



ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

POLICY DETAILS			
Policy Title	ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY		
Policy Number	ACP-26-13		
Policy Area (Choose One)	☐ Governance	☒ Academic	☐ Administrative
	☐ Research		☐ Student Affairs
Policy Owner	Deputy Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs		
Policy Status	☒ New Policy	☐ Major Amendment	☐ Minor Amendment
Approval Authority	University Council		
Approval Status	☒ Approved		☐ Under Review
Approval Date	10 th May 2026		
Lead Contact	Deputy Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs		
E-mail Address	ahmed.almamari@utas.edu.om		
Contact Number	+968 24114224		

VERSION CONTROL

Version No.	v1.0 (Final)
Date of Next Review	10 th May 2029
Unit of Origin	Academic Affairs Sector
Reviewers	Academic council

Feedback And Amendments

Version No.	Date	Summary of Revisions or Feedback Remarks	
v0.1(Draft)	17 Nov. 2024	UTAS branches	1. Clarity, Language, and Readability 2. Purpose, Values, and Scope 3. Tables of Violations and Penalties 4. Committees and Governance Structure 5. AI, Detection Tools, and Training
		Quality Department	1. Evidence of Policy Development 2. Process Compliance with Content 3. Consistency Across Documents 4. Use Official Templates and Checklists
v0.2 (Draft)	25 May 2025	Academic Council	1. Distinguishing Procedures from the Main Policy 2. Content review 3. Assuring compliance with other policies like Code of Conduct
v0.3 (Draft)	30 March 2025	Academic Council	1. Renaming the Policy from Academic Integrity and Honesty Policy into Academic Integrity Policy 2. Content Review

Plagiarism Verification

Version No.	Date	% Of Similarity	Remarks
v1.0 (Final)	2 April 2026	2%	NA

Proofreading

Version No.	Date	Proofread By	Remarks
v1.0 (Final)	16 March 2026	Dr Sergio Saleem Scatolini	NA

SIGNATURE AND STAMP



TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY	6
1. PURPOSE.....	6
2. SCOPE	6
3. POLICY STATEMENT	7
4. AUDIENCE, RESPONSIBILITIES AND DELEGATION.....	7
5. POLICY	9
5.1. Definitions	11
5.2. Other Pertinent Elements	16
6. REFERENCES.....	16

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

1. PURPOSE

Based on the University's leading principles in policy formulation, this policy aims to:

- (1) clearly state UTAS's commitment to a culture of Academic Integrity,
- (2) identify, prohibit, and penalize unauthorized and unacceptable academic practices, and
- (3) protect and enhance its reputation and academic trustworthiness.

2. SCOPE

This policy applies to all individuals affiliated with UTAS—including students, faculty, and staff—who are involved in knowledge transfer, generation, or dissemination, as well as in the use or production of deliverables, whether on-campus or off-campus, in person, in print, or digitally (for example, through published or unpublished research papers, journal articles, book chapters, books, course materials, manuals, handouts, course projects, graduation theses, administrative or governance documents, advertisements, surveys, forms, etc.).

The policy covers:

- a) the targeted values,
- b) the academic malpractices,
- c) detection strategies,
- d) stakeholders' duties and responsibilities,
- e) the corresponding disciplinary actions.

This policy does not cover non-academic breaches of professionalism and other forms of dishonesty or unethical behavior that may occur among UTAS's governance members, staff and students as these are covered in other regulations and policies.

3. POLICY STATEMENT

UTAS recognizes the importance of establishing a culture of Academic Integrity and, of, correcting substandard academic practices; preventing, detecting, and eradicating malpractice; and penalizing the violators of academic standards and conventions. This commitment to Academic Integrity standards shall be realized in all matters concerning knowledge transfer, generation, and dissemination, regardless of persons, institutional entities, places, methods, or modalities.

Everyone who is linked to or affiliated to UTAS shall adhere to the integrity and honesty standards set out in this Policy. This applies to all academic, research, and institutional texts, documents, materials, and media produced at or for UTAS (OAQA's ISAM 2024). They are all expected to systematically employ the applicable mechanisms used for safeguarding academic integrity, as well as preventing and detecting acts and practices that could be qualified as academically substandard, wrong, or dishonest according to this policy.

4. AUDIENCE, RESPONSIBILITIES AND DELEGATION

Table 1 below identifies the roles fulfilled by specific functionaries and officials and their responsibilities with respect to this policy.

