



PROCEDURE 2.1 ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

Prepared by	Ian Fleming Ercan Erkus	Reviewed by	Selin Doyan Ercan Erkus Erhan Yurdakul	Approved by	Canan E. Celik
Review No	9	Next Review Date	August 2025	Approved on	03.09.2024

Procedure issued: April 2014

Procedure owner: Principal / CEO

- ❖ This procedure is shared with our students and/or can be obtained:
 - on our website <https://docklandsacademy.co.uk/policies-and-procedures>,
 - on the desktops of all computers in the library on the top floor,
 - by emailing us at info@docklandsacademy.co.uk in the case of remote learning.
- ❖ Also, our students are informed about the related main aspects of the procedure in the Student Handbooks, Induction Seminar and Learning Agreement.
- ❖ The procedure is reviewed and monitored on a regular basis for currency and fitness as part of our Annual 1.9 Policy and Procedures Review.

1. Background: Examples of Academic Misconduct

1.1 The Academy needs to ensure that all assessments are equitable, valid and reliable (*revised UK Quality Code - 2018*).

1.2 The OIA *Good Practice Framework: Disciplinary Procedures* provides examples of academic misconduct, which include:

- Plagiarism (Including misuse of AI)
- copying another students' work
- falsifying data
- collusion
- contract cheating
- impersonation during examinations
- cheating in examinations
- submitting fraudulent mitigating circumstances claims

1.3 Cheating in assessments of all kinds for the award of a certificate or diploma is fraud. A student who copies other people's work is passing off something as their own when it belongs in reality to someone else. A qualification is awarded when a person has achieved a certain body of knowledge and acquired certain high-level skills. If the student has not actually gained that knowledge or cannot demonstrate those skills, because in fact s/he had misled the assessors about the extent of her/his accomplishment, then the qualification cannot be treated by employers or others as a reliable indicator. As a consequence, the award will be devalued for all those who have earned it honestly.

1.4 For these reasons, the Academy has a duty to all its students and to its awarding bodies to ensure that all certificates and diplomas are earned by students by their own efforts and not by



any form of cheating. Consequently, there are penalties for any student who commits an act of academic misconduct, ranging from failure in the module to exclusion from the course of study. There are also intermediate requirements to resit or retake a module, which would cost the student a substantial additional investment of time and money.

1.5 Practical examples are provided below. This is *not* an exhaustive list. During induction they will be explained to new students.

2. Investigations

Investigations of suspected academic misconduct may take place in three stages which may vary depending on the student[s] involved. The three stages of dealing with suspected academic misconduct are outlined below:

1	In the first event of suspected academic misconduct the student is informed in writing that their work is not fit for purpose and is returned. The student is allowed a resubmission attempt. Tutor support is made available to coach the student in assignment-writing skills.
2	In the second event of suspected academic misconduct (in the student[s] second term), the student is informed in writing that their work is not fit for purpose and is returned. The student is allowed a resubmission attempt. The student must also attend mandatory training sessions with the appointed tutor for assignment-writing support.
3	In the third event of suspected academic misconduct (in the student[s] third term), the student is informed in writing that the situation may be escalated to a panel for a formal investigation to be held. The panel may use the penalty structure to make their judgement in section 3, 4 and 6 of this procedure.

3. Types of Academic Misconduct in Time-constrained Examinations

The normal penalties for each offence are set out in the right-hand column in the table below. A reprimand will be issued in cases where the Panel substantiates academic misconduct, and the seriousness of the mitigating factors justifies a reduction in the penalty from penalty level 2 to Penalty 1.

	Offence	Penalty
1	Removing any script, paper, or other official stationery (whether completed or not) from the examination room, unless specifically authorised by an invigilator or examiner.	1
2	Introduction or use of devices of any kind other than those specifically permitted in the rubric of the paper.	2
3	Communicating with another student or with any third party other than the invigilator/examiner during an examination test.	2
4	Possession/or limited use of crib sheets, revision notes etc. at any time during an examination or test.	2
5	Having obtained special examination arrangements by making false declarations.	2
6	During an examination or test, copying or attempting to copy the work of another student, whether by overlooking his or her work, asking him or her for information, or by	2
7	Possession and extensive use of crib sheets, revision notes etc. at any time during an examination or test.	3
8	Obtaining access to an unseen examination or test prior to the start of an examination/test.	3



9	Attempting to persuade another member of the Academy (student, staff or invigilator) to participate in actions which would breach these rules.	4
10	Taking into an examination a pre-written examination script for submission and exchanging it for a blank examination script.	4
11	Being party to any arrangement whereby a person other than the candidate represents, or intends to represent, the candidate in an examination or test.	4
12	Where students have previously committed an offence where penalty 2 or 3 is awarded, students shall receive penalty 4 for any subsequent allegations that would merit a penalty 2 or 3.	4
13	A penalty of exclusion shall be applied where a student has previously received a penalty 4 under these Regulations or where a second allegation is upheld within one semester that each individually equate to penalty 4.	5
14	Being party to any other arrangement that would constitute a breach of these rules.	See *note
<i>*Note: The penalty will correspond to the nature of the offence and will be in accordance with penalties outlined for each of the above</i>		

4. Types of academic misconduct in coursework

A reprimand will be issued where the Panel substantiates academic misconduct, and the seriousness of the mitigating factors justifies a reduction in the penalty from penalty level 2 to penalty 1.

