



Rambert School Academic Discipline Procedure

1. Definition and Expectations

1.1 Students are required to act with honesty and integrity in fulfilling requirements in relation to assessment of their academic progress. If a student fails to achieve good academic progress they may be guilty of either poor academic practice or academic misconduct:

- **Poor academic practice** can be dealt with within the marking criteria. It is expected that markers will use the ordinary marking procedures to provide the student with an appropriate mark for their performance, in accordance with the standard practice of awarding a lower mark for lower levels of achievement. For example, students who do not reference adequately should expect to lose marks
- **Academic misconduct** is any action that produces an improper advantage for the student in relation to his or her assessment or deliberately and unnecessarily disadvantages other students. It includes, but is not limited to, such offences as plagiarism, impersonation, collusion and disruption. It should be noted that sufficiently poor referencing which creates the impression of work being the student's own when it is not may be regarded as academic misconduct
- **Research Misconduct:** the School will investigate allegations of falsification, fabrication or deception committed during a research project

1.2 Rambert School takes very seriously any form of academic misconduct, including plagiarism and collusion.

2. The student's responsibilities.

At registration, students sign an undertaking to observe and comply with the School's Regulations, which embrace the rules on academic misconduct. In addition, students must declare on coversheets for all assessments and coursework, that the work they have submitted is their own. Cover sheets will be provided by the Head of Academic Studies at the time the assignment is set.

Students who are unclear about the rules regarding the use and referencing of other people's work or ideas should seek advice from the Head of Academic Studies well in advance of assignment deadlines.

3. Examples of Misconduct

The following are some examples of conduct which will be regarded as a breach of Rambert School's Academic regulations:-

3.1 Plagiarism

3.1.1 Plagiarism means reproducing in any work submitted for assessment or review (for example, essays, project reports, or dissertations) and any material derived from work authored by another without clearly acknowledging the source. Other types of plagiarism could include representing the ideas of another, or using another individual's intellectual conclusions or expressions. Taking or copying the work of others (ideas movements etc.) and presenting it as your own choreographic work, also constitutes plagiarism.

3.1.2 It should be noted that Rambert School regards plagiarism as a strict liability offence and so does not require evidence of intent to commit plagiarism in order to determine that an offence has occurred. However, where it is determined that the act of plagiarism has occurred as a result of poor academic practice, it is open to the panel to interpret the matter as constituting a minor offence.

3.1.3 The School makes information about the definition and seriousness of plagiarism offences available to students in Critical Studies lectures and in tutorials. This is also published in the School's Academic Information Handbook which is given to each student at Registration. It is the responsibility of the student to consider this carefully. Lack of understanding on behalf of the student will not be considered acceptable grounds in response to an allegation of plagiarism or when appealing a penalty imposed under the academic discipline procedures.

3.1.4 The identification of plagiarism is an academic judgment, based on the assessor's knowledge of the sources, of their practice in the discipline and of expectations for professional conduct. The Chair of the Academic Misconduct Panel, or the panel itself, may therefore determine that plagiarism has taken place even if the source has not been identified.

3.1.5 The School uses Turnitin software to identify potential plagiarism. The software is used as an initial indicator and may assist the Academic Misconduct Panel to determine whether plagiarism has been committed.

3.2. Duplication of material: reproducing in any submitted work any substantial amount of material used by that student in other work for assessment, either at Rambert School or elsewhere, without acknowledging that such work has been so submitted. For example:

3.3 Conspiring with others to reproduce the work of others without proper acknowledgement, including knowingly permitting work to be copied by another student

3.4 Falsification of data /evidence.

3.5 Attempting to influence an examiner or teacher improperly

4. Procedures for Dealing with suspected academic misconduct

4.1 Alleged breaches of Rambert School's Academic Regulations will be dealt with in accordance with the following procedures:

Cases of suspected academic misconduct will be reported to a panel set up specifically for this purpose, and a Chair will be elected to represent the panel. This panel will comprise senior members of academic staff and will consider reports of academic misconduct: where the misconduct is established, the panel may recommend a range of penalties. The penalties imposed will reflect the severity of the offence. Students who commit academic misconduct may be subject to severe penalties. The person responsible for marking the piece of work and for raising the claim of plagiarism or other misconduct will not be a member of the panel.

4.2 The student concerned and the Chair of the panel will be informed of the alleged breach.

4.3 The Chair will be provided with full details and supporting evidence.

4.4 If the Chair considers *prima facie* that the allegation is without foundation, he/she shall so inform the student and no further action will be taken.