Table 1: Roles and Responsibilities

ROLE	RESPONSIBILITY
Academic HoDs and HoCs	1. Ensuring that AI policy is implemented across all programs and courses in the department/Center 2. Communicating policy expectations to Heads of Sections/units, teaching faculty and staff. 3. Promoting a culture of integrity within teaching faculty, staff and students.
Assistant Vice Chancellor & Dean of	1. Ensuring the effective implementation and enforcement of the policy at the branch level

ROLE	RESPONSIBILITY
Rustaq College of Education	2. Ensuring that investigations and disciplinary actions are conducted fairly, consistently, and in accordance with university regulations. 3. Monitoring the implementation of the policy.
Deputy Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs	1. Ensuring the AI policy is properly implemented across all branches, colleges, and departments. 2. Ensuring consistent handling of academic misconduct cases across the university. 3. Reviewing reports on academic misconduct trends and ensuring corrective actions or preventive measures are taken.
Faculty and Staff	1. Implementing and enforcing the AI policy within classroom settings and throughout all academic activities 2. Reporting violations to Head of Section/Unit 3. Educating students about policy expectations. 4. Ensuring compliance with the AI policy in the development of teaching materials and the conduct of all research activities.
Heads of Sections/Units	1. Ensuring AI policy compliance within the Department or Center's operations. 2. Overseeing integrity practices related to the department or center's functions. 3. Guiding faculty and staff on policy procedures 4. Monitoring integrity-related issues within Department or Center activities and reporting them to the hod/hoc. 5. Providing guidance and awareness to faculty, staff and students

5. POLICY

UTAS employs its own classification of substandard and dishonest academic practices and the sanctions to which violators become liable.

1. Each breach shall, in and of itself, constitute an instance, regardless of the course, academic level, or semester where it took place.
2. All substandard practices or breaches shall be accumulated within a continuous period, which, for students, will be the duration of their enrolment and, for staff, will be the duration of their contractual relationship with the University. This period shall not be reset to zero if they leave UTAS and later return to it in the same capacity (i.e., as a student or member of staff).
3. Breaches that could lead to legal action against the offender may be addressed separately from this policy's provisions.
4. Academic violations are divided into four categories as outlined in Table 2.
5. Sanctions are imposed as per the Student Code of Conduct. Sanctions warranted to staff are regulated by national laws and, for example, but not limited to, UTAS's regulations, contractual stipulations, and Human Resources Committee.

Table 2: Categories and subcategories in student AI cases

CATEGORIES (CS)	SUBCATEGORIES (C1.1...)
1 POOR ACADEMIC PRACTICE	C1.1 Inadequate referencing
	C1.2 A similarity percentage (incl. (self-)plagiarism) exceeding the tolerance threshold by up to 5% (see 'Similarity Tolerance Percentage' below)
	C1.3 A similarity percentage (incl. self-plagiarism) exceeding the tolerance threshold by up to 6% to 10%
	C1.4 A repeat offence

2 MISDEMEANORS	C2.1 Recycling one's own work C2.2 Attempt to cheat in a quiz, test, or exam C2.3 Collusion to engage in or commit an academically dishonest practice/act C2.4 Contract cheating (incl. ghost-authoring and unauthorized outsourcing) C2.5 Unauthorized or undisclosed significant AI use (see 'AI Assistance' below) C2.6 A repeat offence
3 MISCONDUCTS	C3.1 False claim to <u>sole</u> authorship (see 'AI Assistance' below) C3.2 False claim that no copyright applies C3.3 Clear and demonstrable bias C3.4 A repeat offence
4 GROSS MISCONDUCTS	C4.1 Academic sabotage C4.2 Data fabrication or falsification C4.3 Leak of a graded item before or during its implementation C4.4 Unauthorized sharing of quizzes, tests, exams, or other items classified as 'not to be shared without express authorization'

BREACHES INVOLVING AI ASSISTANCE

1. Classify the use or assistance of generative or agentic AI as a C2.5 breach when the AI use was explicitly and officially authorized in the syllabus or the item specifications, rubric, or brief but not acknowledged according to the *AI Integration Protocol*.
2. Escalate a C2.5 breach to C3.1 when the extent of AI involvement, judged holistically, gives rise to reasonable doubt that the student was not the real author of at least one-third of the work (taking its nature into account).
3. If there is doubt about a student's work, particularly in cases where AI-detection technologies cannot be relied upon, investigate the probability of their authorship by using two types of evidence:
 - a) Previous work produced by the student independently (i.e., unaided by AI or any unauthorized third party).
 - b) Evidence from the student's participation in class.
4. When possible, seek corroboration from two or more of the student's current teachers.
5. Classify the use or assistance of generative or agentic AI as a C3.1 breach when the AI use was not explicitly and officially authorized in the syllabus or the item specifications, rubric, or brief.