	Offence	Penalty
1	Making available work that can be passed off or presented as the work of another student.	2
2	Having obtained special consideration for the submission of coursework by making false declarations.	2
3	Isolated use of quotes or close paraphrasing without the use of quotation marks/grades and referencing.	2
4	Representation of work produced in collaboration with another person or persons as the work of a single student.	3
5	The presentation of data in laboratory work, projects etc. based on work purporting to have been carried out by the student but which has been invented, altered or falsified.	3
6	Prevalent use of quotes or close paraphrasing amounting to at least 20% of the total word count, without the use of quotation marks/grades and referencing.	3
7	Commissioning another person to complete work, which is then submitted as a student's own work. This could include the use of professional essay writing services or essay banks.	4
8	Stealing another student's work and submitting it as the student's own work.	4
9	Attempting to persuade another member of the Academy (student or staff) to participate in actions which would breach these Regulations.	4
10	Where students have previously committed an offence where penalty 2 or 3 is awarded, students shall receive penalty 4 for any subsequent allegations that would merit a penalty 2 or 3.	4



11	A penalty of exclusion shall be applied where a student has previously received a penalty 4.	5
12	Misuse of AI as explained in DAL Procedure 2.8 Plagiarism / Section 2.7 examples	See *note.
13	Being party to any other arrangement that would constitute a breach of these Regulations.	
*Note: The penalty will correspond to the nature of the offence and will be in accordance with penalties outlined for each of the above.		

5. Academic Judgement

Identifying suspected academic misconduct and making decisions on disciplinary cases often involves academic judgment. Questions involving academic judgment:

- Is the standard of work so out of line with the student's other work that it suggests cheating?
- Are ideas copied from someone else's work?
- Is any plagiarism major or minor?
- Do the student's notes support the case that the work is theirs?

In evaluating evidence, VARCS can be used as a helpful guide:

Valid: Is the evidence relevant to learning outcomes and assessment criteria? It is important to show how the evidence is relevant. For example, a photograph can be useful; however, it needs to be annotated, or a short professional discussion completed to explain what the picture shows and how it relates to a learner's performance.

Authentic: Is the evidence the learner's own work? It is good practice to have a statement from the learner confirming that the work presented is their own. An assessor who has worked with a learner throughout their qualification will understand how the learner writes and uses language. The assessor can use their knowledge to ensure that the evidence presented is the learner's own work.

Reliable: Assess whether the evidence truly reflects the learner's level of knowledge and performance. If assessing knowledge, ensure that the learner has written the content in their own words. If competence is being evaluated, consider whether further evidence can be produced to support an observation or witness testimony.

Current: Check whether the evidence meets current legislation or processes. If the evidence presented is over 12 months old, support it with information relating to the learner's Continuing Professional Development (CPD).

Sufficient: Ensure enough content in either knowledge or through performance to meet learning outcomes. Check whether it meets command verbs, and the requirements or amplification as required. If workplace evidence is asked for, ensure it comes from the learner at work.



6. Standard List of Penalties

- **Penalty 1:** Reprimand, a formally recorded warning kept on the student's record with Academic Head's discretion.
- **Penalty 2:** Failure in item of assessed work, with right to resit. The assessed work may be recorded as 'graded as Unclassified'.
- **Penalty 3:** Failure in the unit[s], without right to resit. The student may have to register for the same or an alternative unit[s].
- **Penalty 4:** Failure in the unit[s], without right to resit (the student may have to register for the same or an alternative unit[s]) and a possible suspension for 2 semesters commencing at the start of the next full semester depending on the nature of their misconduct.
- **Penalty 5:** Exclusion.
A signed copy of a note confirming understanding of the procedure must be given to the student and another copy kept in the student's file.

