HIGHER EDUCATION ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT POLICY
2024-2025

Contents

1.   Context

1.1   This policy is based on the expectations and core practices of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (2018) and the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) Good Practice Framework for Disciplinary Procedures (2018).

1.2   The College seeks to promote a strong understanding by students of academic integrity and practice. It expects all students to apply academic conventions for citing and acknowledging the work of others.

1.3   Attempts to gain unfair advantage or to cheat are considered Academic Misconduct and are taken very seriously. Academic Misconduct is activity which can be interpreted as an attempt to gain unfair advantage, for example by passing off the work of others as the student's own. In cases of serious cheating, the most severe penalty is being required to withdraw without a degree or exit award.

2.   Introduction

2.1   Chichester College Group works in partnership with a number of Higher Education Institutes (HEI). Each awarding body and validating HEI has their own specific course regulations and guidelines which constitute part of the partnership agreements within the context of QAA's UK Quality Code. This policy relates specifically to Pearson Higher National qualifications.

2.2   Further guidance from awarding institutions policies and procedures regarding Academic Misconduct are available on the link below:

Section: Academic Regulations & Policies | HE Information Pages | CCGOnline (chichester.ac.uk)

3.   Scope and Objectives

Objective 1: There are clear expectations of academic integrity for students and staff
Objective 2: To promote clear decision making and behaviour in an academic context and reflect acceptable academic practice.
Objective 3: The process of academic misconduct is clear accessible and actively promoted
Objective 4: There is clear guidance on the different types of Academic Misconduct
Objective 4: Students have clear guidance on standards of conduct expected in the

preparation of coursework and the consequences of academic malpractice

Objective 5: Students have clear guidance to appeal against academic misconduct decisions

The expected impact is that all students have clear, and consistent guidance on what constitutes Academic Misconduct and the consequences of Academic Misconduct.

4.   Monitoring arrangements

4.1   The operation of the policy, including academic appeals will be monitored through the Higher Education Management Committee and evaluated by the Higher Education Board.

4.2   Where amendments to the policy are required, a paper will be submitted to the Higher Education Board for consideration before the beginning of the following academic year.

5. Communication

5.1   The policy will be available on the CCG Website and available to all staff and a link to the policy will be included in all student handbooks and on the course CCG On-line pages and the HE Student Landing page.

5.2   The student version of this policy will also be available on the HE Policy page, on the college intranets.

5.3   All students will be informed that the policy exists and will discuss it with their study programme leaders during induction.

6.   Academic Malpractice

6.1   All assessable items must be the candidate's own work; where this is not so the Exam Board will deal with case as one of academic malpractice. All reported allegations of Academic Misconduct will be investigated, though the College will consider whether first occurrences can be categorised as Poor Academic Practice and used as a learning opportunity, taking into account the stage of study concerned.

6.2   Poor Academic Practice normally arises through a lack of following academic conventions by a student not yet familiar with the assessment practices of the College. Hence their work may include un-attributed or incorrectly referenced material that is very similar to the original source. The procedure for Poor Academic Practice will include advice for the student on good academic practice, but repeated instances will be considered Academic Misconduct.

7.   Definitions of Academic Misconduct

7.1   Academic malpractice is cheating: it is when a person (or people) trick, defraud or deceive others. It includes but is not limited to the following:

7.1.1   Collusion: where a student works in a fraudulent manner with another (or others) being assessed independently (either wholly or in part) in the same module.

7.1.2   Plagiarism: to 'take and use another person's thoughts, writings, inventions as one's own' (Oxford English Dictionary). All quotations must use the Harvard APA referencing system.

7.1.3   Commissioning: getting another person(s) to complete work which is subsequently claimed as the student's own work.

7.1.4   Impersonation: where somebody undertakes an examination or assessment posing as another person.

7.1.5   Syndication: the submission of substantially similar piece(s) of work by two or more students, either in the same institution or in a number of institutions, either at the same time, or at different times.

7.1.6   Falsification of data: where data has been invented, altered, copied or obtained by unfair means.

7.1.7   Aiding and abetting: where a student assists another student in any form of dishonest academic practice.

7.1.8 Duplication: Where a student submits work for assessment that is the same as, or broadly similar to, work submitted earlier for academic credit, without acknowledgement of the previous submission.

