



## Equality Impact Analysis

This form enables you to reflect on your proposed activity, and to assess the potential positive and negative impacts it might have on different members of the community. The Equality Analysis is designed to help you ensure your activities are meaningfully considered and not spending your time on an activity that will later need to be changed or disbanded due to not thinking about the practical needs of diverse communities who we are required to protect. If you have any questions about how to complete this Equality Analysis, please read the [Guidance](#) or contact the Equality, Diversity and Inclusivity Team: [edi@uwe.ac.uk](mailto:edi@uwe.ac.uk).

### **Activity Title: Review of the Academic Conduct Policy**

**Project Manager and Contact: Nicky Wisdom – [nicky.wisdom@uwe.ac.uk](mailto:nicky.wisdom@uwe.ac.uk)**

#### *Proposed activity (change, refresh, policy, process or practice) being analysed*

*Enter short description of what it is, the objectives and why you are doing it. If you are amending a current activity, what changes are proposed? Please outline the ways that students, staff, visitors or contractors might experience changes in their day to day lives e.g., changes to buildings, working hours, administrative processes.*

We are undertaking a comprehensive review and update of the Academic Conduct Policy and associated procedures, aligned with the Academic Governance Framework, to place greater emphasis on education, prevention, and clarity in relation to academic misconduct.

A key driver of this review is the need to ensure the policy remains relevant and effective in an AI-literate academic environment. This includes explicitly defining authentic authorship, clarifying acceptable and unacceptable uses of AI and supporting students in understanding the ethical boundaries of academic work. While recognising that AI tools can enhance learning when used appropriately, the revised policy will clearly outline where their use may compromise academic integrity.

The overarching objective is to shift the focus from purely punitive responses to a more developmental and supportive approach. Rather than relying solely on penalties after misconduct has occurred, the revised policy will introduce educational interventions, such as workshops for students involved in low-level or first-time offences. This 'rehabilitative' element aims to help students learn from their mistakes, build confidence in academic skills, reduce repeat offences and level the playing field for students who may not have previously been exposed to academic integrity as a concept because of previous life experiences.

Key proposed changes include:

- Ensure it aligns with the Academic Governance Framework.
- Review and redefine offences, where necessary.
- Reflect the realities of an AI-literate academic environment.
- Shift from a punitive to a developmental approach, especially for low-level or first-time offences.
- Introduce educational workshops and clearer guidance.
- Review penalties and procedures to match the principles of any policy changes.
- Streamline administrative processes for consistency and timeliness.

Rationale:

- The need to educate students fairly and proactively about academic integrity.
- The emergence of AI tools in academic work, requiring clearer definitions of authentic authorship and ethical boundaries.
- A desire to reduce repeat offences and support students who may lack prior exposure to academic integrity principles.

What sources of information/ data, or who have you identified to help explore potential equalities impacts?

*Examples include: External or Sector data/research, Staffing Statistics, Student or Staff Networks, specific stakeholders.*

- Academic conduct case data – Including a breakdown of AO allegations but ethnicity, fee status and disability below. These will be compared to in years following the workshop pilot and following if changes are approved.
- Sector research on academic misconduct, inclusive practice, and the impact of AI on academic integrity.
- Students views including from Global Majority, Disabled Students, LGBTQ+, International Students and mature students to gather lived experiences and feedback.
- Assessment Offence Advisors.