7. Related Documents

7.1 Policies

- 2 Academic Management
- 5 Student Support, Engagement and Learning Resources
- 7 Information

7.2 Procedures

- 1.5 Equal Opportunities
- 1.7 Data Protection
- 1.9 Review and Revision of Policies and Procedures
- 2.2 Academic Regulations
- 2.4 Appeals
- 2.5 Complaints
- 2.6 Self-Assessment and Annual Programme Monitoring
- 2.7 Program Design and Approval
- 2.1 Plagiarism
- 2.9 Academic References for Students
- 2.10 Special Circumstances Affecting Study
- 2.11 Pearson Registration
- 2.12 Contingency and Adverse Effects
- 2.13 Access and Participation Statement
- 3.6 Internal Verification
- 4.4 Attendance Monitoring
- 4.6 Student Induction
- 4.7 Student Disciplinary
- 5.1 Student Code of Conduct
- 5.3 Equality, Diversity and Special Needs
- 7.1 Review and Sign off PI
- 7.4 HE Public Information

7.3 Student Terms and Conditions

7.4 External Reference Points

- Office for Students (OfS) Requirements and Guidance at [Advice and guidance - Office for Students](#)
- UK Quality Code Advice & Guidance – Concerns, Complaints and Appeals at <https://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/quality-code/advice-and-guidance/concerns-complaints-and-appeals>
- UK Quality Code Advice & Guidance – Assessment at <https://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/quality-code/advice-and-guidance/assessment>
- Higher Education Code of Governance (Committee of University Chairs, December 2014) at <https://www.universitychairs.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/CUC-HE-Code-of-Governance-publication-final.pdf>
- Association of Employment and Learning Providers (AELP) principles of Good Governance for Independent Training Providers at <https://www.aelp.org.uk/media/2595/code-of-governance->



[final-sept-2018.pdf](#)

- **OIA The Good Practice Framework: Handling Students Complaints and Academic Appeals** at <https://www.oiahe.org.uk/media/1859/oia-good-practice-framework.pdf>
- **OIA Disciplinary Procedures** at <https://www.oiahe.org.uk/media/2045/good-practice-framework-disciplinary-procedures-section.pdf>
- **UKCISA Code of Ethics** at <https://www.ukcisa.org.uk/Membership/Codes-of-practice/Code-of-ethics>
- **Equality Act – 2010** at <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/15/contents>
- **BTEC Centre Guide to Plagiarism** at <chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://qualifications.pearson.com/content/dam/pdf/Support/Quality%20Assurance/btec-centre-guide-to-plagiarism.pdf>
- **pearson-ai-centre-staff-guidance** at <chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://qualifications.pearson.com/content/dam/pdf/Support/Work%20based%20learning/pearson-ai-centre-staff-guidance.pdf>
- **JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres/ Section 5.3 (k)** at chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/Gen_regs_approved_centres_24-25_FINAL.pdf



Appendix 1

ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT REPORT FORM

This form is intended to report incidents of suspected academic misconduct arising from one, or multiple, submissions for a single assessment on a single course.

PART ONE: For completion by the member of staff reporting the incident.

1. STAFF DETAILS

Name of staff member reporting the suspected offence	
Role (e.g., Lecturer, Assessor)	
Date of submission to Academic Head	

2. STUDENT WORK DETAILS

Course (Title / code / credits etc.)	
Name of student work (Unit)	
Submission	Resubmission
Supporting documents A copy of each piece of affected work submitted by each student A copy of each piece of source material that may have been additionally plagiarised.	
Incident Details <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • should allow both the nature and extent of areas of concern to be located quickly and unambiguously. • In some cases, the description on the form may suffice; in other cases, it may be necessary to highlight the relevant sections of the submissions and/or source material. • In this context 'multiple' refers to where there are pieces of work submitted for the same assessment that match each other i.e. suspected collusion/plagiarism among students taking the same course.) 	
reasons for suspecting academic misconduct and details of evidence gathered to date. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please include only factual, impartial statements: do not speculate on potential motivations for the suspected misconduct. • Make an academic judgement and describe both the nature and extent of areas of concern. 	



- Please remember that if the cases are formally investigated the student(s) will see the report.
- The 'nature' of issues might include for example, presence of verbatim or closely paraphrased text, use of unattributed sources, exam misconduct, self-plagiarism, secondary citation, etc.
- The 'extent' of issues should indicate of the proportion of the work affected by potential academic misconduct; for example, the proportion of pages of work affected.
- Raw similarity scores from Turnitin should not be relied on for this as they constitute evidence only if contextualised.

PART TWO: For completion by the Academic Head

4. ACADEMIC HEAD DECISION

Please tick the relevant box. In the case of more than one student, please duplicate the chart below as necessary.

Student Name / Surname	Student ID	Programme	Enrolment Date
1ST ATTEMPT	2ND ATTEMPT	3RD ATTEMPT	4TH ATTEMPT
1st Reprimand Letter	2nd Reprimand Letter	3rd Reprimand Letter	
The student(s) has been given the right to update the related section of their assignment and submit again			
The student(s) has been referred but awarded with resubmission right with a cap, where they can receive PASS grade utmost			
The student(s) fails for the related unit and will not be awarded with resubmission right			
Academic Misconduct Panel will be called for			

Academic Staff Signature :

Student Signature :

Date :