

Higher Education Academic Integrity Code of Practice

This Code of Practice relates to the processes that must be adhered to when investigating instances of unacceptable behaviour in relation to Higher Education programmes of study. The Code does not supersede any regulations in place at partner Universities or Examining Bodies.

Full account has been taken of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education, particularly the Advice and Guidance on Assessment which embeds the Guiding Principle that:

Assessment encourages academic integrity.

In addition, the College has taken account of:

- the OIA Good Practice Framework: handling student complaints and academic appeals (revised December 2016)
- Regulations governing Academic Misconduct by candidates in pursuit of the award of any academic or professional qualification of the University of Hull v4.09 April 2017, Part V.

This Code of Practice should be read alongside the Higher Education Complaints Procedure.

This Code does not apply to Students on programmes validated by Leeds Beckett University or franchised by the University of Huddersfield – any such student should familiarise themselves with the regulations of the relevant University. Guidance can be sought from the HE Administrator. Students on programmes validated by the University of Hull will be subject to the Regulations identified above; such regulations to be implemented by the University Centre as directed by the University.

This Code of Practice (“the Code”) clarifies the expectations and procedural guidelines adopted by Wakefield College (“the College”) relating to issues of plagiarism, cheating and any other unfair means on any summative assessment contributing to the final mark or classification on a programme of study.

1.0 With reference to validating University partners or to Examining/Awarding Bodies, unfair means is referred to as:

1.1 University of Hull: Academic Misconduct (the regulations of the University are applicable; to be implemented by the College)

1.2 Leeds Beckett University: Academic Integrity (this Code is not applicable for these students)

1.3 University of Huddersfield: Academic Integrity Offences (this Code is not applicable for these students)

1.4 Pearson: Malpractice.

This list is not exhaustive and other awarding or examining bodies may have their own reference point or definition. Student programme handbooks will contain appropriate links to the relevant validating University/Examining or Awarding body (“partner organisation”) regulations where applicable.

2.0 The Code does not offer procedures or guidance in relation to any criteria for decision making or penalties applicable for proven cases as in all cases, the regulations/Code of Practice of the relevant partner organisation will be applied.

3.0 For the purposes of the Code, unfair means relate to acts (or attempted acts) committed by the student(s) in order to obtain, or attempt to obtain, an illegitimate or unpermitted advantage (whether for themselves or for a third party). The act (or attempted act) may have been carried out individually or in collusion with others.

4.0 Some examples of unfair means are:

4.1 Possession and/or use of unauthorised materials on entry to an examination room, irrespective of whether that examination has commenced. This may include, but not exclusively, books, papers, data from an electronic device or any other unpermitted resource

4.2 Impersonating a candidate for an examination, assessment or other summative event (the act of allowing oneself to be impersonated is also unfair means)

4.3 Self-plagiarism – the act of submitting work for a summative assessment which is significantly the same as that submitted for a previous summative assessment

4.4 Falsifying data for research, fieldwork, analysis etc. or entries for learning logs, records or statements (this is not an exhaustive list)

- 4.5 Collusion – the act of working together with others without tutor authorisation in order to submit a summative assessment and where the work is claimed on an individual basis, without acknowledgement of the contribution of others
 - 4.6 Utilising false statements or evidence in support of extension requests, applications for mitigating circumstances, absences or examination exemptions
 - 4.7 Falsifying a transcript purporting to relate to other qualifications, or any other documentation which would usually be relied upon in academic decision making.
- 5.0 For the purposes of the Code, plagiarism can take many forms, but at the simplest level can simply be the absence of quotation marks (or the presence of false quotation marks), or the failure to adequately acknowledge source material in references, notes or bibliographies. It should be noted that source material includes that obtained online or from electronic sources. Some examples of plagiarism are:
- 5.1 Unacknowledged verbatim copying throughout an assessment
 - 5.2 Unacknowledged verbatim copying where some attempts have been made to change individual words/phrases, change word order or insert linking words. Students may believe this to be paraphrasing, but appropriate paraphrasing is the restatement of the work/ideas of others in the student's own words
 - 5.3 Paraphrasing where unacknowledged verbatim phrases from others are utilised
 - 5.4 The substantial and unauthorised use of the work of others without acknowledgement and, in certain circumstances without their consent.
- 6.0 The College will, in order to assist with the identification of potential plagiarism, require all summative assessments (where appropriate) to be submitted via Turnitin, the electronic detection software currently in place. It is recognised that some assessments formats cannot be submitted via this software at present and tutors will clarify this for individual assignments as necessary, however, where the format is one accepted by the software, submission must be via this route.
- 7.0 Where a tutor identifies plagiarism in a summative assessment, they must submit either the Turnitin originality report or indicate in an appropriate manner which sections of the work are plagiarised. If the information submitted takes the form of prints from a book or journal for example, the relevant sections within the student assessment must also be highlighted.
- 8.0 Where a tutor believes the plagiarism to be minimal in nature (based on their own academic judgement) they should complete the relevant marking and moderation processes and within their feedback indicate to the student that a minimal amount of plagiarism was identified. They should also provide guidance and developmental feedback to the student in order that further instances of plagiarism can be avoided. This guidance may relate to specific actions that may be required or could be generic in nature, for example referring the student for study support sessions.