## Breakdown of AO Allegations 2021-2025

### Breakdown of allegations by ethnicity

<b>Ethnicity (inc. fees status)</b>	<b>Total 2024/25 (1118)</b>	<b>Total 2023/24 (976)</b>	<b>Total 2022/23 (1304)</b>	<b>Total 2021/22 (1296)</b>
Global Majority <b>HOME</b>	179	164	178	156
Global Majority <b>EU/other</b>	9	13	13	14
Global Majority <b>OVERSEAS</b>	623	603	914	822
White <b>HOME</b>	270	176	159	255
White <b>EU/other</b>	6	1	9	11
White <b>OVERSEAS</b>	16	1	6	12
Prefer not to say/information not provided	15	18	25	26

### Breakdown of allegations by fee status

<b>Fee Status</b>	<b>Total 2024/25 (1118)</b>	<b>Total 2023/24 (976)</b>	<b>Total 2022/23 (1304)</b>	<b>Total 2021/22 (1296)</b>
Home	453	343	340	414
EU/Other	15	30	25	28
Overseas	650	603	939	854

### Breakdown of allegations by disability

<b>Disability</b>	<b>Total 2024/25 (1118)</b>	<b>Total 2023/24 (976)</b>	<b>Total 2022/23 (1304)</b>	<b>Total 2021/22 (1296)</b>
No disability	839	760	1178	1214
Learning difference	63	41	29	25

Mental Health	36	37	17	16
Multiple or other	76	47	27	15
Prefer not to say or no information provided	104	91	53	26

### Assessing the activity from different perspectives

*Might your proposal impact people who identify with the protected groups below in the following contexts?*

- *Access to or participation in UWE Bristol Faculties or Professional Services?*
  - *Student experience, attainment or withdrawal?*
  - *Staff experience, representation, or progression?*

*Explain why you have made that assessment and plan your response.*

As part of the initial scoping for the workshop, we held a trial session with ten students representing a broad mix of backgrounds and characteristics, including overseas and home students, those with declared disabilities, and a range of ethnic heritages.

The group included:

- three overseas Asian students (two female, one male)
- one home student with a disability who identified as White (female),
- one overseas student with a disability who identified as Other (male),
- one home student with a disability who identified as Multiple Heritage (female),
- one overseas student identifying as Asian (female),
- and one overseas student identifying as Multiple Heritage (female).

We have also gathered early input from Students' Union presidents, offering perspectives from global majority, international and mature students.

Looking ahead, we will consult students twice during the development of the policy, procedures and workshop materials—once in the initial phase and again at a later stage. We intend to look at ways to ask questions to students who self identify with certain groups about their ideas and perspectives.

In addition, ongoing focus groups and feedback surveys will be embedded in the workshop pilot, with a particular focus on accessibility, whether sessions meet diverse needs, and how these can be further improved.

**Action Planning:** how will you mitigate negative and maximise positive outcomes?

Please feed information from this action plan to your activity's own planning documents e.g., action plans, risk registers, benefits maps

	<b>Possible Positive Impact on Groups</b> Include relevant data if possible	<b>Possible Negative Impact on Groups</b> Include relevant data if possible	<b>Actions Required</b>	<b>Responsible Person</b>	<b>Target date</b>	<b>Success indicators</b>	<b>Progress to date</b>
<b>All</b> (possible impacts affecting many groups)	<p>More supportive and educational approach to misconduct. Clearer guidance on academic integrity and AI use.</p> <p>Education instead of penalty may help reduce future offences and therefore better outcomes overall. Academic rigour of UWE degrees is 'safer'.</p>		General monitoring of outcomes.	Student Voice and Academic Policy Manager	June 2026	<p>Reduction in repeat offences.</p> <p>Positive student and staff feedback.</p> <p>Consistent case handling.</p>	Policy draft in progress; stakeholder consultation underway throughout October and November 2025.
<b>Age</b> (older people, younger people)	Younger students may benefit from early intervention and clearer expectations from the start of their academic journey. The chance to make mistakes and then learn from them.	No specific negative impact identified. While some consultation responses suggested age differences in familiarity with AI, we do not consider there to be sufficient evidence to assume that younger or older students are more	<p>Maintain a neutral approach that avoids assumptions about AI use or misconduct likelihood based on age.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitor age-related patterns</li> </ul>	Student Voice and Academic Policy Manager	June 2026	Student consultation from a range of age groups.	Workshop design phase initiated.

