

Triagon Academy

Academic Integrity Policy

Document Notice

This policy establishes Triagon Academy's institutional framework for academic integrity across all study programmes at Bachelor, Master, and Doctoral level. It defines the expected standards of honest and responsible academic conduct, sets out the types and levels of academic misconduct, and specifies the procedures and sanctions applicable when those standards are not met. This policy shall be read in conjunction with the Policy on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Academic Work and any applicable programme-specific regulations.

Document type:	Institutional Policy
Proposed by:	Executive Dean
Version:	1.0
Status:	Deemed effective by the Office of the President from 1 September 2026
Scope:	All study programmes and levels
Review cycle:	Annual or as required

Contents

Preamble	2
1 Purpose, Scope, and Related Documents	3
2 Principles of Academic Integrity	4
3 Expectations for Students	5
4 Types of Academic Misconduct	6
5 Levels of Academic Misconduct and Sanctions	7
Level I — Minor Misconduct	7
Level II — Major Misconduct	7
Level III — Substantial Misconduct	7
Level IV — Severe Misconduct	8
6 Competent Bodies and Decision-Making Authority	9
7 Procedures for Handling Suspected Misconduct	10
8 Appeals	11
9 Education, Prevention, and Support	12
10 Relationship to the Policy on the Use of Artificial Intelligence	13
11 Policy Review and Continuous Improvement	14
Annex: Quick-Reference — Misconduct Levels at a Glance	15

PREAMBLE

Academic integrity is the foundation on which the value of any qualification rests. It means that the work students produce is genuinely their own, that sources and contributions are acknowledged honestly, and that the processes of learning, assessment, and research are conducted with fairness and transparency.

Triagon Academy is committed to building and maintaining a culture of academic integrity across all programmes and levels of study. This policy sets out clear expectations, defines what constitutes misconduct, and establishes proportionate and fair procedures for addressing breaches. It is grounded in the six fundamental values of academic integrity — honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage — and reflects current best practice in higher education governance.

This policy shall be reviewed at least every three years, or more frequently where significant changes in technology, regulation, or institutional experience make revision necessary. Students, supervisors, and academic staff are encouraged to raise questions and practical concerns with their programme director for consideration in future revisions.

1 PURPOSE, SCOPE, AND RELATED DOCUMENTS

1.1 This policy sets out Triagon Academy's expectations for honest, responsible, and transparent academic conduct across all programmes at Bachelor (MQF Level 6), Master (MQF Level 7), and Doctoral (MQF Level 8) level.

1.2 The policy applies to all forms of academic work, including written assignments, projects, examinations, presentations, dissertations, theses, research activities, and any other work submitted or performed for assessment or academic credit, whether formative or summative.

1.3 This policy shall be read in conjunction with:

- the Policy on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Academic Work, including its rules on permitted use, disclosure, and citation;
- relevant programme and module regulations;
- applicable research ethics and data protection policies.

1.4 Where there is any inconsistency between this policy and programme-specific regulations, the higher standard of academic integrity shall prevail.

1.5 Any person involved in misconduct investigation or decision-making under this policy shall declare any actual or perceived conflict of interest and shall recuse themselves where impartiality may reasonably be questioned.

1.6 All formal decisions taken under this policy shall be recorded in writing, communicated to the student without undue delay, and retained on the student's file in accordance with the institution's record management procedures.

2 PRINCIPLES OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

2.1 Triagon Academy is committed to the fundamental values of academic integrity: honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage.

2.2 Students, academic staff, and all members of the academic community are expected to:

- produce and present their own work truthfully;
- acknowledge the contributions of others accurately and consistently;
- follow assessment instructions and ethical guidelines;
- engage in learning and research in ways that support genuine understanding and development.

2.3 The use of tools and technologies, including generative artificial intelligence, is permitted only where it does not undermine these values or substitute for a student's own intellectual work. Permissible, conditional, and prohibited AI uses are defined in the AI Policy.

2.4 In the context of artificial intelligence, Triagon Academy adopts a disclosure-based integrity framework: students must be transparent about when and how AI tools have been used, in accordance with the AI Policy, including any level-specific disclosure or citation requirements.

2.5 Poor academic practice — for example, minor or inconsistent referencing errors with no intent to deceive — is distinguished from academic misconduct. Where there is no intent to deceive and the impact is low, an educational response may be more appropriate than a formal misconduct finding.