5. Determining Minor Offences / Serious Offences

5.1 Where the Chair considers the evidence of academic misconduct is substantive, he/she will determine if the breach should be regarded as constituting **either** a minor **or** a more serious offence. In reaching this determination, the Chair will take into account such factors as the following:

- The contribution to the overall mark for a module made by the piece of work in which the instance of alleged plagiarism has been detected.
- The proportion of the piece of work that is plagiarised
- Whether a formal warning has earlier been issued to the offender.
- The number of previous or contemporaneous offences, if any, with any instances of repeat offending normally to be regarded as constituting a more serious offence;
- Evidence of intent to deceive, with any such evidence normally to be regarded as requiring the treatment of the case as per a more serious offence.

6. Minor Offences

6.1 Where the Chair determines that the case should be treated as per a minor offence he/she will write to the student and set out the details of the allegation and the nature of the evidence against him/her. The Chair will also propose a penalty for the offence and will inform the student of the proposed penalty and that it will be automatically applied should the student either decide not to contest the allegation or fail to respond to the Chair within the prescribed deadline (normally 14 days, though this may be a shorter period if this is necessary to ensure that the outcome can be made available to a meeting of the Board of Examiners).

6.2 If the student contests the allegation and / or the proposed penalty, the Chair will refer the case to a hearing of the panel and the student will be invited to attend. The case will proceed as detailed in point 2 below.

7. Serious Offences/Contested Offences.

7.1 Where the Chair determines on the basis of the available evidence that the case should be treated as per a serious offence, or where the student contests the allegation, the following procedure will be followed:

7.2 The student will be informed by the School of the date on which the panel will consider the case. The student may submit evidence to the panel in writing and/or in person. The members of the panel and the student will each be provided with copies of the written evidence submitted by the other, and they will both be permitted to hear the other's verbal evidence.

7.3 Where a student attends a hearing of the panel, he/she may be accompanied by a member of staff or a student of the School or a relative. The student may be accompanied by a legal representative.

7.4 A panel *may* proceed in the absence of a student: however a hearing can only proceed in the absence of the student if fair to do so.

7.5 The student may submit all relevant evidence to the panel. It is a matter for the panel to decide whether it considers evidence relevant, credible and thereafter to consider what weight to give to such evidence.

7.6 The hearing will be held in public with the student having the right to be present. Once the evidence has been heard and all representations made by the parties, the panel will retire to deliberate in private. The panel will reconvene to announce its decision in public and in the presence of the student.

7.7 The School will inform the student of the decision of the panel. The student will be informed of his/her right to appeal against this decision as per the procedure set out in point 8 below.

7.8 The Secretary shall be responsible for ensuring that a confidential record is kept of all cases notified under points 2-2.7 above. The School is obliged to release details relating to academic discipline offences if these are explicitly requested by prospective employers as part of an academic reference or where disclosure is an obligatory professional requirement.

SECTION 8 APPLIES TO STAGE ONE ONLY.

8. Plagiarism in Stage 1 - Formal Warning

8.1 Rambert School acknowledges that at the start of a student's career, plagiarism may be inadvertent and a result of inexperience or poor academic practice. In recognition of this fact, the following procedures have been developed to allow for such cases to be processed without penalty except for the issue of a formal warning as to future conduct:

8.2 Where plagiarism is suspected in a piece of work submitted by a stage 1 FD student, discretion is afforded for the Chair to treat the case as warranting only a **formal warning** provided that:

- The Chair is satisfied that the incidence of plagiarism is a result of poor academic practice;
- That there is therefore no evidence of any intent to deceive;
- That the piece of work in question constitutes the first such incidence of plagiarism for that student;

8.3 Such cases will be conducted as per the procedures for uncontested minor offences and, if proven, will result in the Chair issuing a formal warning letter to the student. The formal warning letter will set out the possible consequences of any further cases of plagiarism and will provide direction to sources of advice and guidance to prevent any future breaches.

8.4 The Chair, in consultation with the first/second markers, will determine if a mark may be returned for the piece of work based on the portion which is not plagiarized or whether the student should be permitted to re-submit the piece of work without penalty by an agreed deadline. Where, subsequent to the discounting of the plagiarized portion, the mark awarded is lower than the pass

mark, the student should normally be given the opportunity to resubmit the work where it is considered appropriate to do so, by an agreed deadline.

8.5 Such cases will not – in isolation - be regarded as constituting a breach of academic discipline and will not be recorded on the student’s transcript or academic reference. However, when considering any subsequent cases of plagiarism, the Chair will take into account whether a formal warning has earlier been issued to the offender.

8.6 If the student does not contest the allegation by the prescribed deadline, the Chair will confirm the outcome of the case to the student. The maximum penalty that may be applied by a Chair for an uncontested minor offence will be a mark of zero for the piece of work in question. The student shall be informed of his/her right to appeal against this decision as per the procedure set out in point 7 of this Policy document.