5.1. Definitions

The terms below are central to this Policy and must be understood as defined in the table.

CONCEPTS	DEFINITIONS
Academic dishonesty	This concept refers to every improper acquisition, use, transmission, and self-attribution of data, ideas, work, or output, without acknowledging one's source in the established and acceptable ways. This constitutes a breach of academic integrity and a dishonest academic act. N.B. Although in administrative settings, people's output is not usually academic in nature, false claims to having conceived ideas or authored

	documents, reports, templates, forms, and the like without proper reference to their complete or partial origin or model constitute breaches of professional integrity and are dishonest acts.
Academic dishonesty detection devices	These are the various devices, tools, and technologies used to discover and identify cases that violate academic integrity.
Academic integrity	This concept refers to the institutional culture and personal attitude whereby academics, researchers, teachers, artists, professionals, and the like acknowledge the sources from which their data, ideas, work, or output were drawn, be it in their entirety or in part. This term covers the academic honesty as well, where the intangible attribute of people and, in the case of artificial intelligence, of systems and their designers whose working method (or <i>modus operandi</i>), actual practice, and concrete output, such as articles, artefacts, artistic objects, and innovations, demonstrate a continuous and systematic commitment to academic integrity as a personal and social value.
Academic Integrity Folder (AI Folder)	The individual folder created on each branch's AI Drive to store all the evidence pertaining to each reported case of breaches of this Policy.
Academic misconduct	A significant infraction of academic standards and conventions.
Academic misdemeanor	A minor infraction of academic standards and conventions.
Academic sabotage	When a person or organizational unit intentionally and publicly seeks harm the academic standing of a person, regardless of whether they succeed in the attempt or not.

Artificial Intelligence (AI)	The simulation of human intelligence processes by machines, particularly computer systems. These processes include learning (the acquisition of information and rules for using it), reasoning (using rules to reach approximate or definite conclusions), and self-correction. (POE, 2025)
Assessment tools	This concept refers here to every <u>graded</u> activity used to measure students' or trainees' achievement of the learning outcomes, especially summative assessments.
Attempt to cheat in graded assignments, exams, or tasks	When a person tries to cheat during a graded task or activity, regardless of whether they succeed or not.
Breaches	This refers to instances in which individuals did not adhere to the academic standards stipulated in this policy.
Clear and demonstrable bias	When a person or organizational unit's unfounded negative or overly positive attitude towards a person or organization in academia and/or their ideas can or does bring potential harm or a disproportionate advantage in relation to the latter's reputation, freedom and means to publicly articulate their thoughts, teach, conduct research, etc. This infraction contravenes self-determination, inclusion, or freedom of expression norms against a person or academic ideas that were expressed respectfully, methodically soundly, and through the appropriate channels.
Collusion	When a person or AI system cooperates with others to facilitate or engage in academic dishonesty.
Contract cheating	When a person pays or offers a reward of any kind to someone else to do their work without explicitly acknowledging it.

Data fabrication or falsification	When a person or AI system refers to or actively uses data that they created or concocted as if it had resulted from real sources or through the application of academically reliable methods.
Exams (الامتحانات)	Summative assessment tools that are (a) graded, (b) worth at least 40% of the total marks, and (c) conducted according to the examination protocol (e.g., the exam questions/activities are validated/moderated prior to their implementation, and the exam is invigilated (if onsite) or proctored (if online).
Exclusive false attribution	When a person claims ownership over data, ideas, or other kinds of items that go back to two or more co-authors whose names are not revealed. <u>NB.</u> This type of misconduct is twofold: the perpetrators make a false claim to exclusive agency/property and consciously deprive partners of the right to own their ideas/work.
False claim that no copyright applies	When a person or AI system uses data, ideas, or other kinds of items that were produced by a known author but claims that the authors were either unknown or had relinquished their copyrights or ownership rights. <u>NB.</u> This type of misconduct is twofold: the perpetrators make a false claim to agency/property and consciously deprive known authors of the right to own their ideas/work.
Gross academic misconduct	An infraction of academic standards and conventions whose gravity warrants the most severe sanctions.
Inadequate referencing	When a person or AI system fails to openly declare in the professionally established manner that a piece of (written, oral, conceptual, audiovisual, material, or artistic, etc.) work resulted from someone else's data, ideas, methodology, or agency. (This applies to people or entities that may reasonably be expected to have been aware of academic referencing conventions.)

