

Academic Integrity Acknowledgement



A3

GC Academy Limited

Student responsibilities and procedural rights

Revision date 9 September 2026

Institutional approval pending

This document explains the academic integrity standards students follow, how to seek guidance and what happens when a concern is raised. It includes the right to respond and to seek an independent appeal. The acknowledgement at the end records that the student has read the relevant information and agrees to follow it.

Contents and document control

Academic integrity standards.....	3
Guidance and responsible use of AI.....	4
Fair procedure and the right to appeal.....	5
Student acknowledgement.....	6

Responsibility and approval

The Head of Institution owns this document. The Head of Quality Assurance Office coordinates its alignment with the academic integrity and appeal procedures and the retention of acknowledgement records. The QA and Curriculum Committee reviews proposed amendments; the Academic Board approves the academic provisions under A16 and A17.

Revision date: 9 September 2026. Review: annually and when the related integrity, assessment, AI or appeal requirements change. The approval record identifies the effective version. Preparation of this revision does not establish institutional approval.

Approval reference and date: _____

Effective date and next review: _____

Documents to provide with this acknowledgement

A4 Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy sets the formal misconduct procedure and authorised sanctions. A1 Academic Appeals Procedure sets the appeal route, grounds, deadlines and remedies. A23 Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct and the existing AI and Generative AI Guidance for Staff and Students explain related responsibilities. Each assessment also has its approved brief and applicable rubric.

Provide students with accessible, current approved versions before requesting acknowledgement and before assessed work begins. The full policies are made available through the institutional website and LMS, with guidance on where to seek clarification or use an alternative contact if access fails. Confirm the actual links and contacts before publication.

Administration records the issued versions, student identity, date and method of acknowledgement in the student record under A25. The signed form or identifiable LMS confirmation is retained with that version record. Staff follow up missing acknowledgements or access difficulties; an empty form or a policy upload does not record student completion.

Academic integrity standards

1 Introduction

Academic integrity means that your work honestly demonstrates your own learning, understanding and judgement. These standards apply throughout your studies, including online examinations, written assignments, case studies, practical and group projects, presentations and the Final Project. You are responsible for following the assessment instructions and asking for guidance when a requirement is unclear.

2 Principles of academic integrity

- Honesty: describe your work, sources, evidence and the assistance you receive accurately.
- Trust: act reliably and respect the work and contributions of others.
- Fairness: follow the same published requirements and do not seek an unfair advantage.
- Responsibility: take ownership of your academic obligations and the work submitted in your name.
- Courage: maintain these standards under pressure and raise concerns in good faith.

3 Forms of academic misconduct

A4 explains how suspected breaches are reviewed. Examples include:

- Plagiarism: using another person's words, ideas, images or other work without appropriate acknowledgement, including inadequately attributed paraphrase.
- Cheating or unauthorised assistance: using materials, tools, AI or information that the assessment instructions do not permit.
- Collusion: unauthorised collaboration or presenting another person's contribution as your individual work.
- Fabrication or falsification: inventing or altering data, quotations, sources, references or other academic evidence and presenting it as genuine.
- Impersonation: completing an assessment for another person or allowing someone to act in your place.
- Contract cheating: submitting work produced by another person or service as your own, whether paid for or obtained otherwise.

Collaboration required or permitted by the brief is legitimate. In group work, identify your contribution and provide the individual evidence required for assessment. A shared product, a peer rating or participation alone does not demonstrate each student's learning. Cite sources and acknowledge contributions accurately in individual and group submissions.

Guidance and responsible use of AI

4 Prevention and support

GC Academy includes academic ethics, writing and referencing guidance in orientation and module preparation. Tutors explain the brief, source acknowledgement, permitted collaboration and task-specific AI conditions before assessed work begins. LMS guidance, practical examples and referencing resources support this preparation; any workshop arrangements are communicated when scheduled.

Ask your tutor or module coordinator about an academic requirement. Use the support channel identified in the LMS for access, communication or technical problems. Explain any need for an accessible format or other support. Staff clarify the requirement and record any agreed arrangement; support does not replace your own academic work.

Follow the conditions for the actual task

The existing AI and Generative AI Guidance for Staff and Students applies together with the approved assessment brief. AI use can be prohibited, limited to study support, restricted to language or planning assistance, or permitted more widely with a declaration. Permission for one assessment does not establish permission for another. Seek clarification before using a tool if the instructions are unclear; clarification does not itself change the approved task conditions.

Where the brief requires a declaration, identify the tool, purpose, extent of assistance and parts of the work affected. Check the accuracy of AI-assisted content, quotations and sources, and accept responsibility for the submitted work. Do not fabricate sources or submit assistance that substitutes for the learning the task assesses. Declaring use does not make prohibited assistance permissible.

Do not enter personal, confidential or sensitive student, staff, institutional or assessment information into external AI tools unless the use is explicitly authorised and appropriate under the existing data privacy requirements. This acknowledgement is not blanket consent to external processing of your work or personal information.

