

Academic Misconduct policy and procedure

List of appendices:

Appendix A - Academic Misconduct Penalties (AMBeR Tariff)

1. Context

Art Academy London regards any action by a student which may result in an unfair advantage, such as cheating, collusion, falsification, ghosting, personation and plagiarism, as a serious academic offence. All students are expected to maintain academic integrity, respect other members of the academic community, both within and outside the Academy, and uphold the ethical values of that community when producing work. Students should be made aware that this extends beyond ensuring that work presented is their own and may include encouraging or enabling plagiarism, including the reporting of any instances of misconduct of which they become aware.

It is the student's responsibility to ensure that all work presented for summative assessment is their own, and that any work (e.g. collaboration) or opinions of others are appropriately acknowledged. Students are required to submit a declaration of authenticity along with submissions for summative assessments. Students should not submit any coursework which has been previously submitted for another module and fully declare the roles of any other people who might have been involved in the production of collaborative work (regardless of whether they are fellow students or not). Where a student is unsure of what is acceptable, guidance should be sought from tutor(s) or the Academic Team before proceeding.

Guidance and definitions of academic misconduct are provided in the student handbook, along with an outline of the policy, procedure and penalties involved. Further to this, students are introduced to the subject at induction and instructed on how to denote ownership of written passages, ideas, images, sound or performance which are not their own during modules. Students will be asked at submission to sign (or digitally submit) a statement confirming that all work produced is their own. All written work submitted for summative assessments will be processed through Turnitin software to check for plagiarism.

Obviously students obtain ideas from other sources during their research and adapt these ideas to their own requirements, making the distinction between this and academic misconduct often quite difficult to define. In this regard, research/sketchbooks and files are important, because these evidence the development of individual ideas and sources of inspiration, so that tutors can trace the train of thought. Tutors should be aware that the best proof of authenticity is the evidence in sketchbooks or research files, or the progress which has been noticed at tutorials, or during daily studio contact.

Students need to be made aware of the law around copyright, and although this is recognised as a grey area with regard to the appropriation of images in the creation of works of art, as artists and academics, students need to understand that a creator has the right to control the way their work can be used through copyright and the actions that can be taken against individuals for breach of copyright.

Any serious misconduct offence may be regarded as gross misconduct and may therefore lead to suspension pending a disciplinary hearing and possible expulsion. The Academy's Disciplinary Policy and Procedure may be invoked where gross misconduct is deemed to have taken place. In the event of an allegation/s of academic misconduct being proved after a student has been awarded credit or graduated, any credit, degree or other award that is held by the student may be revoked by the Academy.

2. Procedure

Any cases of suspected plagiarism must be passed to the Director of Academic Quality, Standards and Student Experience who will review the case along with the relevant Programme/ Pathway Leader. The student will be invited to attend a meeting where any academic penalty will be discussed with them. Substitution will not be allowed for any assessed work to which an academic penalty has been applied.

An informal meeting to allow the student an opportunity to justify the work, between the student, Programme/ Pathway Leader and the Director of Academic Quality, Standards and Student Experience, may be arranged with an Academic Administrator recording full minutes. Following discussion and the informal meeting (if applicable), the Programme/ Pathway Leader and Director of Academic Quality, Standards and Student Experience will decide if academic misconduct may have taken place. If it is decided that academic misconduct has not taken place, no further action is required.

If the Programme/ Pathway Leader and Director of Academic Quality, Standards and Student Experience decide that this may be a case of academic misconduct, the case will be put to the Academic Misconduct Panel for further investigation. The Programme/ Pathway Leader will present the case to the Academic Misconduct Panel. The Panel may use an appropriate detection facility (e.g. TurnItIn) to aid the investigation. The Panel may require the student to attend a meeting (the student must receive at least five days written notice). At the meeting the evidence will be presented to the student and their response recorded. The Panel will discuss the case to decide on the severity of the misconduct, considering any other prevailing circumstances, including attendance and any extenuating circumstances.

Where they are required or invited to attend an appeals panel meeting, students have the statutory right to be accompanied by a friend, representative of the student council or other suitable individual. However, it would not normally be reasonable for a student to insist on being accompanied by an individual whose presence would prejudice the meeting. The panel will not re-arrange meeting timings to facilitate companions; where individuals cannot attend original schedules the student is expected to appoint another suitable individual. The companion should be allowed to address the meeting to put and sum up the student's case, respond on behalf of the student to any views expressed at the meeting and confer with the student during the meeting. They do not, however, have the right to answer questions on the student's behalf, address the meeting if the student does not wish it or prevent the Academy from explaining their case.

At the end of the investigation, the Panel will write to the student to inform them of the outcome and the penalty to be applied appropriate to the severity of the academic misconduct. The Panel will also ensure that the appropriate arrangements are put in place, including any resubmissions and additional work deemed necessary.