Leak of assessment tools	When someone discloses without authorization a quiz, exam, or assessment tool in a situation other than the review/moderation/validation or implementation setting (place, time, and modality).
Poor academic practice	Breaches of academic standards and conventions due to negligence or lack of training.
Recycling and self-plagiarism	When a person or AI system reuses or recycles their/its own ideas, creations or words, especially without any substantial revision, without disclosing that they had already been articulated, presented, or disseminated in another published source, such as a book, article, or audio-visual creation. <u>NB.</u> Recycling and self-plagiarism percentages equal to and below 10% are deemed negligible or tolerable in all cases.
Sanctions	These are official penalties stipulated by the country's law for any violations of academic integrity to which UTAS adds the violations recognized and listed in this Policy.
Significant concealed use of AI	When a person fails to explicitly acknowledge that their output or work has been produced, partially or in its entirety, by AI technologies.
Similarity percentage	When a person or AI system's output shows a significant degree of similarity with someone else's or another entity's work without due acknowledgment of the sources used. <u>NB.</u> Similarity percentages equal to and below 10% are deemed negligible or tolerable in all cases.
Unit	A generic term referring to a UTAS department, center, directorate, or section

5.2. Other Pertinent Elements

This policy is consistent with other policies and protocols established by UTAS. It should be reviewed in conjunction with the procedures and guidelines derived from this policy.

6. REFERENCES

SN	Institution Name	Referenced Points
1.	Centre for Excellence in Learning and Teaching	Centre for Excellence in Learning and Teaching (CELT). (2023). <i>Institutional strategies that foster academic integrity: A faculty-based case study</i> . European Conference on Ethics and Integrity in Academia (ERAE).
2.	Cornell University.	Cornell University. (2023). <i>Testing of detection tools for AI-generated text</i> . Center for Teaching Innovation. https://teaching.cornell.edu/testing-detection-tools-ai-generated-text
3.	Leeds Beckett University	Leeds Beckett University. (2024). <i>Academic regulations: Academic honesty</i> . https://www.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/public-information/academic-regulations/
4.	Melbourne Institute of Technology	Melbourne Institute of Technology. (2023). <i>Academic integrity policy and procedures</i> . https://www.mit.edu.au/about-mit/institute-publications/policies-procedures-and-guidelines/academic-integrity-policy-and-procedures
5.	Ministry of Transport, Communications, and Information Technology	Ministry of Transport, Communications, and Information Technology (2025). <i>General Policy for the Safe and Ethical Use of Artificial Intelligence Systems, First Edition</i> .

		Directorate General of Policies and Governance.
6.	doi.org	Ng, D. T. K., Leung, J. K. L., Chu, S. K. W., & Qiao, M. S. (2023). A comprehensive AI policy education framework for university teaching and learning. <i>International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education</i> , 20(1), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00392-w
7.	OAQA	OAQA (2024). <i>Institutional Standards Assessment Manual</i> . Oman Authority for Academic Accreditation and Quality Assurance of Education.
8.	University of Manchester	University of Manchester, <i>Artificial Intelligence (AI) Teaching Guidance</i>
9.	University of Technology and Applied Sciences	University of Technology and Applied Sciences (2022). <i>Academic Regulations of the University</i> . University Council.
10.	University of Technology and Applied Sciences	University of Technology and Applied Sciences (2024). <i>Academic Regulations for Postgraduate Studies</i> . University Council.
11.	University of Technology and Applied Sciences	University of Technology and Applied Sciences (2025). <i>Assessment Policy</i> . University Council.
12.	University of Technology and Applied Sciences	University of Technology and Applied Sciences (2025). <i>Common Pedagogical Framework</i> . University Council.
13.	University of Technology and Applied Sciences	UTAS 2020-2025 Strategic Plan, 2.2.3.