7.1.9 Cheating in an invigilated examination: Where a student copies from unauthorised material or from another student's script within an examination room, communicates with another person during an examination, consults information or individuals while absent from the examination room, or attempts to gain a higher grade by fraudulent means.

7.1.10 Ghosting: Where a student submits as their own, work that has been done as a whole or in part by another person on their behalf, or deliberately makes available or seeks to make available material to another student with the intention that the material is to be used by the other student to commit Academic Misconduct.

7.1.11 Unethical Behaviour: Conduct which deviates from accepted ethical behaviour, including failure to gain ethical approval, coercion or bribery of project participants, breach of confidentiality or improper handling of privileged or private information on individuals gathered during data collection.

7.1.12 Professional misconduct: where, in the course of their assessed work, students on professional courses act in a manner which breaches the relevant professional Code of Conduct.

8. Misconduct duties

8.1 In all cases of academic misconduct or any other form of attempting to secure unfair advantage, Chichester College Group confirms a Member of the HE Quality Team will be responsible for initial investigations of alleged academic misconduct by any student undertaking a Pearson Higher National module all cases must be investigated and dealt with on a formal basis.

8.2 General Considerations:

8.2.1 Students may be found guilty of academic misconduct whether or not there has been any intention to deceive; that is, a judgement that negligence has occurred is sufficient to determine guilt.

8.2.2 Students have a duty to inform themselves of the Assessment Policy and Procedures and of the academic conventions used in the College for correctly citing and acknowledging the work of others, including the correct use of quotation marks, and the regulations governing examinations. For advice on correct referencing see programme handbooks, referencing information and relevant websites.

8.2.3 Depending on their nature and severity, alleged academic misconduct will be dealt with by the HE Team.

8.2.4 When academic misconduct is alleged, a student is required either to attend a meeting arranged to discuss the alleged misconduct with a member of the HE Team or if they do not wish to attend to submit a written response to the allegation 48 hours before the date of the meeting. If the student attends the meeting, they may bring a member of the Students' Union executive to help him or her in presenting his or her case. A meeting may proceed in the absence of the student (and their representative) provided that the member of the HE Quality Team concerned is satisfied that due notice has been given to the student

8.2.5 In some instances, such as allegations relating to collusion or group submissions, it may be necessary and appropriate for a member of the HE Quality Team to see more than one student at a time

8.2.6 If an allegation of an academic misconduct has been proven, the student will be invited to disclose any further cases which they wish to be taken into consideration as part of the same misconduct. Students are warned that all undisclosed misconduct which comes to light will be treated as subsequent misconduct, potentially carrying heavier penalties.

8.2.7 In determining the penalty for an academic misconduct, any previous confirmed academic misconduct will be taken into account. When more than one misconduct is considered at the same time the misconduct will normally all be considered as a first

misconduct if the student has not previously been found guilty of academic misconduct. A subsequent academic misconduct may occur from the point at which a student is found guilty of a first misconduct.

8.2.8   If a student is given an opportunity to resubmit work having been found to have committed academic misconduct; any further allegations made about the resubmitted piece of work will be treated as subsequent misconduct.

8.2.9   Students are reminded that the penalties for academic misconduct may be very severe, especially those for any subsequent misconduct (i.e. misconduct identified after any previous misconduct has been confirmed), including requiring a student to withdraw or determining that a qualification may not be awarded. Where necessary the relevant Professional Body will also be informed.

8.2.10 Where a student has a penalised mark for work as a result of an academic misconduct the penalty will not be carried forward if the student repeats a year. However, the record of the misconduct is kept on the student's record and the academic misconduct database, and any further misconduct will be classified as subsequent misconduct. Where necessary, the relevant Professional Bodies will be informed.

8.2.11 Where the alleged misconduct involves an alleged breach of the College's behaviour policy, the case must be referred to the Head of Student Services.

8.1.12 Where academic misconduct has been alleged and a student has withdrawn, or is required to withdraw, from the College for reasons not related to the allegation; the Academic Misconduct Procedures will be completed. If the student is found to have committed an academic misconduct, a notional penalty will be allocated, and a record made of the outcome. The outcome will be communicated to the student in writing.