	<p>With uptake of AI higher in younger groups, there is a chance they would be more likely to accidentally commit an offence. Better definitions may help improve guidance.</p> <p>Mature students may benefit with better definitions and guidance around AI use/misuse that may be more unfamiliar.</p>	<p>likely to commit offences. However, perceptions around age-related differences in AI use have been raised and will form part of monitoring.</p>	<p>in referrals and outcomes during the pilot to identify any emerging trends</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure guidance and workshop content is accessible and relevant to students of all ages.</li> </ul>				
<p><b>Disability</b>, including mental health and non-visible disabilities</p>	<p>Educational approach may reduce anxiety and stress linked to punitive systems.</p>	<p>Risk of inaccessible materials or workshops.</p> <p>Risk of complex and inaccessible policy and procedures.</p>	<p>Assess accessibility of workshops and access for disabled/neurodiverse students.</p> <p>Flexible scheduling and remote access to workshops.</p> <p>Potentially alternative methods or extended period of time to take part if required.</p>	<p>Student Voice and Academic Policy Manager</p>	<p>June 2026</p>	<p>Positive feedback from disabled students on accessibility and access.</p> <p>Reduction in (or no increase in) penalties for disabled students.</p> <p>Disabled/neurodiverse students are</p>	<p>Workshop design phase initiated.</p>

						able to access and participate in workshops or have alternative options available to them.	
<b>Women and men</b>	Neutral – no direct gendered impact expected	None identified.	Monitor gender data in misconduct cases to ensure equity.	Student Voice and Academic Policy Manager	June 2026	No disproportionate impact by gender.	N/A
<b>Trans and non-binary people, including gender reassignment</b>	Inclusive language and supportive approach may improve trust in processes.	No negative impacts identified at this stage. However, consultation feedback suggested inclusivity measures should apply broadly across all groups, not just trans and non-binary people.	Ensure inclusive language of workshop and related materials.	Student Voice and Academic Policy Manager	June 2026	No disproportionate impact for this group.	Review of inclusive language of workshop and related materials planned.
<b>Marriage and/or civil partnership</b>	Neutral – no direct impact expected.	None identified.	No specific action required.	Student Voice and Academic Policy Manager	June 2026	N/A	N/A

<p><b>Pregnancy and/or maternity,</b> including Adoption</p>	<p>Supportive approach may reduce stress during vulnerable periods.</p>	<p>Risk of missed communications or workshop attendance due to caring responsibilities.</p>	<p>Flexible scheduling and remote access to workshops. Potentially alternative methods or extended period of time to take part if required.</p>	<p>Student Voice and Academic Policy Manager</p>	<p>June 2026</p>	<p>Pregnant students, or those who are recently parents, are able to access and participate in workshops or have alternative options available to them</p>	
<p><b>Race,</b> including ethnicity and citizenship</p>	<p>The educational and rehabilitative approach may reduce the disproportionate impact of penalties currently experienced by ethnically minoritised, global majority and international students. Replacing grade-impacting penalties with a learning-focused intervention reduces the risk of penalties worsening awarding gaps and may</p>	<p>Risk of disproportionate referrals if cultural differences are not understood.</p> <p>Risk of continued disparity in referrals or outcomes if cultural differences and systemic bias are not adequately addressed.</p> <p>Over-representation in referrals may result in workshops being visibly populated by global</p>	<p>Monitor case data by ethnicity.</p> <p>Monitor case data by ethnicity; provide cultural sensitivity training for staff; engage student networks in policy design.</p> <p>Monitor referral and outcome data by ethnicity and citizenship</p>	<p>Student Voice and Academic Policy Manager</p>	<p>June 2026</p>	<p>Reduction in overrepresentation of ethnically minoritised students in low-level academic conduct cases.</p> <p>Improved equity in outcomes</p>	<p>Initial consultation with students, including focus on diverse groups, planned.</p> <p>Not related to pilot but further work identified to support includes:</p>



