3.0 Academic Regulations

3.8 Academic Misconduct Policy

Approved in	Academic Board April 2024
Version Number	3
Reviewed by	Principal April 2024

Version Control Statement

Version	Date	Changes	Reason	Author	Next review
1	July 2021	New Policy		Principal	July 2022
2	August 2022	Minor changes/role and Grammar check. Partner institution policy takes president	Annual Review	Principal	August 2023
3	April 2024	General Updates	Updated other polices	Principal	April 2025

External Reference Points

This policy is developed based on the QAA UK Quality Code:

- Assessment
- Enabling Student Development
- Learning and Teaching

It seeks to meet any requirements for awarding partners concerning the assessment of student work

Related Policies and Documents

- Admissions Policy
- Fitness to Study Policy
- Complaints Policy
- Appeals Policy

Table of Contents

Academic integrity 4
Principles 4
Definitions and examples 5
Plagiarism 5
Collusion 5
Falsification 6
Personation 6
Ghosting 6
Procedures for suspected plagiarism 6
Stage 1 6
Action by Assessment Boards 7
Guidelines on penalties for academic misconduct 7
Plagiarism, collusion, falsification or similar 7
- First instance of academic misconduct 8
- Second or subsequent instances of academic misconduct 8

Checking for plagiarism 8
1. Scores of 10% or less 8
2. Scores of between 10-20% 8
3. Scores of between 20-40% 8
4. Scores over 40% 8

Ghosting, personation or cheating in an examination 8
- First instance of academic misconduct 8
- Second or subsequent instance of academic misconduct 8

Student's right of appeal 9
Stage 2: 9
Annexe 1: Operation of the Academic Misconduct Appeals Panel 10

EDA Academic Misconduct Policy and Procedures

Academic integrity

1.1 Every student of EDA College is expected to act with integrity about the production and representation of academic work. Academic integrity is central to academic life and requires that students be honest and responsible in acknowledging the contributions of others in their work.

1.2 Where a student is registered with a partner institution the regulations of the Partner Institution takes president.

1.3 In all assessed work students should take care to ensure that the work presented is their own and that it fully acknowledges the work and opinions of others. It is also the responsibility of students to ensure that they do not undertake any form of cheating or gain an unfair advantage in any other way.

1.4 To assure EDA College that the work is their own and that the work and opinions of others have been acknowledged, students must take care to follow the appropriate standards for academic practice. This includes:

a) Providing full citation of all sources (books, articles, websites, newspapers, images, artefacts, data sources, programme code etc) which have been drawn on in the preparation of an assignment. Normally this will be done in a bibliography included in the assignment.

b) Properly referencing the sources of the arguments and ideas in an assignment using a recognised referencing system (as specified in programme and module guidelines). It is not only quotations that must be referenced but also paraphrasing of the arguments of others and the use of their ideas, even if explained in the student's own words.

c) Following other guidelines for preparing and presenting coursework as defined in the relevant programme handbooks, module guides and assignment briefs.

d) Using mechanisms provided by EDA College for checking their work.

1.5 Proofreading entails the identification of grammatical, spelling or punctuation mistakes in the text. The use of a proofreading service may constitute academic misconduct if the service includes any editorial activity which entails re-writing or re-wording the student's original work beyond this.

1.6 Work that does not meet appropriate standards of academic practice will be marked at a lower level than work that does and may leave the student open to action under this policy and procedure.

Principles

2.1 The work submitted by a student for assessment must have been undertaken by the student.

2.2 Academic misconduct includes cheating or other types of academic misconduct.

2.3 The determination of whether cheating, plagiarism or another form of academic misconduct has occurred is not a matter of an Assessment Board.

2.4 The facts must be established before an Assessment Board can consider the effect of the alleged incident on a student's performance.