9.   Artificial Intelligence and Academic Integrity

9.1   Academic integrity is an underlying principle of research and academic practice. Students are expected to demonstrate their development as an independent learner, researcher and critical thinker, including maintaining good academic practice. This involves completing studies honestly and ethically, having respect for the work of others and recognising their responsibility to ensure fair assessment.

9.2   The overarching purpose of assessment is for students to demonstrate their understanding and ability to analyse and apply knowledge gained to their assessors. Passing off someone or something's work as their own, such as claiming authorship of machine generated content (including text, code and creative works) means that they are not demonstrating their own skills and learning. As well as limiting opportunities to develop as a learner, it is also highly unethical.

9.3   When using AI tools to support learning and in the development of student work students must maintain good academic practice. This will include:

- Acknowledgment of AI sources through appropriate referencing where students have used content as an information source alongside other reading and acknowledging how and when AI has been used to inform the approach to the assessment or as part of the writing process.
- Being clear about where AI has informed or supported work will allow students to demonstrate the development of their learning while avoiding academic misconduct.

9.4   There are many different ways that students may have used AI tools in the preparation of an assessment, including helping students to create a basic structure for writing or generating initial ideas around a topic. While students may not have used the content directly as a source of information in a quotation or citation, applying AI in these ways, means students have used it as a tool in the creation of assessed work. To maintain good academic practice and the fairness of assessment students must acknowledge this contribution.

9.5   Where AI has been used students should:

9.5.1 Name the AI technologies used and summarise how they have used them

For example:

- I acknowledge the use of <insert name(s) and url> to generate information for background research and at the drafting stage of the writing process with the creation of an outline structure for this essay.
- I acknowledge the use of <insert name(s) and url> to identify improvements in the writing style.
- I acknowledge the use of <insert name(s) and url> as an information source to generate materials that were included within my final assessment in my own words.
- I acknowledge the use of <insert name(s) and url> to create the images included in this presentation.
- No content generated by AI technologies has been presented as my own work
- Describe how the information or materials were generated
- Provide a description of the prompt or question used, the output generated, and how students modified the material for inclusion in their assessment.

9.5.2 Students should also include the material generated an appendix at the end of their work.

For example:

- Prompts used with <AI name>: list prompts
- Output generated: Provide a copy of the output created
- The output was modified as follows: briefly explain the changes made
- Provide a reference

9.6   Where a student is suspected of academic misconduct using AI to create all or part of an assessment the students will be asked to demonstrate their understanding of the topic through a professional conversation, Viva or presentation.

10.   Academic Malpractice procedure

10.1   The HE Quality Manager acting on behalf of CCG shall have the power, taking into account the circumstances of the case, to carry out a full investigation and where required hold investigatory meetings to uncover all related facts in order to:

- Determine that no misconduct has been committed
- Determine that misconduct has been committed and issue penalties

10.2   The HE Quality Manger will:

- Inform in writing the student whose case has been referred about the nature of the alleged misconduct
- Check if any there have been any previous occurrences which will be taken into account
- Hold investigatory meetings where required in order to fully understand the circumstances and support decisions made
- Inform the student of the outcome within 10 working days and the student's right to appeal against the decision within 5 days.
- Confirm in writing the decision in respect of any case and grounds for the decision (a copy must be given to the student and a copy must be held on the Course Managers File) in line with the standard closure of procedures letter.
- Inform Pearsons annually of the number of cases dealt with

10.3   Investigatory meetings:

Investigatory meeting must be fully minuted and where students are witnesses to facts, the investigation will allow the investigated student to question witnesses to support their defence

10.4   Retrospective Misconduct:

Misconduct identified post completion of the qualification which has led to the former student having an unfair advantage over their peers may lead to the full retrospective removal of the qualification.

11. Appeal Procedure

11.1   The student has the right of appeal to the next level of review at each stage in the procedure. In the event of an appeal, they may choose to be accompanied by a friend, a responsible peer or student advocate. An appeal should be submitted within 5 working days of the outcome being notified to the student and should be heard within 5 working days after the appeal is received. The appeal must state the grounds upon which there is disagreement with the college's decision. An appeal against the outcome of an offence considered as serious malpractice will be heard by the Vice Principal.