	improve fairness and clarity for these groups	majority or international students, potentially leading to perceptions of referral bias.	throughout the pilot.  Engage global majority and international student networks in shaping communications and ongoing improvements.			across ethnic groups.  Positive feedback from global majority students on fairness and clarity of policy.	Deliver staff training on academic integrity with reference to unconscious bias and anti-racism  Review assessment design to reduce ambiguity and minimise opportunities for biased or inconsistent reporting.  Analyse programme- and school-level data to understand where over-referral patterns occur and address structural
--	---	--	--	--	--	---	--

							causes upstream.
<b>Religion and/or belief</b> , including those without religion and/or belief	Neutral – no direct impact expected.	Risk of scheduling conflicts with religious holidays or observances.	Flexible scheduling and remote access to workshops. Potentially alternative methods or extended period of time to take part if required.	Student Voice and Academic Policy Manager	June 2026	No complaints or missed participation due to religious observance conflicts.	Flexible delivery options under consideration.
<b>Sexual orientation</b>	Neutral – no direct impact expected.	None identified.	Ensure inclusive language and representation.	Student Voice and Academic Policy Manager	June 2026	No disproportionate impact for this group.	
<b>International Students</b>	May benefit international students, some of whom may be unfamiliar with UK academic norms.  International students may benefit from clearer expectations and educational support.  May reduce the disproportionate number of international students	Risk of continued disparity in referrals or outcomes if cultural differences and systemic bias are not adequately addressed.  Risk of students being intimidated by an in person workshop, not in their first language. May opt for a penalty instead.	Monitor case data by ethnicity and home/EU/Inten status.  Consult and pilot workshops and policies with students.	Student Voice and Academic Policy Manager	June 2026	Reduction in academic conduct referrals involving international students.  Increased understanding of academic integrity principles	International students invited to attend and feedback on workshop and policies.

	receiving penalties for low level offences.					(measured via feedback and workshop engagement)  Positive feedback from international students on clarity and fairness of policy.	
<b>Students with Caring Responsibilities</b>	Supportive approach may reduce stress during vulnerable periods.	Risk of missed communications or workshop attendance due to caring responsibilities.	Flexible scheduling and remote access to workshops. Potentially alternative methods or extended period of time to take part if required.	Student Voice and Academic Policy Manager	June 2026	Students with caring responsibilities are able to access and participate in workshops or have alternative options available to them.	

## Project manager next steps

Does this Equality Analysis require consultation of 3 or 6 weeks ([chart to help you decide](#))

### 6 weeks

Is further monitoring or engagement required? (In addition to the formal Equality Analysis consultation, e.g., with the Students' Union, Disability Services, relevant staff groups)

### Yes

**Students' Union** – to ensure consult and engage with elected VPs who have a stake in the student representation and feedback on the educational approach and accessibility of the policies and procedures.

What measure / statistic / data will you use to check if the activity has had a positive, negative, or neutral outcome?

- **Demographic breakdown of academic conduct cases** (e.g., ethnicity, disability, international status, gender).
- **Repeat offence rates** before and after implementation.
- **Workshop attendance and completion rates**, segmented by protected characteristics.
- **Student feedback surveys** post-intervention (e.g., confidence in understanding academic integrity).
- **Staff feedback** on effectiveness and workload.

When will you review this Equality Analysis? Enter date or project stage suitable to the proposal:

- 1) June 2026 (or before) at the submission of final Policy and Procedures to LTSEC for approval.
- 2) Monitor data on Assessment Offences for the 2/3 years following any changes being made.

#### Equality, Diversity, and Inclusivity Team Review

The EDI Team has reviewed this Equality Analysis and is satisfied that it is ready for formal consultation

EDI representative: Elizabeth Garnham

Date: 11.12.25

#### Faculty/Service/Departmental Sign off

I am satisfied with the results from investigation, consultation, and analysis. The progression of this EA will continue to throughout the activity/project and I will ensure that a review is undertaken following the final implementation of the proposal, to assess its actual impact. Any actions or feedback that results as a consequence of ongoing project changes will be monitored and incorporated within the stated processes. Any negative outcomes will be resolved with the appropriate stakeholders identified.