2.5 An allegation of cheating, plagiarism or other academic misconduct is not the same as proof of the incident.

2.6 Allegations of academic misconduct will be investigated with full regard to principles of equity and fairness.

2.7 Once the facts have been established, it is then for the Programme Leader or Assessment Board to judge the seriousness of the case and to exercise discretion, accordingly, having regard to an institutional precedent where appropriate.

Definitions and examples

There are different forms of academic misconduct, all of which may be the subject of the procedures described below. The following are different examples of academic misconduct but do not constitute an exhaustive list:

Plagiarism

The unacknowledged incorporation in a student's work of material derived from the work (published or unpublished) of another. Examples of plagiarism are:

i) the inclusion in a student's work of more than a single phrase from another person's work without the use of quotation marks and acknowledgement of the sources.

ii) the summarising of another person's work by simply changing a few words or altering the order of presentation, without acknowledgement.

iii) the use of the ideas of another person without acknowledgement of the source.

iv) the unacknowledged use of images (digital or otherwise) music, patents, or other creative material either in their entirety or in the creation of a derivative work.

v) copying the work of another student, with or without their knowledge or agreement. See section on Collusion.

vi) the unacknowledged re-submission of work the student had previously submitted to gain academic credit at EDA College or elsewhere.

Collusion

Collusion exists were a student:

vii) submits as entirely his/her own, work done in collaboration with another person.

viii) collaborates with another student in the completion of work which is submitted as that other student's unaided work.

ix) enables another student to copy all or part of his/her work and to submit it as that student's unaided work.

Falsification

Examples of falsification include:

ii) The falsification of data. The presentation of data in laboratory reports, projects or other forms of assessment based on experimental or other work falsely purported to have been carried out by the student or obtained by unfair means.

iii) The falsification of references, including the invention of references and/or false claims.

Personation

"Personation" is the legal term for what is usually referred to by the layperson as "impersonation". Personation is thus the assumption by one person of the identity of another person with the intent to deceive or to gain an unfair advantage. It may exist where:

i) one person assumes the identity of a student, to gain an unfair advantage for that student.

ii) the student is knowingly and willingly impersonated by another to gain an unfair advantage for himself/herself.

Ghosting

Ghosting exists where:

iii) A student submits as their own, work which has been produced in whole or part by another person on their behalf, e.g. the use of a 'ghost writing' service or similar.

ii) A student will also be guilty of academic misconduct if he/she deliberately makes available or seeks to make available material to another student (of this college or elsewhere) whether in exchange for financial gain or otherwise with the intention that the material is to be used by the other student to commit academic misconduct.

Procedures for suspected plagiarism

Stage 1: Programme Leader

4.1.1 When academic misconduct is suspected, the lecturer should bring this to the attention of the appropriate Programme Leader who will deal with the matter. The tutor should provide the evidence of suspected academic malpractice to the Programme Leader who should then meet with the student. The student should be allowed to present his or her case.

4.1.2 The Programme Leader must complete the Academic Misconduct Report form. If the student admits to academic misconduct, this should be indicated on the Academic Misconduct Report form and confirmed by the student's signature. Details of the alleged academic misconduct should be recorded on the form. The

Programme Leader must sign the form and send a copy to the Academic Development Lead. The Academic Development Lead is responsible for ensuring that the matter is reported to the next scheduled meeting of the Assessment Board.

4.1.3 The student should also be allowed at the Stage 1 meeting to declare academic misconduct in other work that they have submitted. The report to the Academic Development Lead should contain details of any other academic misconduct declared and a statement by the Programme.

Leader about any other cases of proven or admitted academic misconduct in the student's record. In cases of plagiarism, collusion or falsification, the report should also contain a statement from the Assessor for the unit on whether or not there is evidence of the learning outcomes for the assessment having been met by the student/s involved, despite the misconduct.