The declaration for each submission

Complete the AI-use declaration required by the brief, including the existing declaration in the combined Assessment Rubrics for Assignments and Case Studies where applicable. Record “No use” only when true; otherwise accurately describe permitted use. A general acknowledgement of policy does not replace this task-specific record or certify that every future submission is original.

Before submitting, check the permitted assistance, source references, individual contribution and any required AI declaration. Keep the drafts, sources or contribution evidence the brief requires. Automated similarity and AI reports can prompt human review, but neither a flag nor a percentage proves misconduct on its own. A clear report also does not by itself establish authenticity.

If you cannot access a referenced policy or do not understand a statement, ask for clarification before signing the acknowledgement. Administration records the issue and follows it up so that the confirmation reflects what you have actually received and understood.

Fair procedure and the right to appeal

5 Consequences of academic misconduct

A concern is reviewed under A4 before any misconduct finding or sanction. A tutor or assessor can identify and refer a concern. QA coordinates the record, notice and conflict checks without deciding the merits. Under A16 and A17, three independent academic voters, including a senior academic chair, form the Academic Integrity Panel; the original assessor or referrer does not decide the case. The Head of Institution arranges implementation of the authorised outcome and does not replace the Panel's finding.

Authorised A4 sanctions include a written warning and academic counselling; grade reduction or resubmission; and, for serious or repeated established misconduct, module failure or programme removal. The Panel considers the evidence, seriousness, relevant circumstances and your explanation, and gives reasons for a proportionate sanction. Academic counselling here means guidance on academic practice. This acknowledgement creates no additional penalty or automatic consequence from a detection score.

Your opportunity to respond

You receive the allegation and supporting evidence in writing, the relevant rule, possible consequences and the response arrangements. You can give a written explanation, present evidence, request a meeting and seek appropriate access or support arrangements. You have an opportunity to answer material new evidence and receive a reasoned written decision. A4 sets the full safeguards; silence or absence is not itself an admission.

Direct and independent appeal

You can appeal a misconduct decision under A1 within ten working days of notification. Submit the decision, grounds, evidence and remedy requested through the formal LMS appeal channel or published alternative institutional contact. You do not have to return to the original tutor for informal resolution. The notice identifies the actual deadline; promptly explain any access failure or circumstances preventing timely submission so that admissibility can be considered under A1.

Grounds include procedural irregularity; perceived unfairness, bias or conflict; relevant new evidence not reasonably available earlier; inadequate consideration of mitigating circumstances; an unsupported finding; or a materially disproportionate sanction. Explain how the ground affected the decision.

Three independent voters, including a senior academic chair, decide the appeal by majority. No original assessor, moderator, referrer, first-instance decision-maker or participant in that decision or its implementation decides the appeal. QA provides non-voting procedural support, with an unconflicted substitute where needed. The Panel can uphold the decision, vary the sanction within A4, set it aside or remit the case to a differently constituted Panel.

The written outcome and reasons are due within fifteen working days of receipt of the formal appeal. Exceptional delay is explained with a revised expected date. Academic remedies and their effect on assessment records follow A1 and the applicable assessment rules.

Signing this acknowledgement does not waive your right to respond, see relevant evidence or appeal, and does not admit misconduct. You can raise concerns in good faith without retaliation. General complaints remain under A2; staff or senior-officer ethical concerns follow A23 through the appropriate unconflicted route.

Student acknowledgement

6 Confirmation by the student

Complete this section after receiving and reading this document and the related policies identified below. Ask for clarification or access support before confirming anything you have not understood. A signature or identifiable LMS confirmation records acknowledgement; it does not record completed assessment or a misconduct decision.

I confirm that I have read and understood the academic integrity responsibilities and procedural rights explained in A3, together with the relevant A4, A1, A23 and AI guidance provided to me. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and seek clarification.

I agree to act honestly, submit work that represents my own learning, acknowledge sources and contributions, and follow the approved conditions for collaboration and AI use. I will make accurate task-specific declarations where required, verify the material I use and seek guidance whenever I am uncertain.

I understand that concerns are reviewed fairly under A4 and that I can respond and seek an independent appeal under A1. My acknowledgement is not an admission, a waiver of those rights, an acceptance that a detection result proves misconduct, or a declaration of no AI use in future work.

Student name: _____

Student identifier: _____

Programme title: _____

Date: _____

Signature or identifiable LMS confirmation reference: _____

Versions provided and acknowledgement record

Administration completes these fields with the actual issued versions and links the full documents to this record. An approved version is not inferred from a draft revision date. Expand the fields or attach the linked version record as needed.

A3 version and date: _____

A4 version and date: _____

A1 version and date: _____

A23 version and date: _____

AI guidance version and date: _____

LMS or student record location and acknowledgement method: _____

Staff member recording receipt and date: _____

Clarification or access issue and recorded resolution if relevant: _____

Retain the actual confirmation and issued versions under A25. Do not prefill a student's signature or record an unresolved acknowledgement as complete. When material requirements change, provide the revised information and record the applicable renewed acknowledgement.