Faculty Dean/ Head of Department/ Head of Service: Jedd Billing

Faculty/ Department/ Service: Head of Learning and Teaching Transformation, Education Services

Date: 26/03/26

#### So what?

Consultation and engagement feedback is extremely important in Equality Analysis. Listening to student and staff voices and acting on their feedback mean that activities become fit for purpose for diverse student and staff communities. Complete the 'You Said, We Did' table **before and after formal consultation**, and throughout the remaining lifetime of your activity to show the impact of feedback on your activity. The Equality and Diversity Unit will be in touch to gather examples of this feedback to share with equality stakeholders. Please add additional rows to the table as required.

You said	We did
<p>Respondents agreed with revising the academic conduct policy to improve student engagement and learning after misconduct.</p>	<p>Acknowledge that revisiting the policy and subsequent procedures is timely.</p>
<p>Many respondents were in favour of <b>educational interventions</b>: They strongly support using <b>workshops or similar educational approaches</b> for first-time or low-level offences instead of purely punitive responses. The workshops are seen as beneficial in the same way that speed awareness courses raise understanding and change behaviour without punishment. Learning gained in workshops could <b>spread informally</b> among the wider student community, benefiting even those who do not attend.</p>	<p>Acknowledge that educational and workshop style interventions are timely and better align with the institutions approach to assessment and addressing sector challenges.</p>
<p><b>Concerns of reinforcing racial/international inequalities and perceptions of this.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Educational/rehabilitative workshops could unintentionally reproduce institutional inequalities.</li> <li>• Black and minoritised students are likely to be over-represented in these workshops due to existing disparities in academic offence referrals.</li> <li>• This could undermine UWE’s anti-racism strategy and reinforce a deficit narrative about certain groups.</li> <li>• High representation of global majority and international students in AO referrals could result in workshops being visibly populated by these groups.</li> </ul>	<p>Agree (and have previously acknowledged in the EIA above) that international, Black, Asian and minoritised students are currently over-represented in academic offence referrals. This over-representation reflects structural issues earlier in the process, including prior educational experience, cultural differences in academic conventions, and potential conscious or unconscious bias in detection and reporting.</p> <p><b>The workshop approach does not shape who is referred.</b> It simply replaces the penalty currently applied to those who are already being referred. Under the existing system, these students typically receive grade-impacting penalties that contribute directly to awarding gaps. The workshop model therefore offers a more equitable alternative, enabling students to learn and reflect without academic detriment and reducing the disproportionate penalty impact on already disadvantaged groups.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This may lead to perceptions of referral bias based on ethnicity or nationality, even if unintentional.</li> </ul>	<p>However, we fully agree that the broader deficit narrative and structural causes cannot be addressed through the workshop alone. To tackle the root issues, institutional work is required beyond the pilot. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• strengthening staff training on unconscious bias, academic integrity, and cultural academic conventions;</li> <li>• reviewing assessment design to reduce ambiguity and reduce the likelihood of biased or inconsistent misconduct reporting;</li> <li>• analysing programme and school-level data to identify where specific groups of students are being disproportionately referred.</li> </ul> <p>This wider structural activity is essential to reducing the number of students, particularly those from minoritised or international backgrounds, reaching the academic offence stage in the first place. <b>The workshop is designed as a fairer consequence, while the institution continues work to address the underlying causes of disparity.</b></p>
<p><b>Concerns about confidence, belonging and emotional impact</b></p> <p>If the workshop cohort is visibly dominated by Black and minoritised students, it could negatively affect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• student confidence,</li> <li>• sense of belonging,</li> <li>• experience of inclusion.</li> </ul>	<p>We understand the concern that students’ confidence or sense of belonging could be affected by workshop attendance. To address this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The workshops use neutral, case-study-based scenarios, not students’ personal cases.</li> <li>• Any personal reflection is completed privately, not shared with the group.</li> <li>• Participants will be asked to assess how they feel before and after the workshop, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ confidence,</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ sense of belonging,</li> <li>○ feelings of inclusion,</li> <li>○ perceived fairness.</li> </ul> <p>This emotional evaluation is deliberately built into the pilot so that we can fully understand not just what students <i>learn</i>, but what they feel and <i>experience</i>.</p>
<p><b>Concern that the workshops focus on ignorance of rules rather than structural barriers students face</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students may misuse AI due to time pressure, workload, or needing paid employment, not lack of understanding.</li> <li>• An educational workshop alone risks misdiagnosing the issue as individual ignorance, rather than recognising material/structural drivers.</li> </ul>	<p>While this is not a concern directly related to equality, it is agreed that there are adjacent concerns that misconduct is frequently linked to time pressure, workload, caring responsibilities, employment, and other structural or material factors, not simply ignorance of academic rules.</p> <p>For this reason, the workshop does not focus narrowly on AI or specific types of misconduct.</p> <p>Instead, the majority of the content focuses on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• managing workload and competing commitments,</li> <li>• planning and time management,</li> <li>• accessing support structures,</li> <li>• understanding pressures that lead to poor academic decisions.</li> </ul> <p>The aim is to address the context around misconduct, not just the technical definitions. We believe this responds directly to concerns about misdiagnosis and deficit framing.</p>
