UK Versity
Education That Empowers Lives

PLAGIARISM AND ASSESSMENT MALPRATICE POLICY

EFFECTIVE DATE	:	**10 NOVEMBER 2014**
REVIEWED BY	:	**QUALITY MANAGER**
NEXT REVIEW	:	**NOVEMBER 2024**
POLICY NUMBER	:	**QA-09**

Plagiarism and Assessment Malpractice Policy

Purpose/Scope

- To have a policy in place to deal with Plagiarism and Assessment Malpractice

- To ensure that issues are dealt with in an open, fair and effective manner.

- To ensure that the centre provide appropriate deterrents and sanctions to minimise the risk of malpractice.

Aims:

- To identify and minimise the risk of malpractice or students.

- To respond to any incident of alleged malpractice promptly and objectively.

- To standardise and record any investigation of malpractice to ensure openness and fairness.

- To impose appropriate penalties and/or sanctions on students where incidents (or attempted incidents) of malpractice are proven.

- To protect the integrity of this centre and the qualifications it delivers.

Definitions/Terminology

Student Malpractice: Any action by the student, which has the potential to undermine the integrity and validity of the assessment of their work. (Plagiarism, collusion, cheating, etc.)

Plagiarism: Taking and using another's thoughts, writings, inventions, etc. as one's own.

Minor Acts of Student Malpractice: Handled by the assessor by, for example, refusal by the assessor to accept work for marking due to questions with possible plagiarism and student being made aware of malpractice policy. Student resubmits work in question.

Major Acts of Student Malpractice: Extensive copying/plagiarism, 2nd or subsequent offence, inappropriate for assessor to deal with.

Responsibilities

Centre: Seeks proactive ways to promote a positive culture that encourages students to take individual responsibility for their learning and respect the work of others.

Assessor: Responsible for designing assessment opportunities which limit the opportunity for malpractice and for checking the validity of the student's work.

Internal Verifier: Responsible for malpractice checks when internally verifying work.

Quality Nominee: Required to inform Edexcel of any acts of malpractice.

Heads of Centre or their nominees: Responsible for any investigation into allegations of malpractice.

Procedures

Addressing student malpractice:

UK Versity Online will see to minimise student malpractice by:

- Using the induction period and the student handbook to inform students of the centre's policy on malpractice and the penalties for attempted and actual incidents of malpractice.

- Promoting positive and honest study practices.

- Showing students the appropriate formats to record cited texts and other materials or information sources.

- Asking students to declare that their work is their own.

- Asking students to provide evidence that they have interpreted and synthesised appropriate information and acknowledged any sources used.

- Ensuring assessment procedures are developed which help to reduce and identify malpractice.

Definition of Malpractice by Students

This list is not exhaustive and the centre at its discretion may consider other instances of malpractice:

- Plagiarism of any nature.
- Collusion by working collaboratively with other students to produce work that is submitted as individual student work.
- Copying (including the use of ICT to aid copying).
- Deliberate destruction of another's work.
- Fabrication of results or evidence.
- False declaration of authenticity in relation to the contents of a portfolio or coursework.
- Impersonation by pretending to be someone else in order to produce the work for another
- Arranging for another to take one's place in an assessment/examination/test.

Dealing with malpractice:

In order to do this, the centre will:

Investigate in a fair and equitable form commensurate with the nature of the malpractice allegation. Where the offence involves other students they will also be involved in the investigation. The Principal will support such an investigation and all personnel linked to the allegation. It will proceed through the following stages:

1. The individual will be made fully aware at the earliest opportunity of the nature of the alleged malpractice and of the possible consequences should malpractice be proven.

2. The individual will be given the opportunity to respond to the allegations made.

3. The individual will be informed of the avenues for appealing against any judgment made.

4. All stages of the investigation will be documented.

5. If it is found that there has been a malpractice then the Awarding body will be informed. The Awarding Body will then advise UK Versity Online on further action.

Where malpractice is proven, this centre will apply penalties commensurate with the degree of malpractice. Malpractice will be dealt with through the Student Disciplinary Policy.

Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Assessments

Using AI, for example, ChatGPT to generate or modify content to evade plagiarism detection is deemed as malpractice.

Instances of AI misapplication encompass:

Replicating or rephrasing segments of AI-generated material to the extent that the work deviates from the student's original effort.

Duplicating or rephrasing entire AI-generated responses without proper attribution.

Employing AI to accomplish portions of an assessment in a manner that does not genuinely represent the student's individual work, including analysis, evaluation, or calculations.

Omitting to acknowledge and cite the utilization of AI tools as sources of information.

Presenting work with deliberately incomplete or deceptive references or bibliographies.

When submitting work for assessment, it is imperative that the student's efforts are genuine and entirely their own. Students are obligated to adhere to the principles encapsulated in the student code of conduct, often referred to as the "3 R's," and ensure that all submitted assignments are their original creations, suitable for evaluation.

If any portions of a student's work are directly sourced from AI-generated responses, it is the student's responsibility to acknowledge these sections. It is

important to understand that relying on AI-generated content does not allow students to demonstrate independent fulfilment of the marking criteria, and consequently, they will not receive credit for such sections.

Teachers and assessors are entrusted with the responsibility of only accepting work for assessment that they have reasonable confidence in as being the student's authentic effort. In cases where doubt arises regarding the authenticity of a student's work submitted for assessment, such as suspicions of AI-generated content not being acknowledged, it is incumbent upon educators to initiate an inquiry and take appropriate measures as necessary.

By taking proactive measures to confront the potential threat of AI-facilitated cheating, we can nurture a learning environment that remains steadfast in its commitment to upholding the tenets of academic honesty. Collectively, we can guarantee that technology enriches education without jeopardizing the core principles that distinguish our academic community.

Refer to ATHE, Ascentis, OTHM, Pearson, NCFE malpractice annexure for more details.