date].

Kind regards,