4.1.4 In exceptional circumstances, where a student judges that there had been a procedural error which has resulted in them erroneously admitting to academic misconduct, they should immediately inform the Programme Leader that they now wish to withdraw their admission and contest the allegation of academic misconduct. Any such change of admission must be conveyed in writing to the Programme Leader within five working days of receiving the decision of the Stage 1 meeting. The Programme Leader will advise the Academic Development Lead who will decide on the matter in liaison with the Deputy Principal Academic if required.

4.1.5 An allegation of academic misconduct may be made after the work has been marked and returned to the student.

4.1.6 If a student believes academic misconduct to be taking place in any form of assessment, it is their responsibility to bring this to the attention of the Programme Leader or the Academic Development Lead.

Action by Assessment Boards

4.2.1 For one-off cases of plagiarism handled at the Programme Leader level (usually with the student having their work referred), the Academic Development Lead must ensure that this is reported to the Assessment Board and appears on the student record.

4.2.2 Where a student has committed multiple proven instances of academic misconduct, either for several assignments handed in for a trimester or several assignments over two or more trimesters, it is for the Assessment Board to determine the course of action to be taken with the student. This may range, depending on circumstances, from multiple referrals for the course work to the deregistration of the student from the Awarding Organisation.

4.2.3 All cases of academic misconduct will be recorded on the student record system by the Programme Leader / Academic Development Lead and/or the Student Assessment Officer.

Guidelines on penalties for academic misconduct

Plagiarism, collusion, falsification or similar

- First instance of academic misconduct (or multiple instances declared at the same time) – *written warning plus referral for each piece of work. Referral opportunities are normally granted by the Programme Leader and/or Academic Development Lead.*
- Second or subsequent instances of academic misconduct – *Assessment Board to decide whether referral opportunity should be given, or whether to deregister the student from the programme of study according to the facts and severity of the academic misconduct.*

Checking for plagiarism

EDA uses plagiarism detection software to detect instances of plagiarism. The reports indicate the percentage of work that appears to be plagiarised.

It should be noted that there is no set rule to decide which percentage indicates that the learner's work has been plagiarised and it remains an academic judgement. The following is a guide:

1. Scores of 10% or less – this work will normally include some quotes and some common phrases that match other documents. This score will indicate that the learner's work does not require further checking.
2. Scores of between 10-20% - this is a difficult area and will require careful checking. If the matched material is concentrated in one or two sections or there is some rewording but from a recognised source, this could be plagiarised.
3. Scores of between 20-40% - this work will include extensive quoted or paraphrased material which may be plagiarised. The learner's work will require further checking and where the matched material is concentrated in certain sections of the work and is not attributed there may be plagiarised material.
4. Scores over 40% - there is a high probability that the learner's work is copied from other sources. The work may well have extensive levels of quoted or paraphrased material and should be checked for plagiarism.

Please note that if material such as an assignment brief or extracts thereto and/or learning outcomes or assessment criteria are also included in the uploaded document they may show as plagiarism, so they will need to be discounted.

Ghosting, personation or cheating in an examination

- First instance of academic misconduct (or multiple instances declared at the same time) – *written warning plus referral for each piece of work. Referral opportunities are normally granted by the Programme Leader and/or Academic Development Lead*.
- Second or subsequent instance of academic misconduct – the *mark of zero for the piece of assessed work and the mark of zero for the module/unit. Assessment Board to decide whether a referral opportunity should be given, or whether to deregister the student from the programme of study according to the facts and severity of the academic misconduct.*

Student's right of appeal

6.1 The student has a right to appeal against a finding of academic misconduct.

6.2 The student has a right to appeal against the decision of a Programme Leader and/or Academic Development Lead. This should be done using the Stage 2 procedure outlined below.

6.3 The student has the right to appeal against the decision of an Assessment Board. Here the student must use the EDA College's Appeals against Assessment Board Decisions (available from EDA College's website and the Student Handbook).

Stage 2: Policy and procedures for an appeal against the finding of academic misconduct by a Programme Leader and/or Academic Development Lead

7.1 Introduction

The following section describes the procedure for the consideration of an appeal by a student against the decision of a Programme Leader and/or Academic Development Lead that academic misconduct has occurred.

