

Centre for Alternative Technology Academic Integrity Policy

These Regulations should be read in conjunction with the University of East London's Academic Integrity Policy which is available at: <http://www.uel.ac.uk/qa/policies/policies/academic/>. The University and the Centre are committed to ensuring that everyone is made aware of their responsibilities in maintaining the highest standards of academic integrity and of the steps taken to protect those standards.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Centre for Alternative Technology is committed to safeguarding academic integrity and will take firm action against any student who breaches these regulations and is found guilty of academic misconduct. All students are responsible for ensuring that every element of their studies is their own work and for following regulations for the proper conduct of assessments. No credit will be awarded for work which is found to have breached this Academic Integrity Policy.

2 Definition

- 2.1 For the purposes of these Regulations, academic misconduct is defined as any type of cheating in an assessment for the purposes of achieving personal gain. Examples of such misconduct are given below: the list is **not** exhaustive and the use of any form of unfair or dishonest practice in assessment can be considered potential misconduct. A student cannot initiate an academic misconduct action against another student; this can only be done by an academic member of staff.

Coursework Submitted for Assessment

For coursework submissions, academic misconduct means:

- (a) The presentation of another person's work as one's own with or without obtaining permission to use it.
- (b) The inclusion within one's own work of material (written, visual or oral), originally produced by another person, without suitable acknowledgment.
- (c) The submission, as if it were one's own work, of anything which has been offered to you for your use, but which is actually not your own work.

- (d) The inclusion within one's work of concepts paraphrased from elsewhere without citing your source.
- (e) The inclusion in submitted work of sections of text, whether from electronic or hard copy sources, without appropriate acknowledgement of the source.
- (f) The submission of work that the student, as the author, has previously submitted, without suitable acknowledgement of the source of their previous work; this should not normally be more than a short quotation as the same work cannot be submitted for different assignments.
- (g) Including or quoting the work of other students in one's work, with the exception of published work, or outputs held in the library as a learning resource, which should be cited and acknowledged appropriately.
- (h) Being party to any arrangement whereby the work of one candidate is represented as that of another.
- (i) The submission, as your own work, of any work that has been purchased, or otherwise obtained from others, whether this is from other students, online services, "cheat sites", or other agents or sources that sell or provide assignments.
- (j) Practices such as 'cutting and pasting' segments of text into your work, without citing the source of each.
- (k) For work not intended to be submitted as a collaborative assignment: producing work with one or more other students, using study practices that mean the submitted work is nearly identical, overall or in part, to that of other students.
- (l) Offering an inducement to staff and/or other persons connected with assessment.

2.2 Where academic misconduct is suspected, the UEL Subject Area Progression Board will not come to a decision on the candidate's result until the facts have been established.

3 Roles and Responsibilities

3.1 The Chief Executive will appoint a Responsible Officer, usually the Head of School, to deal with cases of academic misconduct within the Centre on his/her behalf. The Responsible Officer is a senior member of the Centre's academic staff who works closely with Programme Leaders and the relevant administrator to manage incidents of reported academic misconduct within

the School. This includes meeting with individual students to discuss cases and to outline the support available to prevent future incidents of academic misconduct. The role of Responsible Officer may be shared between two people and, in such cases, a minimum of one of the appointees must be a member of academic staff.

4 Procedures to be followed in the event of a suspected case of academic misconduct in undergraduate programmes, taught postgraduate programmes, and undergraduate and postgraduate credit bearing short courses.

- 4.1 If an assessor or invigilator suspects that academic misconduct has occurred, he or she should inform the relevant Programme Leader, and Responsible Officer, by email, within 5 working days after detection.
- 4.2 The Programme Leader, in consultation with the Responsible Officer, will determine whether or not it appears that academic misconduct has occurred, by reviewing the reported circumstances and any relevant materials, including suspected source materials within a period of twenty working days.
- 4.3 Academic Misconduct Regulations do not apply where the suspected breach has occurred in students' work which has been:
- submitted more than 24 hours after, but within 1 week of, the stipulated submission deadline

and

 - where no extenuation claim is made, or if made, not granted.
- 4.4 If, at the end of the twenty working day period stipulated in 4.2 above, the Programme Leader and Responsible Officer have not found evidence that misconduct may have occurred, the relevant administrator will be advised and no further action will be taken.
- 4.5 If, at the end of the twenty working day period stipulated in 4.2 above, the Programme Leader and Responsible Officer have evidence that misconduct may have occurred and:
- (a) there is a record that the student has previously been issued with a Level A penalty
- or

(b) the suspected academic misconduct is such that it might (according to the tariff in the Annex below) merit more than a Level A penalty (regardless of whether it is a first instance of academic misconduct)

the matter will be referred to the UEL Academic Misconduct Officer within 5 working days (see section 5 below).