- 9.0 In a situation where the tutor believes plagiarism has occurred, but where it would be impractical or impossible to evidence, the marking and moderation processes should take place and the student should be advised that concerns have arisen relating to potential plagiarism and be provided with guidance and developmental feedback (as per paragraph 9.0). No further action can be taken in such a case.
- 10.0 Where a tutor believes the plagiarism to be more than minimal, and can evidence this, the work should be submitted to the HE Administrator along with a completed form PCU1 (appendix 1) and any supporting evidence (paragraphs 8.0 and 14.0). Allegations of unfair means should also be submitted in the same way.
- 11.0 Any assessment considered to be plagiarised or produced via unfair means is still subject to the feedback response times detailed in the Higher Education Assessment Policy. At the time of giving formal summative feedback, the student should be advised (verbally or clearly stated within the feedback) that there is a suspicion of plagiarism or unfair means having occurred and that the assessment has been referred for further investigation in line with this Code.
- 12.0 Other supporting information that should be submitted, where possible, with an allegation of unfair means and/or plagiarism are:
- 12.1 The module tutor's rationale for the allegation
 - 12.2 Estimation of the percentage of work which is affected by the allegation
 - 12.3 The summative assessment submitted by the student
 - 12.4 Module handbook and assessment brief
 - 12.5 Copy of the Turnitin originality report and/or any other relevant information (e.g. examination invigilator report).
- 13.0 The HE Administrator will confirm receipt to the relevant module tutor. All documents submitted will be retained by the HE Administrator for use during the investigation and therefore module tutors are advised to retain copies for their own reference.
- 14.0 The timings provided within this Code **refer to working days** and do not include weekends, bank holidays or periods when the College is closed.
- 15.0 On receipt of the submitted allegation, the HE Administrator will, within 5 working days, forward the documentation to the Director of Higher Education for investigation and will also within the same timescale, notify the student, in writing and via recorded or registered post, that the allegation has been received.

- 16.0 Within 21 days of the date that the registered/recorded letter was served upon the student's address, the student is permitted to make a response, in writing, to the HE Administrator. Within the response the student may agree or disagree with the allegation and offer further explanation or information they feel to be of relevance.
- 17.0 The Director of Higher Education will notify the student (via the HE Administrator) of the date, time and venue of the relevant Board hearing. This written notification will be sent out, by registered or recorded post, within 7 days of receipt of the student's formal response, or within 7 days of the end of 21-day response period, whichever is the sooner. Detail provided will include:
- 17.1 Information regarding any other witness being called to the Board
 - 17.2 A copy of the relevant assessment(s)
 - 17.3 A copy of any statement made by the member of staff making the allegation.
- 18.0 The timing of any such Board will be within 10 working days of any response received from the student. In a situation where the student fails to make a response within the normal timescales, and where no mitigating circumstances for failure to do so are advanced, the Board hearing will be within 10 working days of the end of the response period.
- 19.0 All Boards will be held in accordance with the regulations of any partner organisation and will be chaired by the Director of Higher Education. They will be formally minuted in order to ensure consistency of approach and, where required, a copy of the minutes will be forwarded to the partner organisation. The Board will consist of at least two staff members in addition to the Chair who, where applicable, are approved by the partner organisation and will include at least one academic member of staff.
- 20.0 The student has a right, if they so wish, to attend the Board and may bring with them a third party who may not speak on their behalf or advocate for them unless invited to do so by the Chair, and subject to partner organisation regulations. This third party may, for example, be a friend, relative, student experience manager. The third party may not be a lawyer acting in a professional capacity. If the student wishes for their third party to be their tutor, this is permissible, however, they should bear in mind that the tutor may also be required to provide evidence to the Board.
- 21.0 The Board may call any other witness that they deem to be appropriate to supply relevant evidence, subject to the provisions of paragraph 19.0 above.
- 22.0 Where electronic evidence is available, such as that provided through the Turnitin software, or electronic copies of assessment, this shall be made available to the Board.

