



HE ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

- 1. General**
- 2. Scope**
- 3. Principles**
- 4. Definition of Academic Misconduct**
- 5. Process**
- 6. Penalties**
- 7. Appeals Procedure**

1 General

1.1 Ada College has a duty to maintain academic standards by ensuring the integrity of all aspects of the assessment process and is confirming that the regulations and policies governing the assessment of HE programmes at the College are fully and fairly implemented. To this end, Ada will act against any student who contravenes these regulations and policies, whether inadvertently or through negligence or deliberate intent, and who, by so doing, could gain unfair advantage over other students. This aligns with the [Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education's \(QAA\) Quality Code Advice and Guidance for assessment](#) that institutions ensure that “students do not obtain credit or awards through any form of unacceptable academic practice relating to assessment.”

1.2 The College also recognises its responsibility stated in the Quality Code advice and guidance to “implement effective measures to encourage students to develop and internalise academic values and good academic practice.”

1.3 Academic misconduct is defined as any improper activity or behaviour by a student which may give that student, or another student, an unpermitted academic advantage in a summative assessment. In investigating and dealing with cases of suspected misconduct, the college will follow the approved policy and processes

2 Scope

2.1 This policy applies to all students enrolled on HE programmes at the Ada College . It covers academic misconduct in any form of assessment including written examinations, assessed coursework (in whatever form the coursework might take) and oral/practical assessments.

2.2 There is no time limit beyond which academic misconduct will not be investigated. Suspected academic misconduct, whether discovered before or after graduation, will be investigated and dealt with in accordance with this policy. Where academic misconduct is proven after work has been formally assessed, this may lead to the withdrawal of credit previously ratified by Exam Board or withdrawal of a conferred award.

2.3 In addition to consideration under this policy, all proven offences of academic misconduct by students on courses leading to professional registration will be referred to the relevant Dean of School to consider whether further action should be taken under the Fitness to Practise Procedure.

3 Principles

3.1 Ada College bases its Policy on the expectations and core practices of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (2018) and the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) Good Practice Framework for Disciplinary Procedures (2018).

3.2 Academic integrity is the basis for ethical decision-making and behaviour in an academic context. This is reflected in norms of acceptable academic practice and is informed by the values of honesty, trust, responsibility, fairness, respect and courage.

3.3 Ada endeavours to ensure that all policies, procedures and guidance relevant to academic integrity are clear, accessible and actively promoted

3.4 Ada will work with students to strive towards early achievement of academic integrity. We recognise that students who are new to higher education will need some time to achieve this goal. For these early stages this policy reflects the intention to address poor academic practice through pedagogical, formative approaches.

3.5 Ada will support students so that they can take responsibility in the process of familiarisation with the rules governing assessment including conduct in examinations and the correct academic conventions for referencing and acknowledging the work of others.

3.6 Ultimately, it is the student's responsibility to avoid infringements of regulations and policies and to ensure that they have behaved with academic integrity. Ignorance of this policy cannot be used to excuse infringements.

3.7 Ada will act on all identified infringements of this policy whether inadvertently or through negligence or deliberate intent.

3.8 Ada expects that all work submitted for assessment by students is the student's own work, without falsification of any kind.

3.9 Allegations of academic misconduct will be treated in the strictest confidence. No student will be recorded, or referred to, as having committed an academic misconduct offence until the full process (as detailed in section 5) has been completed and the allegation proven.

4 Definition of Academic Misconduct

4.1 Ada employs the OIA definition of academic misconduct as provided in its good practice framework for disciplinary procedures: "Any action by a student which gives or has the potential to give an unfair advantage in an examination or assessment, or might assist someone else to gain an unfair advantage, or any activity likely to undermine the integrity essential to scholarship and research."

4.2 Academic misconduct typically falls under one of the following headings:

- Plagiarism
- Collusion
- Fabrication
- Cheating
- Failure to have ethical approval

Plagiarism

4.3 Plagiarism is defined as the presentation of another person's work or ideas as the student's own, without proper acknowledgement. This could be in direct copy or close paraphrase.

4.4 In the context of the policy, another person's work or ideas includes text, images (graphics, illustrations or photographs), designs, computer code, diagrams, data and formulae or any other representation of ideas (written, visual or oral) in print, electronic or other media, and may be from any published or unpublished source including books, journals, the internet, course handouts or another student's work.

4.5 Plagiarism can occur in examinations and/or coursework assessment which may take a variety of forms including, but not limited to, essays, reports, presentations, dissertations and projects.

4.6 The reproduction of a student's own previously submitted work, without acknowledgement, is regarded as self-plagiarism and will be treated in the same way as any other form of plagiarism.

