

Somerset Centre for Integrated Learning Plagiarism and Cheating Policy and Procedures

Accountable Lead: Keith Ford		
Responsible Lead: Aimee Cordioli		
Date(s) of review(s)	Reviewed by	Date of next review
June 2007	Management Board	June 2008
June 2008	Management Board	June 2009
June 2009	Management Board	June 2010
June 2010	Management Board	June 2011
June 2011	Management Board	June 2012
June 2012	Management Board	June 2013
June 2013	Management Board	September 2014
July 2014	Management Board	July 2015
July 2015	Management Board	July 2016
August 2016	Management Board	August 2017
August 2017	Management Board	August 2018
August 2018	Management Board	August 2019
July 2019	Management Board	July 2020
May 2020	Management Board	May 2021
May 2021	Management Board	May 2022
<p>Process for monitoring and evaluation. Monitoring by Management Team with outcomes recorded in notes of meetings and periodic evaluation and review by Management Board.</p>		
<p>This Policy has been developed by Somerset Centre for Integrated Learning (SCIL), the training arm for Support Services for Education (SSE) part of Somerset County Council. All training programmes have a commitment to providing a supportive learning environment which enables all trainees who have chosen to study with SCIL to achieve their full potential.</p> <p>Appendix 1 – Study Centre</p> <p>Appendix 2 – Higher Education Courses</p>		

Introduction

This policy sets out to define the procedures to be followed in the event of any dispute or allegation regarding plagiarism.

Plagiarism is a specific form of cheating which applies to assignments completed by learners independently. It is the substantial, unacknowledged incorporation into a learner's work of materials derived from published or unpublished work by another person.

Examples of Plagiarism

- Extracts from another person's work without using quotation marks and/or acknowledgement of the source
- Summarising the work of another or using their ideas without acknowledgement of the source i.e. referencing
- Copying or using the work of another learner (past or present) with or without that person's knowledge or agreement
- Purchasing essays or downloading them from the internet to submit them as your own work.

Appendix 1 – Study Centres

Plagiarism Procedure

Investigations into allegations will be coordinated by the named Internal Quality Assurer (IQA) at SCIL, who will ensure the initial investigation is carried out within ten working days. If a learner is on an ILM or NCFE CACHE course, SCIL will inform the relevant Investigation and Compliance team of the potential plagiarism case within 10 working days.

The investigation will involve establishing the full facts and circumstances of any allegation. It should not be assumed that because an allegation has been made, it is true. Where appropriate, the individual concerned, and any potential witnesses will be interviewed and their version of events recorded on paper.

The individual will be:

- informed in writing of the allegation made against him or her
- informed what evidence there is to support the allegation
- informed of the possible consequences, should plagiarism be proven
- given the opportunity to seek advice (as necessary) and to provide a statement (if required)
- informed of the applicable appeals procedure, should a decision be made against him/her
- If the incident is proven to be plagiarism this will result in the learner being withdrawn from the qualification.

Preventing Plagiarism

SCIL will actively seek to support learners in guiding them to avoid the practice for example, advice on referencing and bibliographies are provided to all learners undertaking accredited qualifications.

Appendix 2 – Somerset SCITT

Cheating, Plagiarism, Collusion, Falsification or Deceit Policy

If a trainee is found to have cheated, plagiarised or attempted to gain an unfair advantage, through falsification or deceit, the Examiners shall have the authority to deem a trainee to have failed part or all of the assessment(s) and shall be empowered to determine whether or not the trainee should be permitted to be re-assessed. The Board of Examiners has the right to require a PGCE trainee found guilty of cheating or plagiarism to withdraw from the PGCE programme.

All proven cases of cheating or plagiarism and the action taken shall be reported by the Board of Examiners to the Management Board.

A copy of the current definitions and procedures is as follows:

Cheating, Plagiarism, Collusion, Falsification or Deceit Procedures Academic dishonesty and learner incompetence

1. Definition

1.1 All trainees are expected to adhere to standards of academic honesty in their study with the SCITT. Academic dishonesty is any attempt by a trainee to submit as her or his own work which has not been done by her or himself, or to give improper aid to another student in the completion of an assignment or to gain unfair academic advantage by infringement of examination regulations or by other improper means. Such academic dishonesty includes:

- 1.1.1 Plagiarism
- 1.1.2 Cheating
- 1.1.3 Collusion
- 1.1.4 Falsification
- 1.1.5 Deceit

1.2 Plagiarism includes:

The representation of the work, written or otherwise, of any person, including another trainee, or any institution, as the candidate's own. Examples of plagiarism are as follows:

- 1.2.1 the verbatim copying of another's work without acknowledgement
- 1.2.2 the close paraphrasing of another's work by simply changing a few words or altering the order of presentation, without acknowledgement
- 1.2.3 unacknowledged quotation of phrases from another's work
- 1.2.4 the deliberate and detailed presentation of another's concept as one's own
- 1.2.5 the act of using the ideas of another as one's own.