3 EXPECTATIONS FOR STUDENTS

3.1 Students are expected to:

- understand and follow this policy, the AI Policy, and all relevant assessment instructions;
- ensure that all submitted work represents their own understanding and intellectual contribution;
- cite and reference sources appropriately, using the required referencing style for their programme;
- disclose any use of AI tools in assessed work in accordance with the AI Policy;
- seek clarification from module instructors or supervisors when unsure about permissible practices.

3.2 Triagon will provide academic integrity education and guidance. However, students remain responsible for their own conduct. Ignorance of this policy or of programme-specific assessment requirements does not constitute a valid defence.

3.3 Students must not:

- present the work of others, including AI-generated work, as their own;
- fabricate, falsify, or manipulate data, sources, or evidence;
- collude with others in individual assessments where collaboration is not permitted;
- interfere with the academic work of others or with assessment processes.

4 TYPES OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

4.1 Academic misconduct includes, but is not limited to, the following:

Type	Description
Plagiarism	Presenting another person's ideas, words, data, or creative output as one's own without proper acknowledgement, whether from published sources, other students, or AI-generated content.
Self-plagiarism	Re-using substantial parts of one's own previously assessed work without prior approval and appropriate referencing.
Collusion	Unauthorised collaboration with others on individual assessments, including sharing drafts, answer materials, or AI-generated content for use in another student's submission.
Contract cheating / ghostwriting	Submitting work completed, in whole or in substantial part, by another person or entity, including commercial ghostwriting services or AI tools used as a ghostwriter.
Fabrication and falsification	Inventing or altering data, results, sources, or other evidence, including the use of AI to generate fabricated research data presented as real.
Cheating in examinations	Using unauthorised materials or assistance in tests or examinations, including AI-enabled devices, unauthorised notes, or impersonation.
Inappropriate use of AI	Using AI tools in ways that breach the AI Policy, including undisclosed use in assessed work, submitting AI-generated content as the student's own intellectual work, or failing to meet required disclosure or citation standards.
Fraudulent documents	Submitting falsified or forged documents, records, or credentials in connection with enrolment, assessment, or any academic process.

4.2 Poor academic practice is distinguished from academic misconduct. Isolated referencing errors, minor procedural non-compliance, or unintentional omissions may be addressed through educational guidance rather than formal misconduct procedures, where the impact is low and there is no evidence of intent to deceive.

5 LEVELS OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT AND SANCTIONS

5.1 Triagon Academy applies a four-level misconduct framework to ensure that findings and sanctions are proportionate to the nature, severity, intent, and impact of the breach.

5.2 The examples in section 5 are indicative only. The final classification of any offence and the sanction applied remain the responsibility of the competent body and will be determined with regard to all relevant circumstances, including the student's level of study, prior academic conduct, and any mitigating factors presented. Where relevant, the competent body shall also consider whether the student's AI use complied with the disclosure and, where applicable, citation requirements set out in the AI Policy.

5.3 Where a case involves elements of more than one level, the most serious applicable level will normally determine the proceeding, subject to proportionality.

Level I — Minor Misconduct

Negligent, low-impact, or first-time offence with little or no evidence of intent to deceive.

Typical examples:

- Improper citation, for example APA 7 style not correctly applied or reference list entries containing errors, where sources remain identifiable.
- Failure to include an AI Use Note by accident, with no intent to deceive and no effect on the assessed outcome.
- Minor unauthorised collaboration on an individual task without intent to deceive.

Possible sanctions:

- Written warning.
- Academic integrity workshop or reflective essay.
- Resubmission permitted, normally without grade penalty or with a limited deduction.

Level II — Major Misconduct

Intentional misconduct of moderate scope, or repeated Level I misconduct.

Typical examples:

- Plagiarism of a paragraph or section of text from an external source.
- Submitting previous assessed work without prior approval (self-plagiarism).
- Intentional undisclosed use of AI in a graded submission, where AI has contributed to the wording or structure of the work.
- Repeated Level I misconduct.

Possible sanctions:

- Grade "Fail" (0 points) for the assessment.
- No resubmission permitted for that assessment.
- Internal record retained (confidential).

Level III — Substantial Misconduct

Serious or repeated violations, with clear intent to deceive and major influence on academic integrity.

Typical examples:

- An entire assignment substantially generated by AI or a third party and submitted as the student's own work.
- Fabrication or manipulation of data, including AI-generated fake data presented as real research findings.
- Cheating during written or oral examinations.

- Repeated or escalating Level I or Level II offences.

Possible sanctions:

- Grade “Fail” for the entire course or module.
- Suspension of enrolment for one or more semesters.
- Academic probation and mandatory integrity training.

Level IV — Severe Misconduct

Systematic, premeditated, or egregious fraud with serious academic, reputational, or legal consequences.

