

Higher Education Academic Misconduct Policy 2021

APPROVED BY (HE PM Meeting, HE Academic Board and LCC Policy Panel) in September 2021

Applies to:		
Harrogate College		
Keighley College		
Leeds City College		
Leeds Conservatoire		
White Rose Academies Trust		
University Centre	Х	

CHANGE CONTROL

Version:	3	
Approved by:	HE PM Meeting HE Academic Board LCC Policy Panel	
Date approved:	September 2021	
Name of author:	Higher Education Registry	
Name of responsible committee:	Higher Education	
Related policies: (list)	Academic Misconduct Process Student Guide to Avoiding Academic Misconduct Turnitin Guide Assessment and Moderation Handbook Academic Appeals Policy Academic Appeals Process Foundation Degree Academic Regulations	
	Date:	September 2021
	Assessment type	
Equality impact assessment completed	□ Full	
	□ Part	
	□ x Not required	
Policy will be communicated via:		
Next review date:	September 2023	

Contents

1.	POLICY STATEMENT	4
2.	POLICY OBJECTIVES	4
3.	OTHER GUIDANCE ON WRITING AND FORMATTING	3
1	DE\/IE\W	



1. POLICY STATEMENT

University Centre Leeds is responsible for the academic standards and quality of the programmes it designs and delivers and is therefore accountable for:

- Designing, approving, monitoring and reviewing the assessment strategies for modules and awards wherever the learning takes place, ensuring that opportunities for plagiarism are minimised through use of a variety of assessment methods;
- Ensuring that students are effectively supported and prepared for assessment, including the development of academic integrity;
- The consistent implementation of rigorous assessment practices, which ensure that the
 academic/professional standard for each award element is set and maintained at the
 appropriate level, and that student performance is properly judged against this;
- Evaluating how academic standards are maintained through assessment practice that also encourages effective learning and a high-quality learning experience.
- Ensuring that External Examiner feedback is utilised effectively to inform future practice and enhancements to processes;

2. POLICY AIMS/OBJECTIVES

This policy applies to all University Centre Leeds Higher Education programmes, and makes clear the expectation regarding conduct in summative assessment, relating specifically to the various forms of Academic Misconduct defined within this policy. In short it refers to any attempt made by a student to gain an unfair advantage, whether intentional or unintentional, in summative assessments.

Its purpose is to ensure that students are acting with personal integrity, self-discipline and respect for others in their academic conduct and effectively developing and utilising academic skills commensurate with their level of study. The Academic Misconduct policy and its associated procedures are fully informed by the revised QAA Quality Code, in particular Advice and Guidance relating to Assessment, and should be read in conjunction with the University Centre Leeds Foundation Degree Academic Regulations.

3. DETAILS OF THE SUBJECT MATTER

Policy	Higher Education Academic Misconduct Policy	Quality Code Ref
Definitions	parametry and a construction of the contract o	Expectations for Quality 1 Core Practices 1 Guiding Principles 2, 9,

Re-use of Material - Work submitted for assessment must be a new, original piece of work produced specifically for the assignment. Any re-use or re-purposing of a student's own material must be clearly identified as such and show how ideas or concepts have been developed in the new work.

Academic Misconduct - Academic misconduct encompasses all kinds of academic dishonesty, whether deliberate or unintentional, which infringes the integrity of University Centre Leeds assessment procedures. The following are examples of academic misconduct:

Plagiarism - a form of cheating which involves presenting another person's ideas or expressions without acknowledging the source. This includes internet sources. Any work submitted for assessment must, unless collaborative work has been specifically permitted in the assignment guidelines, be the result of a permitted collaboration, any material, from whatever source, must be clearly acknowledged.

Collusion – a form of cheating which could relate to unauthorised collaboration with others or presenting work as their own which has been produced by another student. This includes the purchasing of work from a third party.

Fabrication/Falsification – This includes the tampering of official documentation, or fabrication of data or other such content. This includes the content of work submitted for assessment and any records or documentation associated with academic progress such as entry statements or qualifications, false claims for exemption or mitigation, or misrepresentation of a word count or contribution to a group assessment.

Research Misconduct - All research which contributes to the assessment of taught courses must be conducted in an ethical and responsible manner. This includes requirements to secure ethical approval prior to the commencement of primary research, the conduct of the research, the relationship and dealings with participants and proper handling of data.

Impersonation - Any student found to be assuming the identity of a third party, or where a student is impersonated by another person, in order to gain or enable access or advantage will be deemed guilty of impersonation.

Cheating in Examinations - Any breach of the examination procedure which compromises the integrity of the assessment will be regarded as academic misconduct, regardless of whether any advantage was gained or there was any intention to do so. These principles apply equally to formal examinations and to all laboratory and class tests conducted under exam conditions.

		Т
Support for Students	All students will be provided with support to help them to develop appropriate academic skills. This includes, but is not limited to, the following: Taught sessions within the Professional Development module; Workshop sessions provided by Library staff; A range of materials provided via the VLE.	Assessment Expectations for Quality 1 Core Practices 1 Guiding Principles 9
Staff development and training	All suspected cases of Academic Misconduct will be reported to HEDO who will then check the course of action to be taken. HEDO will maintain a record of all instances of proven academic misconduct. University Centre Leeds requires that all staff involved in the supporting, teaching and assessing of students are competent to undertake their roles and responsibilities. Assessors will be appropriately qualified, trained and meet the requirements of the awarding body and the revised Quality Assurance Quality Code.	
Equality and Diversity Statement	This policy will be implemented in accordance with the Luminate Policy on Valuing Diversity and with consideration of assessment guidelines set out by awarding bodies and where appropriate, the revised Quality Code.	Assessment Expectations for Quality 1 Core Practices 1 Guiding Principles 4
Regulatory requirements of awarding and professional bodies	University Centre Leeds requires that all staff are aware of and operate under the specific regulatory requirements of its awarding bodies and, where appropriate, professional bodies. University Centre Leeds has developed appropriate internal policies and procedures that cover major requirements.	
Monitoring and Review	University Centre Leeds will regularly monitor and review this policy and its associated procedures to assess the effectiveness of its implementation and outcomes.	Monitoring and Evaluation EfS Common Practice
Appeals	Appeals against decisions should made in accordance with the Academic Appeals procedure, within 14 calendar days from the date of the Academic Misconduct Panel.	Concerns, Complaints and Appeals Core Practice Guiding Principles All
Related Documentation	Academic Misconduct Process Student Guide to Avoiding Academic Misconduct Turnitin Guide Assessment and Moderation Handbook Academic Appeals Policy Academic Appeals Process Foundation Degree Academic Regulations	

4. REVIEW

Owner: Higher Education Last review: September 2021 Next Review: September 2023