



Leeds City College

Higher Education

Academic Misconduct Policy

Owner: HEDO

Date of Production : July 2016

Last review: September 2019

Next Review: September 2021

Endorsed by: HE PM Meeting, HE Academic Board and LCC Policy Panel

Scope and Purpose of Policy

This policy applies to all Leeds City College Higher Education programmes, and makes clear the College's 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 Leeds City College 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 Leeds City College Foundation Degree Academic Regulations.

Assessment measures achievement of the outcomes of learning in terms of knowledge skills and understanding. The purpose of assessment is to:

- determine if a potential student is ready to start a particular course of learning; (diagnostic assessment);
- provide guidance on how well students are progressing (formative assessment);
- determine eligibility for final grading of module or awards (summative assessment);

Policy Statement

The College 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;

Policy	Higher Education Academic Misconduct Policy	Quality Code Ref
---------------	--	-----------------------------

<p>Definitions</p>	<p>Academic Integrity – This refers to scholarship conducted in an open, honest and responsible manner. All scholarly activity builds upon the work of others and is subject to scrutiny and students are expected to show respect for the intellectual property of the people who have helped them to develop their own ideas by always attributing and acknowledging source material.</p> <p>Poor Scholarship - Poor scholarship is characterised by limited or inadequate technical skills or adherence to academic conventions, whether through negligence or a lack of understanding and ability. Failure to properly attribute the work of others may be regarded as plagiarism and misuse of source material may be regarded as falsification.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Academic Misconduct - Academic misconduct encompasses all kinds of academic dishonesty, whether deliberate or unintentional, which infringes the integrity of the College's assessment procedures. The following are examples of academic misconduct:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<p>Assessment Expectations for Quality 1</p> <p>Core Practices 1</p> <p>Guiding Principles 2, 9, 10</p>
---------------------------	--	---

Policy	Higher Education Academic Misconduct Policy	Quality Code Ref
	<p>qualifications, false claims for exemption or mitigation, or misrepresentation of a word count or contribution to a group assessment.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
Support for Students	<p>All students will be provided with support to help them to develop appropriate academic skills. This includes, but is not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Taught sessions within the Professional Development module; • Workshop sessions provided by Library staff; • A range of materials provided via the VLE. 	<p>Assessment Expectations for Quality 1</p> <p>Core Practices 1</p> <p>Guiding Principles 9</p>
Process	<p>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.</p>	
Staff development and training	<p>The College 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.</p>	

Policy	Higher Education Academic Misconduct Policy	Quality Code Ref
Equality and Diversity Statement	This policy will be implemented in accordance with the College's 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	The College requires that all staff are aware of and operate under the specific regulatory requirements of its awarding bodies and, where appropriate, professional bodies. The College has developed appropriate internal policies and procedures that cover major requirements.	
Monitoring and Review	The College 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	