1.3 **Cheating includes:**

- 1.3.1 communicating with or copying from any other trainee during an examination/test or in connection with any other assessment
- 1.3.2 communicating during an examination with any person other than a properly authorised invigilator or another authorised member of staff
- 1.3.3 introducing any written or printed material into the room where the examination/test is taking place unless expressly permitted by the Board of Examiners
- 1.3.4 gaining access to unauthorised material during or before an assessment
- 1.3.5 in any other way the provision or assistance in the provision of false evidence of knowledge or understanding in assessments.

1.4 **Collusion includes:**

The conscious collaboration, without official approval, between two or more trainees or between a trainee(s) and another person in the preparation and production of work which is ultimately submitted by each to be the product of her or his individual efforts but which is in an identical or substantially similar form.

1.5 **Falsification includes:**

The presentation of fictitious or distorted data purported to have been obtained through laboratory work, surveys, projects, etc.

1.6 **Deceit includes:**

Seeking to achieve unfair advantage through the misrepresentation or non-disclosure of relevant information, including the failure to disclose if work submitted for assessment has been or will be used for other academic purposes.

- 1.7 **Learner Incompetence:**
Learner incompetence is recognised by Somerset SCITT to include:
- 1.7.1 Unreflective regurgitation of the thoughts or approaches of another author - an inability to free oneself from a received view
 - 1.7.2 Technical incompetence in referencing.
- It would be very unusual for learner incompetence to occur in a post graduate level course.
2. **Procedures for dealing with trainees accused of Academic Dishonesty**
- 2.1 **Establishing whether academic dishonesty has occurred:**
Where a trainee is suspected of academic dishonesty, the tutor should ask a colleague to either double mark or double check the work for which it is suspected that the student was dishonest. The tutor should then decide whether the student has been academically dishonest or whether it was a case of learner incompetence. Where the tutor is unclear which category the 'offence' falls into, they should consult the SD Programme Manager or SCITT Programme Managers.
- 2.2 The trainee should be sent a photocopy of their work with a letter attached:
- 2.2.1 In the case of learner incompetence, the letter should request that the student make an appointment to see the tutor.
 - 2.2.2 In the case of Academic Dishonesty, the letter should state that the work is being investigated in relation to possible Academic Dishonesty by the trainee and should have an outline of the procedure relating to this attached.
 - 2.2.3 Original work should be retained by the tutor (in the case of Learner Incompetence) or passed to the SD Manager or SCITT Programme Managers (in the case of Academic Dishonesty).
- 2.3 The tutor should meet the trainee accused of Learner Incompetence and explain the offence and the recommended penalty. The tutor should then report to the SD Programme Manager or SCITT Programme Managers and place a note on that student's file. The SD Programme Manager or SCITT Programme Managers should send a report of such incidents to the Board of Examiners.

- 2.4 Trainees accused of academic dishonesty will be interviewed by a Panel convened by the SD Programme Manager or SCITT Programme Manager and comprising: an independent chair (normally a senior adviser not involved in the SCITT scheme); the SCITT Programme Manager; and the SD Manager. Where either of these latter two is the tutor accusing the student of academic dishonesty a senior member of staff shall be on the panel in their place. The Panel shall take place as soon as possible after the academic dishonesty is detected. The tutor who suspects that the student has been academically dishonest will present the case to the Panel, normally in person. The student will be given the opportunity to put a case and may bring a 'friend' to this interview. Formal minutes will be taken of the interview. As far as possible, such interviews should take place before the Board of Examiners consideration of the case. If academic dishonesty is not detected until the vacation and the trainee is not available earlier, the interview with a Panel should take place in the first week of the following term so that outcomes can be reported to the next Board of Examiners.
- 2.5 Where a case of academic dishonesty has been established, the Board of Examiners shall judge the nature of the offence and exercise its discretion as appropriate to the case. It shall have the authority to deem the student to have failed in part or all of the assessment(s), to deem the unit/module to have been failed or to exclude the student from the Course. The Board may also determine whether or not the student should be permitted to be reassessed. If academic dishonesty is detected after an award has been confirmed, the award may be reconsidered.
- 2.6 Where a case of learner incompetence has been established, the normal penalty will be to award the work a mark reflecting the incompetence demonstrated.
- 2.7 Where evidence becomes available subsequent to the recommendation of the Board of Examiners, the case may be re-opened, and there is no time limit on this course of action.
- 2.8 All proven cases of academic dishonesty and the action taken shall be reported to the next meeting of the Management Board.