



CAMBRIDGE ACADEMY OF
DENTAL IMPLANTOLOGY

Academic Irregularities Policy & Procedures

Cambridge Academy of Dental Implantology

PART A

INTRODUCTION AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1 Introduction

1.1 Academic integrity is fundamental to the values promoted by Cambridge Academy of Dental Implantology. The Academy is concerned to ensure that its assessment regulations are fully and fairly implemented and that no student gains an unfair advantage over others

1.2 This document describes the principles and processes by which the Academy will manage allegations of academic irregularities

1.3 For the purposes of the Academic Irregularities Process, in this document the following words and phrases have the meaning indicated:

AIP Academic Irregularities Panel

AIAP Academic Irregularities Appeal Panel

AIPF Academic Irregularities Penalty Framework

BofE Board of Examiners

2. On induction the Academy will:

- Provide students with awareness sessions in relation to academic irregularity;
- Identify at least one person within the Academy to be a source of information and guidance to academic and administrative colleagues when considering possible academic irregularity cases;
- Develop assessment schemes designed with consideration for the reduction in the risk of academic irregularity.

3. Definition of Academic Irregularities:

3.1 An Academic Irregularity occurs when there is cause to consider that work submitted by a student is not wholly sound in terms of its academic integrity.

3.2 The Academy has three categories of Academic Irregularity within its programmes:

- Poor Academic Practice – Cases of inadequate and poor scholarship
- Academic Misconduct – Minor/limited cases
- Academic Offence – Substantial cases, multiple minor cases

While it is still considered an Academic Irregularity, Poor Academic Practice differs from the more serious categories of Academic Misconduct and Academic Offence in that the student is deemed to misunderstand academic practice rather than creating the potential for

inappropriate advantage. This principle is reflected in the Penalty Framework. The three categories of Academic Irregularity are defined below.

3.3 Poor Academic Practice

- The student demonstrates a lack of understanding of scholarly practice and appropriate academic representation. Sources might be cited incorrectly or inadequately, for example, without quotation marks, even though the author is listed in the references.
- Can apply to all levels of study.
- In cases of Poor Academic Practice the student will receive a written warning that is held on their file. Their result may be revised, and the student will be advised that proven Poor Academic Practice might affect future allegations of Academic Irregularity.
- To ensure the above process operates effectively, the Academy will track cases of Poor Academic Practice so that the Chief Examiner will have the information needed to manage each student case

3.9 Academic Misconduct

- It is either the student's first case of Academic Misconduct or there has previously been a second finding of Poor Academic Practice. If there are three cases of Poor Academic Practice, which establishes a pattern, the irregularity would be considered as an Academic Offence.
 - Can apply to all levels of study; there is an assumption of increasing seriousness as the student progresses through their studies. This is based on an expectation that a student should be aware of proper academic practice and the nature of academic misrepresentation. In keeping with this principle, penalties will be increased if an irregularity is proved later on in the student's course of study.
 - The case is minor. Typically, a few complete sentences or lines of text within the piece of work as a whole, or where there would still be a significant amount of the student's own work/analysis if the copied materials were removed.

3.5 Academic Offence

- Two upheld cases of Academic Misconduct will be regarded as serious enough to be considered as an Academic Offence.
- Multiple previous irregularities which may be of a lesser degree but demonstrate a pattern; or
- A threshold has been reached of three cases of Poor Academic Practice or two upheld cases of Academic Misconduct
- It is the first case of Academic Irregularity and deemed to be so substantial or significant that it is most appropriately dealt with as an Academic Offence.
- Can apply to all levels of study; there is an assumption of increasing seriousness as the student progresses through their studies. This is based on an expectation that a student should be aware of proper academic practice and the nature of academic misrepresentation.

In keeping with this principle, penalties will be increased if an irregularity is proved later on in the student's course of study.

3.6 Where an irregularity is not minor, it is deemed to be substantial.

Examples could include, but are not limited to:

Cases where material is used without proper acknowledgment (plagiarism) or produced with collusion in the following manner:

- The copied material forms a significant or substantive part of the work;
- Where there would be little left of the student's own work/analysis if the copied materials were removed;
- Where the entirety of the work is copied from one or a few sources with little or no further input from the student; unauthorised material is taken into an examination or test; impersonation; submitting bought essays or solutions (contract cheating).

4. Principles

4.1 All students are required to accept the Academy's Terms and Conditions of Offer, in doing so they acknowledge that they are bound by all Academy regulations and processes.

4.2 All students will have online access to a course handbook where links to this Academic Irregularity document will be provided.