7.2 Principles

7.2.1 If a student feels dissatisfied with the decision of a Programme Leader and/or Academic Development Lead, they may appeal to the Deputy Principal Academic of EDA College.

7.2.2 The student should submit their appeal in writing within ten working days of receiving the Programme Leader and/or Academic Development Lead's decision, specifying the grounds for their appeal.

7.2.3 An appeal can only be made on one or both of the following two grounds:

i) that there was a procedural irregularity by the Programme Leader and/or Academic Development Lead which has prejudiced the student's case

ii) additional relevant evidence has come to light since the decision of academic misconduct made by the Programme Leader and/or Academic Development Lead which could not have been made available earlier.

7.2.4 The Deputy Principal Academic will consider the documents submitted and either:

i) reject the appeal because no case has been established in support of their appeal and issue notification to the student of this outcome

ii) if the Deputy Principal accepts that the student has established grounds for having the case reconsidered, the case will be referred to an Academic Misconduct Appeals Panel with the requirement that the Panel reconsider the case in the light of evidence put forward by the student, as soon as practicable. The decision of the Deputy Principal as to whether to convene an Academic Misconduct Appeals Panel is final. The Deputy Principal will advise the student of the outcome of this preliminary stage, normally within fifteen working days of receiving the appeal.

7.2.5 Details relating to the operation of the Academic Misconduct Appeals Panel are given in Annex 1.

Annexe 1: Operation of the Academic Misconduct Appeals Panel

1. When an appeal against a finding of academic misconduct has been accepted for further investigation, the matter will be considered by an Academic Misconduct Appeals Panel as soon as reasonably practicable following the decision of the Deputy Principal Academic to convene such a panel. The Academic Misconduct Appeals Panel will comprise:
    i) the Deputy Principal Academic (Chair of the Panel)
    ii) a Programme Leader not associated with the unit where plagiarism has been alleged to have taken place
2. The Deputy Principal Academic or nominee will notify the student concerned of the date, time, and place of the meeting of the Panel. Notification should be no less than five working days before the scheduled meeting of the Panel.
3. The student may be accompanied by a friend at the Panel meeting. Failure by the student to appear before the Panel or to submit a statement will not prevent the Panel from meeting and deciding.
4. The Academic Misconduct Appeals Panel may call witnesses, as appropriate, and will not unreasonably refuse permission for the student or staff concerned to call such witnesses as they deem appropriate.
5. Evidence may be received by the Academic Misconduct Appeals Panel by the oral statement, written and signed statement, or statutory declaration. The Chair of the Panel shall decide, after taking account of the evidence assembled, whether the evidence from each party can be heard in the presence of others.
6. The Academic Misconduct Appeals Panel will interview the student, staff, and witnesses as appropriate, consider the student's written statement, and come to a decision based on the student's statement and the supporting evidence.

    The order of proceedings is as follows:

    i) statement from the student and production of evidence in support of their appeal and responses to questions from the Academic Misconduct Appeals Panel
    ii) statement from the Programme Leader and/or Academic Development Lead, as appropriate, and production of supporting evidence and responses to questions from the Academic Misconduct Appeals Panel
    iii) the Panel will consider the evidence in private and decide by section 9 below.
7. Each member of the Academic Misconduct Appeals Panel has equal status and, in the event of a disagreement about the decision a third person may need to be consulted.

8. After consideration of the available evidence relating to the appeal, the Academic Misconduct Appeals Panel will either:
    i) reject the appeal; or
    ii) accept the appeal and nullify any judgement about plagiarism having taken place
9. The student and the Chair of the Academic Misconduct Panel will be provided with a copy of the notes of the Academic Misconduct Appeals Panel's meeting, normally within five working days.
10. The decision of the Academic Misconduct Appeals Panel shall be final.