- 23.0 Although the student is entitled to be present throughout the hearing there may, on occasion be exceptional circumstances where evidence needs to be presented in a closed hearing. At this point the student will be temporarily asked to leave the hearing.
- 24.0 Once the Chair has determined that satisfactory evidence has been presented and that a decision can now equitably be made, the Board will make their formal decision in private. The decision will relate to whether the allegation made is proven or unproven. Where a decision of 'proven' is reached, the Board must then decide upon an appropriate decision made in accordance with the partner organisation regulations. The penalty applied will take into account the nature and severity of the proven allegation, the number of previous breaches, if any, committed by the student, the stage of study that the student is on, and whether any satisfactory mitigating circumstances have been presented.
- 25.0 Following a Board decision, the Director of Higher Education will, via the HE Administrator, notify the student in writing of that decision. This notification will be sent by recorded or registered post within 5 working days of the Board convening and agreeing an outcome. A copy of this letter must also be provided to the student's programme leader.
- 26.0 A student may lodge a formal appeal against the Board's decision, and this must be done within 14 days of the date that the registered/recorded decision letter was served upon the student's address. Any such Appeal should be made to the HE Administrator.
- 27.0 The outcomes of all substantiated cases heard under the procedures set down in the Code will be reported, at the next available opportunity, to the Board of Examiners. Where an academic integrity case is still ongoing at the time of the next Board of Examiners, the decision recorded at the Board will align with the relevant Regulations.
- 28.0 The Panel will produce a semesterly report for consideration by the HEQS Committee. The data contained therein will inform the production of the College's annual Higher Education Self-Assessment Report which will be presented to the Executive Team. In addition, external agencies and Awarding Bodies may require the College to submit data relating to case outcomes for monitoring purposes.

Appendix 1: Form PCU1: Plagiarism, Cheating and Use of Unfair Means Allegation

Student Name:			
Student Number:		Level of Study (delete as appropriate)	4 / 5 / 6
Programme			
Mode of Attendance (delete as appropriate)	FT / PT	Academic Year	
Module Title			
Module Leader			
Module Assessment		Weighting	
Nature of allegation			
Please tick as appropriate. One box must be ticked in order for this allegation to be processed. For further details for each category please utilise the guidance within the CoP			
	Complete plagiarism		
	Partial plagiarism		
	Self-plagiarism (or duplication of work)		
	Collusion		
	Falsification of statements/evidence/transcripts		
	Impersonation of another candidate		
	Irregularity of behaviour in examinations		
	Other (please provide details in the space below)		
Was this the students first or second attempt at the assignment?			

Supporting Evidence

Please ensure **all** of the following are attached. The allegation cannot be processed with this information.

	The piece of work subject to the allegation
	Assessment brief
	Unbiased mark (the mark that would have been awarded had no plagiarism, cheating or unfair means taken place)
	Estimated percentage of work affected by plagiarism, cheating or unfair means (where appropriate the similarity index on Turnitin can be utilised here)
	Original sources (where appropriate the Turnitin report will provide sufficient evidence)
	Rationale for the allegation
	Any other relevant information (e.g. report from Admissions staff/Exam invigilator)
Have you included the Turnitin Originality Report? (Delete as applicable)	Yes / No / No report
Signature of Module Leader	
Received by HE Administrator (signature)	
Date	

Office Use Only:-

Allegation not proven	No evidence provided	Other (with details)
	Unsatisfactory rationale	
	Insufficient evidence provided	
Allegation proven	Details of Board recommendations:	