Typical examples:

- A dissertation or thesis produced substantially by a third party or via an AI ghostwriting service.
- Falsified or fabricated research involving third-party funding or external partners.
- Impersonation in examinations or submission of fraudulent academic documents.
- Repeated major offences, including large-scale AI-enabled fraud.

Possible sanctions:

- Expulsion from the institution.
- Revocation of academic degrees, where appropriate.
- Notification to external institutions, employers, or funding agencies where required by law or agreement.

6 COMPETENT BODIES AND DECISION-MAKING AUTHORITY

6.1 Academic misconduct cases shall be considered according to their seriousness and potential sanction, in a manner intended to ensure fairness, consistency, and administrative proportionality.

6.2 *Level I cases* may be determined by the module instructor together with the Programme Director, provided that the matter is minor, the facts are clear, and the sanction does not exceed a written warning, educational task, or permitted resubmission with no or limited grade penalty.

6.3 *Level II cases* shall be referred to the Examination Office and determined by an Academic Misconduct Officer designated by the relevant Examination Board.

6.4 *Level III and Level IV cases* shall be referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel convened only where required.

6.5 The Academic Misconduct Panel shall normally consist of:

- a senior academic chair;
- one academic member not previously involved in the case;
- one additional member with responsibility for quality assurance, academic governance, or student affairs.

6.6 No person directly involved in the assessment, supervision, or prior handling of the case may act as a decision-maker in that case.

6.7 The quorum for the Academic Misconduct Panel shall be three members. Decisions shall normally be taken by majority.

6.8 Where a case may result in suspension, expulsion, revocation of an award, or any other severe institutional consequence, the Academic Misconduct Panel shall make a reasoned recommendation to the relevant Examination Board, or to such other competent final authority as may be designated by institutional regulations, which shall take the final decision.

6.9 The Examination Office shall maintain the institutional register of misconduct cases, decisions, sanctions, and appeals, and shall provide an anonymised annual summary to the relevant Examination Board.

7 PROCEDURES FOR HANDLING SUSPECTED MISCONDUCT

- 7.1** All suspected cases of academic misconduct shall be handled fairly, promptly, and proportionately.
- 7.2** The student shall be informed in writing of the allegation, the evidence relied upon, and the procedure to be followed.
- 7.3** The student shall normally be given at least five working days to provide a written response before a decision is taken.
- 7.4** Cases shall normally be determined on the basis of the written evidence. A meeting or hearing shall be held only where the seriousness of the case, the existence of disputed facts, or the interests of fairness make this necessary.
- 7.5** Where a hearing is held, it may take place online or in person, provided that confidentiality and procedural fairness are maintained.
- 7.6** The burden of proof lies with the institution. Misconduct must be established on the balance of probabilities.
- 7.7** Decision-makers shall consider all available evidence and the student's explanation fairly, shall identify clearly the conduct found to be problematic, and shall ensure that the sanction imposed is proportionate to the nature, seriousness, intent, and impact of the breach.
- 7.8** A written outcome shall normally be issued within ten working days of receipt of the student's response or, where a hearing is held, within ten working days of the hearing.
- 7.9** The written outcome shall state the findings, the reasons for the decision, the sanction imposed, and the student's right of appeal.
- 7.10** Technological indicators, including similarity reports or AI-detection-related evidence, may inform an investigation but shall not alone determine a finding of misconduct.
- 7.11** Records of all investigations, decisions, and sanctions shall be kept securely and confidentially in accordance with Triagon Academy's data protection obligations and record retention procedures.

8 APPEALS

8.1 A student may appeal a formal misconduct decision within ten working days of the written outcome.

8.2 An appeal may be made only on one or more of the following grounds:

- procedural irregularity that may have affected the outcome;
- new evidence that could not reasonably have been provided earlier;
- disproportionality of the sanction;
- actual bias, conflict of interest, or material unfairness.

8.3 Appeals shall be determined by a person or body not previously involved in the case.

8.4 The appeal outcome shall normally be issued within fifteen working days of receipt of the appeal.

8.5 The appeal body may uphold the decision, vary the sanction, or remit the matter for reconsideration.

8.6 The written appeal outcome shall state the decision reached and the reasons for it.

9 EDUCATION, PREVENTION, AND SUPPORT

9.1 Triagon Academy recognises that a strong culture of academic integrity is best supported through education, clear expectations, consistent institutional practice, and proportionate enforcement.

9.2 The institution shall provide guidance and resources for students on academic writing, referencing, research ethics, assessment expectations, and the responsible use of artificial intelligence.