4.3 The Academic Irregularity Process is accessible via the course website.

4.4 Relevant regulations, including this Process, will be drawn to the attention of students at the beginning of the academic year or any other point of entry.

4.5 In all cases of alleged Academic Irregularity, students will be treated as blameless until a case against them is proved.

4.6 The facts must be established before consideration of the consequences of the alleged incident on a student's performance, assessment or progression.

4.7 Whenever a student is invited to any meeting investigating an alleged Academic Irregularity the student will be informed of the nature of the allegation and that they have the right to be accompanied. The Academy does not permit students to be legally represented at the investigation stage, except in exceptional circumstances. For the avoidance of doubt, the definition of "exceptional circumstances" in this context is a matter for determination by the Academy.

4.8 The Chief Examiner will make an initial decision as to whether there is a case to answer.

4.9 The determination of whether Academic Misconduct or an Academic Offence has occurred is based on findings from the evidence presented to the Chief Examiner. It is therefore a matter to be decided by the Chief Examiner and should not be a matter for the Board of Examiners, whose role is to consider the wider student profile to ensure overall proportionality. The evaluation of the student profile will be based on their achievement of the learning outcomes of the programme.

4.10 In all cases the Chief Examiner will come to a decision based solely on the evidence presented

4.11 Where the Chief Examiner is satisfied that an Academic Irregularity has not taken place the matter will be considered ended. This decision exonerates any students under investigation.

4.12 If the Chief Examiner finds that there is evidence that Academic Misconduct or an Academic Offence has taken place the Chief Examiner will apply the penalty solely to the piece of work under discussion. The penalty will be commensurate with the Academy's Academic Irregularity Penalty Framework (See Appendix 5).

4.13 Lack of intent is not an acceptable defence against an allegation of Academic Irregularity.

4.14 Where an allegation is upheld against an assessment at the final attempt stage and deemed an Academic Misconduct or an Academic Offence, the student will not be permitted to resubmit the assessment. This is to ensure fairness with the wider student body.

4.15 The Board of Examiners has overall authority to determine the outcome for each individual case based on several factors taken together. Decisions will take into account the student's full academic profile, and any extenuating circumstances brought to the attention of the Board through the Notification of Extenuating Circumstances Process

4.16 The role of the Examination Board is not to revisit the detail of the Chief Examiner's decision on Academic Misconduct or Academic Offence, rather the Board will take an overall view of the student academic position, to ensure that penalty outcomes are effective, appropriate and proportionate.

4.17 If an allegation is made after the conferment of any award, such allegations may be investigated up to one year after the conferment date.

4.18 Where an allegation of Academic Misconduct or Academic Offence is proved, the appropriate Professional or Regulatory Body (e.g. the General Dental Council) may need to be informed if this is deemed appropriate by the Academy.

4.19 Records must be kept in each student case and retained in line with current Academy retention policy.

4.20 The student has a right to appeal under the Academic Irregularities Appeals Procedure (see Part C).

5. Monitoring and Reporting

All cases of Academic Misconduct and Academic Offence must be recorded. This is to enable monitoring.

5.1 The Chief Examiner will produce annual monitoring reports which will be made available to the Board of Examiners.

5.2 These annual monitoring reports will summarise the following:

- The number of investigations held during the academic year including a summary of Academic Misconduct and Academic Offences, and the penalty outcomes;
- Those instances where the Board of Examiners made adjustments to student outcomes based on any Extenuating Circumstances;
- Consistency in the application of the Penalty Framework

5.3 No monitoring report will identify an individual student.

PART B

PROCESS FOR DEALING WITH ACADEMIC IRREGULARITIES

Introduction

6.1 The Process describes how the Academy shall manage allegations of academic irregularities and must be adhered to where an academic irregularity is suspected. Staff must ensure that they have grounds to believe that a case of academic irregularity has occurred.

6.2 Academic irregularity occurs where a student gains, or creates the potential to gain, advantage in summative assessments. This includes all examinations and all course work.

7. Related Academy Processes

7.1 Other procedures that are of relevance to the Process and should be considered include:

- Academic Appeals Process
- Complaints Process for Students
- Student Code of Behaviour
- Academy Codes of Ethics
- Suitability criteria set by PSRBs (eg the General Dental Council) for students undertaking professional courses of study (fitness to practice) where applicable

7.2 Where, on investigation of an Academic Irregularity Appeal, it appears to the Academy that the matter should be dealt with through the Academy's Student Complaints Process, or the Student Code of Behaviour, it will be transferred to that Process and the student will be informed of the transfer. Where only a part of the matters raised within an Academic Irregularity Appeal are transferred to other Academy processes, the Academic Irregularity Appeal will be put on hold pending the outcome of this investigation. The student will be informed and made aware of the change in time limits for dealing with the Academic Irregularity Appeal. Initiating the Academic Irregularities

8. Starting the Process

8.1 Where there is a suspected case of academic irregularity the Module Leader must provide a written factual statement indicating clearly the alleged Academic Irregularity, supported by appropriate evidence. This statement and any supporting evidence (e.g. Turnitin reports), should be attached to the work of the student.