Due Acknowledgement

4.7 It is not sufficient merely to list a source in an appended bibliography, or in the body of an assignment to express a general indebtedness. To avoid plagiarism, all sources must be specifically, precisely and accurately referenced in accordance with good academic practice.

4.8 When a source is directly quoted word-for-word, the passage quoted should be placed within quotation marks or indented and the source accurately referenced, in parenthesis, in a footnote, or in an endnote, according to a recognised system. There must be no ambiguity about where the quotation ends or begins.

4.9 The source of any data cited (e.g. figures, tables, charts) should be made explicit. When ideas, or an argument, are reproduced from a source in a general or paraphrased way, the source must be acknowledged. When submitted work is dependent upon a lecture or tutorial for its argument, this fact must be acknowledged.

4.10 In the case of group work submitted for assessment, the relevant module information will make clear whether the submission is collective or individual. In the case of a collective submission, indebtedness to sources must be acknowledged in the usual way, but it is not necessary for work to be attributed to individual members of the group. In the case of individual submissions resulting from group or collaborative work, it is the responsibility of each individual student to make sure that the submission is his or her own work. Acknowledgement should be made to the contribution of other members of the group when this is drawn upon.

Collusion

4.11 Collusion is the unauthorised co-operation between at least two people, normally with the intent to deceive. It can take the following forms:

- the conspiring by two or more students to produce a piece of work together with the intention that at least one passes it off as their own work.
- the willing provision of previously assessed work or examination questions and/or answers by one student to another student where it should be evident to the student providing the work that by so doing an advantage could be gained by the other student.
- In this case both students are guilty of collusion.

Fabrication

4.12 Fabrication is the invention, alteration or falsification of data and evidence that contributes towards assessment. This includes data such as: the origin and results of questionnaires; research data; certificated or portfolio evidence in claims for the recognition of prior learning; and entries and signatures in records of assessment of practice in the workplace.

Cheating

4.13 Cheating includes any behaviour which the student would reasonably know would interfere with the fair operation of the assessment process and could gain unfair advantage, such as:

- any transgression of the College examination room rules, as set out in the Examination's procedures.
- obtaining or seeking to obtain access to examination papers prior to an examination;
- behaviour in a manner likely to prejudice the chances of another student in an assessment;
- being party to an arrangement whereby a person other than the student would fraudulently represent them at an assessment;
- submitting a fraudulent claim for extenuating circumstances.

5 Process

5.1 All potential instances of poor academic practice or academic misconduct will require action.

5.2 In addition to the situations, where the suspected infringement is discovered by the Module Lead (for example in work submitted for a module they teach), all suspected infringements must be reported to the Module Lead for consideration before any allegation of academic misconduct is put to the student.

5.3 It is the responsibility of the person identifying the suspected infringement to clearly set out the nature of their suspicions and provide supporting evidence showing how and where the suspected infringement has taken place.

5.4 Where a marker suspects an infringement, they will, if appropriate, note on the student's work the nature of the alleged offence and report their concerns to the Course Leader

5.5 Where an invigilator suspects a student of infringing examination room rules or any other requirements relating to the conduct of the examination, they shall take the appropriate action as detailed in the Examinations' Procedures. A report of the incident should be provided to the Module Lead.

5.6 It is important for Module Leads to be aware that in some instances, particularly in the early stages of a programme, it will not always be appropriate to proceed to a formal allegation. In particular, if the assessed work, or student's conduct, can be considered as poor academic practice then it should not normally be considered as a potential case of academic misconduct.

5.7 If the Module Lead decided that there is sufficient evidence that an offence may have been committed, they should:

a) complete the Allegation of Academic Misconduct form (See Annex 1) with the following information:

- the student's name, ID number, level of study and programme details;
- module details, including information about the weighting of the component of assessment;
- the formal allegation to be put to the student;
- a summary of the alleged offence;

b) The completed *Allegation of Academic Misconduct* form and supporting documentation should be submitted to the Head of Degree Programmes (HoDP).

c) Upon receipt of the *Allegation of Academic Misconduct* form and supporting documentation from the Module Lead, HoDP will decide one of the following :

1. no further action should be taken because there is no evidence of academic misconduct.
2. the student should be given an informal warning
3. this is a serious offence which should proceed to a College Hearing.

5.8 If the HoDP decides that there is sufficient evidence that an offence may have been committed, they shall proceed to a formal allegation, by writing to the student concerned to:

- i. put the allegation as defined by the Course Leader;
- ii. request confirmation of whether the student also wishes to attend a hearing to respond in person;
- iii. request a reply within ten working days of the date on which the letter is sent;
- iv. enclose a copy of this policy;
- v. enclose copies of any evidence or reports.

