

# **UCEM Code of Practice Chapter**

---

## Academic Misconduct Policy

Version: 2.00  
Author: Wendy Finlay  
Date: 13/12/2016

# UCEM Code of Practice Chapter

## Table of Contents

1.	<i>Statement on Academic Misconduct</i> .....	1
2.	<i>Academic misconduct in assessed coursework (including dissertations and projects) includes but it not limited to:</i> .....	1
3.	<i>Academic Misconduct in Examinations includes but is not limited to:</i> .....	2
4.	<i>Identification of suspected academic misconduct</i> .....	2
5.	<i>A Student's Right to Reply</i> .....	3
6.	<i>Penalties</i> .....	3
7.	<i>Recording of Academic Misconduct</i> .....	3
8.	<i>Appeals</i> .....	4
9.	<i>Guidance with relation to academic misconduct</i> .....	4
10.	<i>Review</i> .....	4

# UCEM Code of Practice Chapter

## 1. Statement on Academic Misconduct

Good academic practice and academic integrity are central to the values promoted by UCEM. It is important that all UCEM students are assessed on their own ability and that no student is allowed to gain an unfair advantage over others, or to diminish the quality or academic standing of a UCEM award or that of UCEM's validating partners.

UCEM defines academic integrity as an honest, transparent and responsible approach to studying. UCEM expects that all students ensure that they understand what academic misconduct is and how to avoid it, and that the ideas or input of others in work presented for assessment is acknowledged, even if it has been included with their consent. Approaching studying with academic integrity will prevent students from being investigated for suspected academic misconduct.

UCEM defines academic misconduct as cheating, attempts to cheat, plagiarism, collusion and any other attempts to gain an unfair advantage in assessments. Assessments include, but are not limited to, coursework, examinations, projects, and dissertations. Academic Misconduct is a disciplinary offence under the Terms and Conditions of Registration, and is punishable by a range of sanctions.

## 2. Academic misconduct in assessed coursework (including dissertations and projects) includes but it not limited to:

- 2.1 Plagiarism: Plagiarism is defined as the fraudulent misrepresentation of the work of others – including ideas, arguments, words, diagrams, images and data – as one's own. This applies whatever the source, e.g. UCEM study material, published books or documents, the Internet, verbal communications or the work of another student or company.
- 2.2 Self-plagiarism is defined as when parts of a previous piece of work or assessment for which academic credit has already been awarded at UCEM or another institution are used in a new assessment, without citing the original content.
- 2.3 Collusion: Where two or more students submit substantial work in individual assignments each representing it as their own work, or knowingly allowing another student to copy one's own work.
- 2.4 Falsifying data or evidence.
- 2.5 Providing assistance to another student in an act of plagiarism or falsification.
- 2.6 Taking a copy of another student's work without his or her permission (whether or not this work is subsequently plagiarised).

## UCEM Code of Practice Chapter

### **3. Academic Misconduct in Examinations includes but is not limited to:**

- 3.1 Improperly aiding or attempting to aid another candidate or obtaining or attempting to obtain such aid.
- 3.2 Possession in the examination room of any unauthorised materials. This includes permitted materials containing unauthorised or excessive annotation, and material held on electronic devices.
- 3.3 Taking into the examination hall or possessing in the examination hall any device which permits communication with others or receipt of communication from others.
- 3.4 Consulting or attempting to consult any books, notes or material including those held electronically during the period of examination, this includes in the examination hall, and other areas candidates have access to, such as the toilets.
- 3.5 Consulting any materials or persons outside the examination room during periods of absence while the examination is in progress.
- 3.6 Copying or attempting to copy another student's work during the examination.
- 3.7 Attempting to influence a script marker or other College official (e.g. by writing additional notes on the examination script).
- 3.8 Other misconduct includes behaviour likely to disturb or distract other candidates during the examination.
- 3.9 Making a false declaration to obtain special examination arrangements.
- 3.10 Impersonating or attempting to impersonate another candidate during the examination.

### **4. Identification of suspected academic misconduct**

Poor academic practice or suspected academic misconduct in coursework may be identified by the marking tutor, or if the coursework has been checked through text-matching software. This information is passed by the Coursework Team to the Programme Leader, who will decide if there is sufficient evidence to investigate further. If there is no case to answer the coursework is returned to the student, and no record is placed on file.