11.2   Students studying programmes validated by Partner Universities will follow appeal procedures as set out by the appropriate universities. For further guidance on appeals at validating Universities please use the link below:

Section: Academic Regulations & Policies | HE Information Pages | CCGOnline (chichester.ac.uk)

11.3   Grounds for appeal

The appeal stage may involve a review of the formal stage, or a complete rehearing of the case. It is good practice to set out the grounds on which a student may appeal.

- That the procedures were not followed properly
- That the decision maker(s) reached an unreasonable decision
- That the student has new material evidence that they were unable, for valid reasons, to provide earlier in the process
- That there is bias or reasonable perception of bias during the procedure
- That the penalty imposed was disproportionate, or not permitted under the procedures.

11.4   Outcomes of appeal

11.4.1 If the student successfully appeals the outcome of an academic misconduct process, the student's case may need to be reconsidered by a board of examiners. The student will be issued with a written outcome that explains what action has been taken as a result of the appeal. A completion of procedures letter will also be issued.

11.4.2 If the appeal is not upheld or is not permitted to proceed under the grounds of appeal, a Completion of Procedures Letter should be sent to the student within 28 days. This should include, or be accompanied by, an explanation of the decision reached and the reasons for it, in straightforward language. This will help the student decide whether to pursue the matter further.

The letter should set out:
- their right to submit a complaint to the OIA for review
- the time limit for doing so
- where and how to access advice and support.

12. Status of this policy

12.1 The policy was approved by the Higher Education Board and supersedes all previous documentation.

12.2 The operation of this policy will be kept under review by the Higher Education Quality Manager

12.3 It may be reviewed and varied from time to time by the Higher Education Board. 10.4 This policy has been impact assessed to ensure that it does not adversely affect staff on the grounds of their disability, gender or race.

Policy review area	Higher Education
Lead Manager/Owner	Vice Principal – HE
Approval level	Group Leadership Team/Corporation
Approval date	September 2024
Review cycle	Annually
Next review	September 2025

Appendix A - Useful links to avoid Academic Misconduct

- UAL Guide to Avoiding Academic Misconduct
- Academic Misconduct by Brighton SU - Issuu
- www.citethemrightonline.com
- Free Harvard Referencing Generator [Updated for 2024]
- Preventing Plagiarism - Plagiarism.org
- University of Portsmouth Library - Referencing @ Portsmouth
- Section: Study Skills | HE Information Pages | CCGOnline

Appendix B - Policy for the Use of ChatGPT and AI Chatbots

Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to provide guidelines for the appropriate use of ChatGPT and AI chatbots to enhance student learning and academic performance.

Definition

ChatGPT and AI chatbots are AI language models that can assist students in expanding their knowledge, improving their academic performance, and enhancing their writing skills.

Eligibility

ChatGPT and AI chatbots can be used by college students and staff members in the college for educational purposes as a research tool.

Guidelines

- ChatGPT and AI chatbots can be used to ask questions and gain insight on relevant topics related to any academic courses. Research
- ChatGPT and AI chatbots should not be used to complete assignments or coursework on behalf of the student or used in replacement
- ChatGPT and AI chatbots should not be used to cheat, plagiarise, or engage in any form of academic misconduct.
- Students and staff members should use their own judgment when relying on ChatGPT and AI chatbots, as they are AI language models and not a substitute for professional advice or human interaction.
- Students and staff members should cite/reference any information obtained from ChatGPT and AI chatbots appropriately in their work.

Like all research tools, thought should always be given to the integrity of the information and should be evaluated by the learner as to the robustness and validity of it; used in conjunction with other sources.

Support

The college will provide support and resources for students and staff members to use ChatGPT and AI chatbots appropriately and effectively in their learning and teaching. This includes providing

guidance on how to use ChatGPT and AI chatbots, as well as promoting academic integrity and proper citation practices.

Review

This policy will be reviewed periodically to ensure that it remains up-to-date and relevant to the needs of students and staff members using ChatGPT and AI chatbots in the college.