2.1 Penalties

Where academic misconduct has been found, the action taken and the severity of the penalty applied will depend on the individual circumstances. The Academy employs penalties based on the AMBeR Tariff system for penalties for Open University validated awards (see **Appendix A**)

2.2 Academic Misconduct Panel

Remit

The remit for the Academic Misconduct Panel is:

- To investigate allegations of misconduct and dishonesty, considering evidence presented to it by the staff reporting the alleged academic misconduct and by the student against whom the allegation is made;
- to determine whether misconduct has occurred and, if so, the extent to which a student has attempted to gain unfair advantage (i.e. the severity of the misconduct);
- to determine the penalty which should be applied to the misconduct;
- to inform the Examination and Progression Board of its findings.

Membership:

- Director of Programmes (Chair)
- A Programme/ Pathway Leader (of a different programme to which the student is enrolled)
- Director of Academic Quality, Standards and Student Experience
- Academic Programme Manager (acting as Secretary)

Reports and Documentation

The Examination and Progression Board will receive a report on all cases of academic misconduct for that academic year.

3. Definitions

Definitions of what may constitute academic misconduct are set out below. Please note this is not an exhaustive list:

Plagiarism

- Representing another person's work or ideas as one's own (including text, data, images, sound and performance), for example by failing to follow convention in acknowledging sources, use of quotation marks, etc. This includes the unauthorised use of one student's work by another student and the commissioning, purchase and submission of a piece of work, in part or whole, as the student's own.
- Reproduction of published or unpublished (e.g. work of another student or the student's own work submitted for a previous module) material without acknowledgement of the author or source.
- Paraphrasing by, for instance, substituting a few words or phrases or altering the order of presentation of another person's work, or linking unacknowledged sentences or phrases with words of one's own.
- Copying directly from a text (book, magazine, internet or printed source) without reference to its author.
- Direct facsimile of an image, a sound or performance without due acknowledgement of its source.

Encouraging or enabling plagiarism: Making available, selling or advertising for sale student work in any form or by any means (print, electronic, recording or otherwise) so as to enable plagiarism, whether or not the work includes marks, comments or any other materials produced by a tutor, supervisor or other marker, unless prior consent has been given by the Academy. The offence of encouraging or enabling plagiarism includes the act of posting student work on to any public website, whether or not it is done with the intention of enabling or encouraging plagiarism.

Collusion

Collusion occurs when, unless with official approval (e.g. in the case of group projects), two or more students consciously collaborate in the preparation and production of work which is ultimately submitted by each in an identical, or substantially similar, form and/or is represented by each to be the product of his or her individual efforts. Collusion also occurs where there is unauthorised co-operation between a student and another person in the preparation and production of work which is presented as the student's own.

Falsification

- Claiming to have carried out any form of research which the student has not carried out.
- Falsification of results or other data.

Ghosting

- Submission of work presented as the student's own which has been purchased, commissioned or otherwise acquired from another person (including internet sellers).

Personation

- Assuming the identity of another student (of this or any other institution) with the intention of gaining an unfair advantage for that student.

- A student allowing another person to impersonate him/her in order to gain an unfair advantage.

4. Academic Misconduct procedures and penalties for internally awarded programmes

The same principles as outlined in the Academic misconduct policy for Open University validated awards apply to internally awarded programmes . However, procedures and penalties differ:

Where an offence of Plagiarism has been committed the following academic penalties may be applied:

- a. Disallowing any piece of assessed work, in whole or in part, to be counted for assessment purposes; or
- b. awarding any piece of assessed work a ‘capped’ mark (‘capped’ means that an upper limit is imposed on the mark); or
- c. for an assessment that has been approved to be included in the examinable assessment component, allowing ‘resubmission but with a ‘capped’ mark.

Any cases of suspected plagiarism must be passed to the Director of Academic Quality, Standards and Student Experience who will review the case along with the relevant Programme Leader. The Student will be invited to attend a meeting where any academic penalty will be discussed with them. Substitution will not be allowed for any assessed work to which an academic penalty has been applied.

Policies and documents that supplement and reference this document:

Quality Handbook
Student Handbook
Tutor Handbook
Student Disciplinary policy and procedure
Regulations for validated awards of the Open University

Version 3 September 2018 Approved by the Academic Board.

Appendix A - Academic Misconduct Penalties (AMBeR Tariff)

For all Open University validated programmes the AMBeR Tariff for penalties must be applied. *Points are assigned based on the following criteria:*

History	
1st time	100 points
2nd time	150 points
3rd or more 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

** This may be considered to be a separate form of academic malpractice

Level	
Level 4	70 points
Level 5	115 points
Level 6	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

Penalties are awarded based on points as below

Penalties (Summative Work*)

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

280 – 329	No further action beyond formal warning Assignment awarded 0% - resubmission required, with no penalty on mark
330 - 379	No further action beyond formal warning Assignment awarded 0% - resubmission required, with no penalty on mark Assignment awarded 0% - resubmission required but mark capped or reduced
380 - 479	Assignment awarded 0% - resubmission required but mark capped or reduced Assignment awarded 0% - no opportunity to resubmit
480 - 524	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	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+ 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

** Summative work is that which is submitted to published deadlines as part of a module and forms part of your overall grade or the award of credits.*

Formative work doesn't contribute to final grades or credit, but rather is work that is assessed for developmental purposes (ie draft essays)