5.9 Where possible, every effort should be made to resolve the matter before the meeting of the Exam Board.

5.10 If no written reply to the allegation is received from the student within ten working days of the date on which the letter is sent, this is deemed to be acceptance of the allegation. In such cases, HoDP will refer the case to the Academic Misconduct Panel for consideration.

5.11 If the student replies accepting the allegation and does not wish to also respond in person, HoDP will still refer the case to the Academic Misconduct Panel for consideration

5.12 If the student replies denying the allegation, HoDP shall invite the student to attend a hearing before the Academic Misconduct Panel. The student should be given at least five working days' notice of the meeting.

Academic Misconduct Panel

5.13 The Academic Misconduct Panel (the Panel) shall comprise:

- i. Dean
- ii. Head of Degree Programmes
- iii. Two members of academic staff, including the Module lead putting the allegation

5.14 The decision of the Panel as to whether an offence has been committed is final and will be reported to the student and the Exam Board.

5.15 In determining the recommended penalty, the Panel will consider:

- the severity of the offence;
- the intent;
- whether it is a first or subsequent offence;
- the academic stage of the student;
- any mitigation;
- the proportionality of the penalty to the offence.

6 Penalties

6.1 The College has based its penalties for academic misconduct on the work undertaken by plagiarismadvice.org and the *AMBeR* project.

6.2 The amount and extent of penalties, based on the *AMBeR* project are listed in Annex 2.

7 Appeals Procedure

Students may appeal against the verdict of academic misconduct and/or the penalty imposed under the provisions of the Academic Appeals Procedure. This procedure is available on the College website.

Policy Name:
Author/Owner: Dean/ head of Degree Programmes
Date of Last Revision : October 2021
Next Review Date: October 2022

Annex 1 :

Academic Misconduct Report Form

This form should be read and used in conjunction with the College's Academic Misconduct Procedure.

How to use the form :

Part A

Teaching staff who are marking summative assessments or invigilating examinations should use Part A of the form to record details of suspected academic misconduct and report these to the Head of Degree Programmes.

Part B

The Head of Degree Programmes should use the information in Part A to determine whether there was an intent to deceive, and whether the suspected case is minor or serious having regard to the guidance in the Academic Misconduct Procedure

This decision should be recorded in Part B.

Where the Head of Degree Programmes decides to proceed to a hearing, Parts A and B should be sent to the student to help them understand the reasons for the hearing and to prepare for it.

Part C

Parts C1 and C2 of the form record the outcome of the Academic Misconduct hearing and the penalty applied, respectively.

After the hearing, all parts of the form will be sent to the student and the Board of Examiners to convey the outcome of the hearing.

Completed forms for cases which result in an admission of academic misconduct by the student, or a finding by an academic misconduct hearing that misconduct has occurred, will be kept on the student's file.

Part A: details of the suspected academic misconduct

Student name		Student ID	
Academic year		Cohort No.	
Programme title		Programme level	
Module title		Credit value	
Assessment component		Component weighting %	
Name of member of staff marking the assessment			
Type of academic misconduct suspected (please place an x in the relevant box)			
Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/>	Theft of work	<input type="checkbox"/>
Collusion	<input type="checkbox"/>	Bribery and blackmail	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fabrication of data	<input type="checkbox"/>	False declarations	<input type="checkbox"/>
Duplication	<input type="checkbox"/>	Misconduct in examination	<input type="checkbox"/>
Commissioning	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other – please specify	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Details of suspected academic misconduct. Please provide as much evidence as possible, appended to the form if necessary, and <u>bear in mind that this form may be seen by the student at the next stage of the procedure.</u></p>			

Please send the completed Part A to the Head of Degree Programmes, who will use it to decide how to proceed.

Part B: Decision to give an informal warning or proceed to a hearing

This part of the form should be completed by the Head of Degree Programmes.

Based on the information in Part A, and according to the College’s Academic Misconduct Procedure, I have decided that...	
...no further action should be taken because there is no evidence of academic misconduct.	
...the student should be given an informal warning.	
...this is a serious offence which should proceed to a College Hearing.	
Name of the Head of Degree Programmes	
Where the decision is not to take any further action, please provide an explanation in the box beneath. This may be used to provide feedback to the member of staff who raised the case.	

Please send the completed Parts A and B to Academic Services (apprenticeship@ada.ac.uk)

Part C1: Outcome of the Hearing

This part of the form should be completed by the member of staff supporting the hearing. The standard of proof required under this procedure is the balance of probabilities. This means that the panel has to be satisfied that, on the evidence available, academic misconduct was more likely to have occurred than not to have occurred.