SECTION 9 APPLIES TO ALL STAGES

9. Penalties

9.1 Where a student is considered to be in breach of Rambert School’s Academic Regulations the penalties to be imposed should be in accordance with the following guidelines. These penalties may however be varied where the panel or the Chair (as appropriate to the case) feels that the suggested penalty would be too lenient or too harsh in the particular circumstances. **If a student does not contest the allegation and/or proposed penalty by the prescribed deadline, the panel will consider the case based on the points set out in point 4.2 below, and the student will be informed of the outcome.** The maximum penalty that may be applied by a Chair for an uncontested minor offence will be a mark of zero for the piece of work in question. The student shall be informed of his/her right to appeal against this decision as per the procedure set out at 7 below.

9.2 Minor penalties for acts of plagiarism other than at Stage 1.

9.2.1 In cases of plagiarism, which warrant only minor penalties at stages other than at Stage 1 of the Foundation Degree, the Chair, in consultation with the first/second marker, will determine if a mark may be returned for the piece of work based on the portion that is not plagiarised. If the mark given is below the pass mark, then the student may be permitted to re-submit the work where it is considered appropriate to do so, by an agreed deadline for a maximum of a pass mark.

9.2.2 In determining an appropriate penalty the following factors may be taken into consideration:

- The severity of the offence
- Whether the student admits or denies the allegation;
- Evidence of intent to deceive;
- The number of previous or contemporaneous offences;
- Whether the student is in receipt of a formal warning;
- The contribution to the overall mark for a module made by the piece of work in which the instance of alleged plagiarism has been detected;
- The proportion of the piece of work that is plagiarised;
- The effect of the intended penalty on the student’s progression or (potential) award (the overall outcome should not be disproportionate to the offence).

9.2.3 In any case the penalty will be proportionate, and this will be a factor taken into consideration.

9.2.4 Where work contains a component of plagiarized or duplicated material, but also contains sufficient evidence that the student has satisfied the requirements to pass, either:

- The mark will be capped *for the piece of work* at a minimum Pass (40%); or
- A mark will be returned for the piece of work based on the portion which is not plagiarized or duplicated; or
- Where the work contains a component of plagiarized or duplicated material which casts doubt on whether the student has satisfied the requirements to pass, a mark of zero will be assigned for the piece of work in question.

9.2.5 Where the application of a penalty for a minor offence results in the failure of a module, students will be permitted to resubmit at the next available opportunity as per normal re-sit rules.

9.2.6 for serious, substantial or repeat offences: students may face termination of registration, or become ineligible for their award or to re-sit examinations.

9.3 Conspiring with others to reproduce the work of others, including knowingly permitting work to be copied by another student

The penalty may range from a reprimand to a mark of zero for a piece of work, or for a number of pieces of work, depending on the circumstances of the case.

9.4. Falsification of Data

The penalty may range from a mark of zero for a single piece of work to termination of registration depending on the circumstances of the case.

These examples are not exhaustive and do not limit other acts deemed to be in contravention of the Regulations

10. Appeals

10.1 Rambert School's courses are validated by the University of Kent. Any appeals will be conducted according to the procedures set out in Annex 9 of The University of Kent's Credit Framework (<http://www.kent.ac.uk/uelt/quality/credit/creditinfoannex9.html>) except insofar as they are amended below.

10.2 The student may appeal against a conviction and/or penalty made under these regulations on one or more of the following grounds, by writing to the Chair of the panel within 21 days of the date on which notification of the decision was sent:

- That there is evidence of a failure to follow the procedures set out in these regulations, which casts reasonable doubt on the reliability of the decision; and/ or
- That fresh evidence can be presented, which could not reasonably have been made available before the decision was made, and which casts reasonable doubt on the reliability of the decision; and/or
- That the decision was unreasonable or irrational given the evidence which was available at the time.

10.3 Appeals lodged with the University of Kent will be assessed by the relevant Dean; if they are to proceed they will be considered by a Faculty Review Panel convened by the University. The Conservatoire for Dance and Drama will also be made aware of any Appeals lodged.

10.4 The remit of the Faculty Review Panel will be to determine one of the following outcomes:

- Confirm the original decision;
- Confirm that an offence has occurred, but adjust the penalty. It should be noted that, if in the view of the Faculty Review Panel [as above], the evidence suggests that the offence was more serious than had been determined by the panel or its Chair, a more severe penalty may be applied than had originally been proposed;
- Decide that an offence has not occurred, and remove the original penalty.
- Reconsider the penalty in its entirety.

11. Falsification of Evidence in Appeal

Where there is a *prima facie* case that documentary evidence submitted in support of an appeal has been falsified, this will be referred to the University of Kent. The referral will include a recommendation as to whether the matter should be regarded as a 'minor' or 'major' offence. The submission of falsified evidence will be grounds for the immediate dismissal of the appeal.