<p><b>Preventative Academic Integrity and AI Education including Alignment With the “Studying with AI” Course</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Academic integrity and AI education should be embedded for all undergraduate students, across all levels.</li> </ul>	<p>While this is not a concern directly related to equality, it is agreed that education for all students (not only those referred for AOs )is essential. The team working on this workshop approach and policy have already done a lot of work to address the foundations. For this reason:</p>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be co-created with learning support and delivered within the curriculum to ensure equity and consistency.</li> <li>• Concern about how the workshop relates to the new Studying with AI course.</li> <li>• Uncertainty about: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ whether academic integrity is covered in the AI module,</li> <li>○ how content will align to avoid contradictions,</li> <li>○ what the workshop actually includes.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foundational academic integrity and AI materials (both online and in-person) already exist for students at all levels.</li> <li>• The materials of the pilot workshop as well as the AI module and the existing academic integrity online module and materials were co-created with Library/Learning Support, academic staff and students.</li> <li>• Programme teams are expected to embed and promote these as part of standard curriculum practice.</li> </ul> <p>The workshop for those accused of committing offences is supplementary, not a replacement for universal academic integrity education.</p>
<p><b>Suggestion that One to One support is better than group workshops</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1:1 meetings with students accused of AOs are seen as more supportive and less discriminatory than group workshops.</li> <li>• Resource-intensive, but considered a better safeguard against unintentional bias</li> </ul>	<p>We agree that 1:1 conversations are really valuable and supportive. AO advisors and programme teams are already expected to meet with students who are accused of, or at risk of, misconduct. These conversations remain part of the wider support process and are not replaced by the workshop.</p> <p>However, it is not feasible to deliver individual educational sessions for every case given the volume of offences. The workshop model allows us to offer a consistent, structured learning opportunity alongside existing 1:1 conversations without creating unreasonable costs and workload barriers for staff.</p>
<p><b>In-person workshops may create additional stress</b></p> <p>Concerns include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost of travelling to campus on a non-teaching day.</li> </ul>	<p>We acknowledge that in-person attendance can be challenging for some students due to cost, caring responsibilities, work commitments or anxiety. For this reason, the pilot will include:</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on students with caring responsibilities.</li> <li>• Impact on students who work or volunteer on certain days.</li> <li>• Stress or anxiety from attending a session with a new group.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Testing sessions at a range of times and days, including evenings and different points in the week, to find what works best for students.</li> <li>• Testing both in-person and online workshop formats, with evaluation of accessibility and student preference.</li> <li>• An automatic option to move to a later session if the allocated time is not suitable.</li> <li>• The ability for students to contact us to rearrange if they have reasonable circumstances such as caring responsibilities, disability, neurodiversity or illness.</li> </ul> <p>It is important to emphasise that the workshop is not an optional enhancement activity, but an alternative to receiving an academic penalty. As with classes, assessments, meetings or misconduct hearings, our expectation is that students will make suitable arrangements to attend.</p> <p>That said, we recognise that attendance may be harder for some students, which is why flexibility is built into the pilot.</p>
<p><b>Institutional approach to AI</b></p> <p>The institution encourages AI use but then appears punitive when students use it “incorrectly”. A preventative, institution-wide approach would be more effective than post-hoc interventions.</p>	<p>While not a concern directly related to equality, agreed that AI guidance must be clear and consistent across the institution. However, it is important to note that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The workshops are not designed specifically around AI.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They focus on authentic authorship, workload pressures, time management, and the broader context that leads students into misconduct situations.</li> <li>• AI will be addressed within the policy and procedures, not as part of the workshop content.</li> <li>• UWE is not banning AI use. The workshops support students to understand appropriate use aligned with their assessment briefs.</li> </ul> <p>This is therefore primarily a pedagogic issue to be addressed more broadly, related to assessments and not just under an academic integrity policy or workshop.</p>
<p><b>Concerns about student engagement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students are already known to have low attendance at optional or extra sessions.</li> <li>• There is worry that students simply will not comply with attending workshops, even if beneficial.</li> </ul>	<p>Recognise that attendance at optional or extra-curricular sessions is often low across the sector. To be clear:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This workshop is not optional; it replaces a penalty.</li> <li>• If a student does not attend without a valid reason, they will receive the same penalty they would have received under the current system.</li> <li>• This maintains fairness and ensures that the educational alternative is taken seriously.</li> </ul> <p>We do not consider non attendance because of a students lack of interest to attend to be an equality issue in itself. However, circumstances that <i>do</i> relate to equity—such as disability, neurodiversity, caring responsibilities or illness—will absolutely be accommodated (see below)</p>