If a candidate is suspected of academic misconduct immediately prior to the start of an examination, or during the examination, the Chief Invigilator will remove any evidence of written material that has been found, and will put a mark in the student's script referencing the point and time at which material was confiscated. The candidate will be permitted to complete the examination. The Chief Invigilator will provide details of the incident in the invigilator's report.

## UCEM Code of Practice Chapter

### 5. A Student's Right to Reply

If it is suspected that a student's work shows evidence of poor academic practice or academic misconduct, the student will be provided with the opportunity of a 'right to reply'. This will require the student to prepare a written statement of no more than 1500 words. Cases of poor academic practice will be considered by the Academic Reviewer, and may be categorised as a minor academic misconduct offence (where the intention to deceive is not relevant; see Appendix A). Cases of suspected academic misconduct may be considered by the Academic Reviewer, or, depending on the nature of the academic misconduct, the case may be referred to the UCEM Academic Misconduct Committee, or if the student is on a programme validated by the University of Reading to the University of Reading's designated staff member.

### 6. Penalties

A proven case of academic misconduct is treated as a disciplinary matter. The Academic Reviewer or Academic Misconduct Committee considers each case on an individual basis with reference to the extent and significance of the alleged misconduct; the intention to deceive and obtain academic advantage that is demonstrated; and the persistence in engaging in misconduct following previous sanctions imposed.

The severity of each may be considered as high, substantial, moderate, low or none, however, these are indicative only and serve only to guide the penalty or sanction to be imposed.

The Academic Reviewer may only impose a penalty where academic misconduct is deemed to be minor, all other cases must be referred to the UCEM Academic Misconduct Committee. The severity of the penalty will be dependent upon the merits of the case, which may include, but is not limited to:

- 6.1 No academic misconduct has occurred.
- 6.2 A deduction of marks in relation to the piece of assessed work (this may be against a particular question or for the whole piece of work).
- 6.3 Failure in the Module, with a right to retake.
- 6.4 Failure in the Module, with no right to retake (requires approval by the Academic Board).
- 6.5 Expulsion from UCEM (requires approval by the Academic Board).

Note: Appendix A provides more information on the scale of offences and the penalties which may be applied.

### 7. Recording of Academic Misconduct

If it is deemed that a student has committed academic misconduct, this will be recorded on the students' academic record for that piece of assessment. This information will be made available to the Board of Examiners.

# UCEM Code of Practice Chapter

## 8. Appeals

The student has the right to Appeal on a decision made with relation to academic misconduct. Details of the procedure and grounds for appeal are set out in the UCEM Appeals Guidance Notes, which are published on the VLE.

## 9. Guidance with relation to academic misconduct

UCEM will ensure that all students are provided with information on how to avoid academic misconduct, including how to reference work correctly.

All students should therefore refer to the following guidance documents:

- UCEM Student Handbook, which is published on the VLE;
- The Induction Module on the Virtual Learning Environment (VLE). All new students are required to complete the section 'Writing in your Own Words';
- The UCEM Guide to Harvard Referencing, which is published on the VLE.

In addition, students have access to the text matching software 'Turnitin' on the VLE, to use as a formative tool prior to the submission of coursework.

## 10. Review

This policy is subject to review as part of the UCEM Code of Practice every two years.

# UCEM Code of Practice Chapter

## Appendix A

Scale of offences for plagiarism cases.

	Extent and Significance		Intent To Deceive		Persistence of Misconduct	PENALTY
<b>A: GROSS***</b> Programme Level Sanction	<p><b>HIGH</b></p> <p>Extensive inclusion of high volumes of source material without any citation or attribution.</p> <p>This could be indicated by an extremely high (90-100%) Turnitin Similarity Index, but academic judgement will be applied.</p>	<b>AND / OR</b>	<p><b>HIGH</b></p> <p>Blatant, systematic and intentional misrepresentation / misuse of source information or data apparent.</p>	<b>AND / OR</b>	<p><b>HIGH</b></p> <p>Repeated acts of misconduct demonstrating a refusal to learn from previous advice or sanctions.</p>	<p><b>A1:</b> UCEM student removed from programme without eligibility for lesser award;</p> <p><b>A2:</b> UCEM student removed from programme but eligible for lesser award;</p> <p><b>A3:</b> UoR student referred to the University with recommendation for removal from programme [as A1 or A2].</p>
<b>B: MAJOR</b> Stage Level Sanction	<p><b>HIGH</b></p> <p>Inclusion of significant volumes of source material without citation or attribution.</p> <p>This could be indicated by a very high (80-90%) Turnitin Similarity Index, but academic judgement will be applied.</p>	<b>AND / OR</b>	<p><b>HIGH</b></p> <p>Systematic and intentional misrepresentation / misuse of source data or information apparent.</p>	<b>AND / OR</b>	<p><b>SUBSTANTIAL</b></p> <p>Frequent acts of misconduct demonstrating an inability to learn from previous advice or sanctions.</p>	<p><b>B1:</b> UCEM student failed in year of programme **;</p> <p><b>B2:</b> UCEM student failed in relevant modules;</p> <p><b>B3:</b> UoR student referred to the University with recommendation for failure of year **as B1];</p> <p><b>B4:</b> UoR student referred to the University with recommendation for failure in relevant modules and classification capped at a pass [as B2].</p>