9.3 Academic staff involved in assessment or supervision shall receive induction and periodic guidance on the operation of this policy.

9.4 Staff who determine misconduct cases or sit on an Academic Misconduct Panel shall receive appropriate case-handling and calibration guidance before exercising those functions.

9.5 The Examination Office shall organise at least one annual calibration exercise, using anonymised examples where appropriate, in order to support consistency of decision-making across programmes.

9.6 Academic integrity expectations shall be communicated clearly in assessment briefs, module documentation, and supervisory guidance.

9.7 Students shall be encouraged to seek support early — through academic skills services, writing support, language assistance, or supervisory guidance — rather than resorting to misconduct.

9.8 Completion of an academic integrity workshop or reflective exercise, where assigned as a sanction at Level I, is itself an educational outcome. Students who complete such a requirement in good faith and do not reoffend will not have that educational measure treated as aggravating conduct in any later unrelated matter.

10 RELATIONSHIP TO THE POLICY ON THE USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

10.1 This Academic Integrity Policy and the Policy on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Academic Work are complementary and must be read together.

10.2 The AI Policy defines what uses of AI are permitted, permitted with disclosure, or not permitted, along with the required disclosure format at each level of study, the circumstances in which AI output must also be cited, and the data protection expectations when AI tools are used in research or related academic work.

10.3 This Academic Integrity Policy defines how breaches of the AI Policy are classified as misconduct (Level I to IV), the procedures for investigating and deciding misconduct cases, and the sanctions applicable at each level.

10.4 The following indicative guidance shows how AI-related breaches typically map to misconduct levels:

Level	Indicative AI-related example	Typical sanction
Level I	Omitting an AI Use Note by accident with no intent to deceive and no impact on the assessed outcome, or making a minor disclosure formatting error.	Warning; resubmission permitted.
Level II	Intentional undisclosed use of AI in a graded submission; AI-assisted text submitted without disclosure.	Fail (0 points) for the assessment; no resubmission.
Level III	Substantial AI substitution of intellectual work; AI-generated arguments, analysis, or conclusions submitted as the student's own with clear intent to deceive.	Fail for the module; suspension; academic probation.
Level IV	Dissertation or thesis substantially generated by AI or a third party; systematic AI-enabled fraud.	Expulsion; possible degree revocation.

10.5 These examples are indicative only. All cases will be assessed individually under Sections 6 to 8 of this policy.

11 POLICY REVIEW AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

11.1 This policy will be reviewed at least every three years, or more frequently if required by regulatory changes, sector developments, accreditation requirements, or institutional experience.

11.2 The review will consider:

- emerging evidence and guidance from academic integrity bodies and relevant higher education quality assurance frameworks;
- developments in AI technologies and their impact on learning, assessment, and research integrity;
- feedback from students, academic staff, supervisors, and external stakeholders;
- casework experience and patterns identified through the misconduct procedure.

11.3 The Examination Office shall prepare an anonymised annual summary of misconduct cases, sanctions, and appeals for consideration by the relevant Examination Board.

11.4 Proposed revisions shall be submitted to the relevant Examination Board for review and, where appropriate, to Senate for approval prior to entry into force.

11.5 Students and staff are encouraged to raise questions, practical concerns, or suggestions for improvement with their programme director or the Examination Office at any time.

ANNEX: QUICK-REFERENCE — MISCONDUCT LEVELS AT A GLANCE

The following table summarises the four misconduct levels with the most common examples and typical outcomes. For the full framework see Section 5; for AI-specific examples see Section 10.

Level	Nature	Examples (including AI)	Typical outcome
Level I <i>Minor</i>	Negligent; no intent to deceive; low impact.	Citation errors; accidental missing AI Use Note; minor unauthorised collaboration.	Warning; workshop or reflective task; resubmission permitted.
Level II <i>Major</i>	Intentional; moderate scope; or repeated Level I.	Plagiarised paragraph; self-plagiarism; intentional undisclosed AI use in graded work.	Fail (0 points) for assessment; no resubmission; internal record.
Level III <i>Substantial</i>	Serious; clear intent; major integrity impact.	Whole assignment AI-generated or ghostwritten; fabricated data; exam cheating.	Fail for module; suspension; academic probation.
Level IV <i>Severe</i>	Systematic fraud; legal or reputational consequences.	AI-ghostwritten thesis; falsified funded research; impersonation; repeat major offences.	Expulsion; degree revocation; external notification.

If you have questions about what is and is not permitted, speak to your supervisor or module instructor before submitting. It is always better to ask first.