In reaching its decision on whether academic misconduct has occurred, the panel should disregard the student’s previous record of academic misconduct.

College Hearing		
Date and time of the Hearing		
Membership of the panel (Dean, Head of Degree Programmes, Head of Apprenticeship programme, Module lead)		
Name of member of staff supporting the hearing		
Did the student attend the hearing?	Yes	
	No	
Summary of discussion at the hearing, including any mitigating circumstances.		
Does the student accept they have committed academic misconduct?	Yes	
	No	
Where the student has accepted academic misconduct, is it confined to this work or has misconduct also been committed in other work he or she has submitted for summative assessment? Please give details.		
Where the student does not accept academic misconduct, does the panel find that, on the basis of the evidence and on the balance of probabilities, that academic misconduct is proven or not proven?	Proven	
	Not proven	
Please give further details		

Part C2: Penalty applied

This part of the form should be used only where the student accepts they have committed academic misconduct or where the panel determines that academic misconduct has occurred.

In determining the penalty to be applied, the panel for the hearing should have regard to the guidance in the Academic Misconduct Procedure.

The panel should consider whether the student has had previous proven academic misconduct when considering the penalty within the minor or serious band.

Based on the information and findings in part C2, and having regard to the guidance in the Academic Misconduct Procedure, the panel recommends that the following penalty or penalties be applied:

Informal warning (only if first offence and minor)	
Formal penalty (please give details)	
Please give reasons for the panel's decision:	

Please send the completed form to the student within five working days of the hearing.

The form will be submitted to the Board of Examiners by the Head of Degree Programmes.

Plagiarism Reference Tariff

*This tariff is based on a national research consultation exercise conducted on behalf of plagiarism**advice**.org by Peter Tennant and Gill Rowell.*

*The full report will be available for download from plagiarism**advice**.org from August 2010.*

AMBeR
PROJECT

plagiarismadvice.org



1

Assign points based on the following criteria

HISTORY

1st Time	100 points
2nd Time	150 points
3rd/+ Time	200 points

AMOUNT / EXTENT

Below 5% AND less than two sentences	80 points
As above but with critical aspects* plagiarised	105 points
Between 5% and 20% OR more than two sentences but not more than two paragraphs	105 points
As above but with critical aspects* plagiarised	130 points
Between 20% and 50% OR more than two paragraphs but not more than five paragraphs	130 points
As above but with critical aspects* plagiarised	160 points
Above 50% OR more than five paragraphs	160 points
Submission purchased from essay mill or ghostwriting service †	225 points

* *Critical aspects are key ideas central to the assignment*

† *Some institutions may consider this to be a separate form of academic malpractice*

LEVEL / STAGE

Level 1	70 points
Level 2	115 points
Level 3/Postgraduate	140 points

VALUE OF ASSIGNMENT

Standard weighting	30 points
Large project (e.g. final year dissertation)	60 points

ADDITIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Evidence of deliberate attempt to disguise plagiarism by changing words, sentences or references to avoid detection **40 points**

2

Award penalties based on the points

PENALTIES (Summative Work)

In all cases a formal warning is given and a record made contributing to the student's previous history

Points	Available Penalties
280 - 329	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assignment awarded 0% - resubmission required, with no penalty on mark
330 - 379	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assignment awarded 0% - resubmission required, with no penalty on mark Assignment awarded 0% - resubmission required but mark capped or reduced
380 - 479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assignment awarded 0% - resubmission required but mark capped or reduced Assignment awarded 0% - no opportunity to resubmit
480 - 524	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assignment awarded 0% - no opportunity to resubmit Module awarded 0% - re-sit required, but mark capped or reduced Module awarded 0% - no opportunity to re-sit, but credit still awarded
525 - 559	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Module awarded 0% - re-sit required, but mark capped or reduced Module awarded 0% - no opportunity to re-sit, but credit still awarded Module awarded 0% - no opportunity to re-sit, and credit lost Award classification reduced Qualification reduced (e.g. Honours -> no Honours) Expelled from institution but credits retained Expelled from institution with credits withdrawn
560+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Module awarded 0% - no opportunity to resit, and credit lost Award classification reduced Qualification reduced (e.g. Honours -> no Honours) Expelled from institution but credits retained Expelled from institution with credits withdrawn

PENALTIES (Formative Work)

280 - 379	Informal warning
380+	Formal warning, with record made contributing to the student's previous history



AMBeR
PROJECT
plagiarismadvice.org