- 4.6 If there is no record of the student having breached our Academic Misconduct Regulations, the Programme Leader, together with the Centre's Responsible Officer, will hold a School Meeting with the student. The student may be accompanied by a relative, friend. The accompanying person cannot be a professional legal representative who has been employed to act on the student's behalf nor can they act in the capacity of a legal advisor. At that meeting, the student will be reminded of the Academic Misconduct Regulations (including the tariff of penalties), shown how s/he has breached the regulations and advised on how to adhere to them in future. The Programme Leader will present the evidence which must include appropriate source material and ask the student whether s/he accepts that s/he has breached these regulations. The student will then be invited to make any further comments.
- 4.7 Where acceptance occurs a Level A penalty will be issued by the Responsible Officer and the piece of work concerned will be awarded a mark of 0.
- 4.8 Students are required to confirm their acceptance that s/he has breached these regulations by signing the School Meeting pro forma, that s/he understands how s/he has breached these regulations, undertakes to take all necessary steps to ensure that s/he does not do so again and understands that any further instance of academic misconduct is likely to lead to a serious penalty. The Programme Leader or Responsible Officer will inform the relevant administrator, who will notify UEL. The Programme Leader will be responsible for notifying the student formally of the outcome and retaining the record of the School Meeting.
- 4.9 Where the student denies academic misconduct the Programme Leader and Responsible Officer will refer the matter to the UEL Academic Misconduct Officer.
- 4.10 If academic misconduct has been alleged because an assessor suspects that the work submitted is not entirely the student's own work, and it is deemed appropriate (e.g. in cases where it has not been possible to identify the sources from which the work (or parts of it) has (or have) been taken), then a *viva voce* interview may be incorporated within the School Meeting. The *viva voce* must be held in accordance with UEL's Guidance for Conducting *viva voce* in relation to academic misconduct.

- 4.10.1 A report of the meeting at which the viva voce is held will be produced and made available to the Responsible Officer.
- 4.11 At the discretion of the Responsible Officer and usually only to accommodate distance learning students, the School meeting may take place via a video or telephone conference.
- 4.12 If the student does not appear at the date and time scheduled for the School Meeting, or refuses to take part in a viva voce interview, the Responsible Officer will consider whether any reasons offered are valid, and if s/he so judges, adjourn proceedings to a later date.
- 4.13 If no reasons are advanced, the reasons are judged invalid or the student refuses to take part in the viva voce interview, the meeting will conclude that the student has admitted academic misconduct and will issue a Level A penalty or where appropriate, a referral to the UEL Academic Misconduct Officer will be made. In these circumstances, there is no right to appeal the decision of the School Meeting.
- 4.14 Where a Level A penalty has been issued in the student's absence, the Responsible Officer will send the student a copy of the record of the School Meeting decision
- 4.15 Where the outcome of the viva voce interview is such that the suspected academic misconduct might (according to the annex) merit more than a Level A penalty (regardless of whether it is a first instance of academic misconduct) the matter will be referred to the UEL Academic Misconduct Officer (see section 5 below) within 5 working days.
- 5 Referrals to the UEL Academic Misconduct Officer (alleged subsequent instances of academic misconduct and alleged first instances of serious academic misconduct)**

See the relevant UEL procedures

<http://www.uel.ac.uk/qa/policies/policies/academic/>

| |
|--|
| Date Document Approved: July 2017 By: Academic Council Version 1.0 To be Reviewed by: July 2020 |
|--|

Annex: Academic Misconduct Penalties – Level A

| Academic Misconduct Penalties – Postgraduate Programmes |
|--|
| Level A: First instance of non-serious offence |
| <p>A student who plagiarises or colludes for the first time will be issued with a Level A Penalty if there is a <i>prima facie</i> case, provided that there is no evidence that s/he has behaved in a pre-meditated dishonest way. The work concerned will be awarded a mark of 0.</p> <p>Where a Level A Penalty is issued at the first assessment opportunity, the relevant component at reassessment will be capped at the minimum pass mark.</p> <p>Where a Level A Penalty is issued at a reassessment opportunity, the Subject Area Progression Board will determine the appropriate consequence.</p> <p>NB: A Level A Penalty is a penalty but is neither recorded on a transcript, nor reported to a professional body.</p> |