## UCEM Code of Practice Chapter

	Level and Significance		Intent To Deceive		Persistence of Misconduct	PENALTY
<b>C: SIGNIFICANT Module Level Sanction</b>	<p><b>SUBSTANTIAL</b></p> <p>Inclusion of significant volumes of source material without citation or attribution.</p> <p>This could be indicated by a high (55-80%) Turnitin Similarity Index, but academic judgement will be applied.</p>	<b>AND / OR</b>	<p><b>SUBSTANTIAL</b></p> <p>The intentional misrepresentation / misuse of source data or information apparent.</p>	<b>AND / OR</b>	<p><b>MODERATE</b></p> <p>Intermittent acts of misconduct demonstrating a failure to learn from previous advice or sanctions.</p>	<p><b>C1:</b> UCEM student failed in specified modules / assessments extending beyond those in which misconduct took place**;</p> <p><b>C2:</b> UCEM student failed in module in which misconduct took place**;</p> <p><b>C3:</b> UCEM/UoR student has mark reduced to zero for assessment in which misconduct took place**;</p> <p><b>C4:</b> UoR student referred by the Academic Reviewer to the University with recommendation for failure in specified modules [as C1 or C2] or significant loss of marks in part of the assessment.</p>
<b>D: MINOR Assessment Level Sanction</b>	<p><b>MODERATE</b></p> <p>Inclusion of source material without proper citation or attribution.</p> <p>This could be indicated by a significant (25-55%) overall Turnitin Similarity Index, or where one source is more than 10% similarity, but academic judgement will be applied.</p>	<b>AND / OR</b>	<p><b>MODERATE</b></p> <p>The unintentional misrepresentation / misuse of source data or information apparent.</p>	<b>AND / OR</b>	<p><b>LOW</b></p> <p>One-off act of misconduct demonstrating a failure to understand and apply proper referencing practice.</p>	<p><b>D1:</b> UCEM/UoR student has mark reduced to zero for specific question(s) in which misconduct took place**;</p> <p><b>D2:</b> UCEM/UoR student has mark reduced (normally by 50%) for assessment in which misconduct took place**;</p> <p><b>D3:</b> UCEM/UoR student has mark reduced (normally by 50%) for specific question(s) in which misconduct took place**;</p> <p><b>D4:</b> UCEM/UoR student is admonished for Poor Academic Practice (PAP).</p>

\*\* A decision can include whether the student has the right to resit the relevant piece of assessment, module or part of the programme.

\*\*\* A deliberate attempt to subvert academic integrity (for example, encouraging or supporting other students to engage in academic misconduct, or procuring others to do so), will normally result in categorisation as gross misconduct, receiving the highest order penalty of expulsion from UCEM, even if there has been no prior history of academic misconduct.

## UCEM Code of Practice Chapter

### Appendix B Benchmarked Policies

University of Birmingham

<http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/university/aprc-13/aprc130503.pdf>

University of Leicester

<http://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/sas2/quality/committees/academic-policy-committee/implementation/student-discipline-regulations/student-misconduct>

University of Nottingham

<http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/academic-services/qualitymanual/assessment/academic-misconduct.aspx>

University of Reading

<http://www.reading.ac.uk/internal/exams/Policies/exa-misconduct.aspx>

University of York

[http://www.york.ac.uk/admin/hr/resources/policy/academic\\_misconduct.htm](http://www.york.ac.uk/admin/hr/resources/policy/academic_misconduct.htm)

Signed.....



Ashley Wheaton  
Chair of the Academic Board

Date.....

30/11/2017