<p><b>Disability and Neurodiversity Access Concerns</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some students with disabilities, high anxiety, mental health conditions or neurodivergence may avoid the workshop (especially in-person formats) because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the group setting could feel exposing or unmanageable,</li> <li>○ the environment may not meet their Reasonable Adjustments.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• These students might therefore choose a penalty instead of the workshop, creating an unintended disadvantage.</li> </ul>	<p>An in-person group setting will not be accessible or appropriate for all students. To address this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both in-person and online workshop formats will be tested during the pilot to understand what works best.</li> <li>• Students will have an automatic opportunity to move their session to a different date/time if needed.</li> <li>• Students may request an alternative or rearranged format where there are reasonable circumstances, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ disability,</li> <li>○ long-term mental health conditions,</li> <li>○ high anxiety,</li> <li>○ neurodiversity,</li> <li>○ caring responsibilities,</li> <li>○ illness.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>This is intended to prevent students feeling forced into choosing a penalty.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Workshops will use neutral, non-exposing content, and no one is required to discuss their own case publicly. This will be made clear within the communication sent to invite students to the workshop as well as a statement at the start of the session.</li> <li>• Reasonable Adjustments will be applied wherever required.</li> </ul> <p>We are still finalising <i>exact eligibility criteria</i> for alternative formats in</p>

	the pilot. This will be shaped by student feedback and accessibility testing.
<p><b>Concerns About Assumptions Regarding Age and AI Use</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Skepticism about assumptions made regarding mature or younger students' familiarity with AI or likelihood of offences.</li> <li>• Suggests avoiding pre-emptive statements and simply monitoring data.</li> </ul>	<p>Feedback acknowledged and will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove or revise any assumptions about age-based AI behaviours in the EIA.</li> <li>• Include monitoring student age data throughout the pilot to identify any variation in misconduct referrals or workshop experiences, rather than predicting them in advance.</li> <li>• Ensure that policy language remains neutral and avoids stereotyping any age group.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Questioning assumptions about Gender and Sexual Orientation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EIA states no expected impact on these groups; commenter suggests removing this assumption.</li> <li>• Supports a fully open monitoring approach rather than pre-defining expectations.</li> <li>• Inclusive language guidance for trans and non-binary students should be extended more broadly.</li> </ul>	<p>Feedback acknowledged and agreed that assumptions about “no impact” should be used cautiously.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EIA will be updated to reflect an open monitoring approach for gender and sexual orientation rather than assuming no effect.</li> <li>• Inclusive language and supportive approaches will be applied consistently across all protected groups.</li> <li>• The specific example relating to trans and non-binary students will be broadened to reflect inclusive practice for everyone.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Parenting and Caring Responsibilities</b></p>	<p>Agreed that “parenting” should be included explicitly to provide clarity and avoid ambiguity. This will be added to the EIA and associated documents.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests explicitly naming parenting as part of pregnancy/maternity/adoption or caring responsibilities sections.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Monitoring and Evaluation of Workshop Effectiveness</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests clearer information on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ how outcomes will be measured,</li> <li>○ how feedback will be gathered,</li> <li>○ who will design the evaluation tools.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>While some of this is not strictly related to equality, it is agreed that clear, robust evaluation is essential for the success of this pilot. The evaluation framework has been deliberately designed to capture academic, emotional, practical and equality related outcomes. Project team have been undertaking effective evaluation training with resources and training from TASO and QAA. The pilot will be evaluated in line with these principles and reported to relevant committees.</p> <p>The evaluation will examine a wide range of factors, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes in student awareness and understanding of academic integrity and authorship.</li> <li>• Emotional impact, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ sense of belonging,</li> <li>○ confidence,</li> <li>○ perceived fairness,</li> <li>○ feelings during and after the workshop.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Student re-offending patterns over time:</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The primary long-term measure of success will be whether repeat offences drop compared with current penalty-based approaches.</li> <li>• Equality and accessibility impacts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Whether any groups are disproportionately represented or negatively affected.</li> <li>○ Whether in-person vs. online formats produce different accessibility outcomes.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Practical feasibility: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How manageable the workshops are to run.</li> <li>○ Who delivers them, how consistently, and with what resource implications.</li> <li>○ Student and staff feedback on deliverability.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Student perspectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Whether students feel they learnt something useful,</li> <li>○ whether the workshop felt supportive,</li> <li>○ and suggestions for improvement.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>How feedback will be gathered</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students will complete pre- and post-workshop questionnaires, focused on both knowledge and emotional experience.</li> <li>• There will be opportunities for qualitative written responses.</li> <li>• The pilot may incorporate follow-up surveys, depending on feasibility (design still in progress).</li> <li>• Staff delivering workshops will also contribute reflective feedback.</li> </ul> <p>Who is designing the evaluation tools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation instruments are being developed collaboratively by staff from:</li> </ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ academic faculties,</li><li>○ Library &amp; Learning Support,</li><li>○ professional services,</li><li>○ and student engagement teams,</li><li>○ alongside student input.</li></ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Importantly, staff leading this work are currently undertaking additional specialist training in effective evaluation, with this pilot serving as a key use case for applying that training.</li></ul>
--	--

**Please forward an electronic copy to the EDI Team by emailing [edi@uwe.ac.uk](mailto:edi@uwe.ac.uk)**

**The original signed hard copy and/or electronic copy should be kept with your team for actions, review, and progression of Freedom of Information requests**