8.2 The Module Leader should then notify the Chief Examiner, who will determine if the case is Poor Academic Practice or potentially more serious.

8.3 Where a Course Leader has decided that the student's work in question contains Poor Academic Practice, the following process should apply:

- An explanation will be given on why the student work demonstrates Poor Academic Practice, and the evidence on which this is based is provided;
- A written warning will be given, and held on the student file;
- It should be made clear to the student that there are potential implications of multiple instances of Poor Academic Practice;
- The student is advised that they have a right of appeal to the view of the Course Leader that the work demonstrates Poor Academic Practice. In such cases the student must put their reasons in writing to the Chief Examiner, who will decide whether or not the work demonstrates Poor Academic Practice, based on the written material;
- In terms of accepting or rejecting the appeal against Poor Academic Practice, the decision of the Chief Examiner is final;

8.9 In all other cases of potential Academic Misconduct or an Academic Offence, the Module Leader will forward all evidence to the Chief Examiner.

8.5 The Chief Examiner will determine whether there are reasonable grounds to suggest the student contravened assessment regulations and whether there is a case that requires examination as a case of Academic Misconduct or an Academic Offence. In making this decision the Chief Examiner shall

- Draw a distinction between Poor Academic Practice or whether the case warrants investigation as Academic Misconduct or an Academic Offence;
- Have available any materials relating to the alleged Academic Irregularity, for example coursework, examination scripts, documents notifying that an incident is suspected;
- Discuss the circumstances with relevant staff members, as appropriate;
- At this stage there is no requirement to inform the student(s) that an investigation into possible Academic Irregularities is under way.

8.6 The Chief Examiner should determine the outcome normally within 5 working days of the alleged academic irregularity being reported to them.

8.7 If the Chief Examiner decides that there are reasonable grounds to suggest that there is a case for adjudication, the Board of Examiners will be notified so that the matter can be considered by the Board

8.8 If the Chief Examiner finds that the case is Poor Academic Practice it will be referred back to the Module leader and dealt with under the process agreed for Poor Academic Practice.

PART C

ACADEMIC IRREGULARITIES – APPEALS PROCESS: RIGHT OF APPEAL IN CASES OF ACADEMIC IRREGULARITY

9. Grounds for Appeal

9.1 If an allegation of academic irregularity has been upheld by the Chief Examiner the student will be informed in the outcome letter that they have the right to appeal under Part C.

9.2 If the student wishes to contest the decision of the Chief Examiner they are entitled to submit an Academic Irregularities Appeal on the following grounds only:

- Ground A: That new and relevant material or evidence has become available which was not previously available for consideration by the Chief Examiner;
- Ground B: That there was a material procedural error by the Chief Examiner;
- Ground C: That the decision of the Chief Examiner did not align with the Penalty Framework.

9.3 There are no other grounds on which an Academic Irregularities Appeal will be considered.

9.9 If the student wishes to submit an Academic Irregularities Appeal against the decision of the Chief Examiner, they must do so in writing via the online form, within 5 working days from the date on the letter notifying them of the Chief Examiner decision. Students must outline the reasons for their Academic Irregularities Appeal and must clearly state the grounds on which the Appeal is being made.

9.5 If the Academic Irregularities Appeal against the decision of the Chief Examiner is being made on the grounds that new and relevant material or evidence has become available, the student must submit that evidence as part of the Appeal submission.

9.6 The Deputy Chief Examiner shall consider whether the Academic Irregularities Appeal against the decision of the Chief Examiner has been made on one or more of the permitted grounds.

9.7 If the Deputy Chief Examiner decides that the Academic Irregularities Appeal against the decision of the Chief Examiner is not within one or more of the permitted grounds for appeal or has been received out of time the student shall be informed in writing within 10 working days of receipt of the appeal submission. The student shall be informed that the Academic Irregularities Appeal has been rejected on that basis, and that the original outcome remains unchanged. Such a decision by the Deputy Chief Examiner is final and there is no further right of appeal regarding academic irregularities within the procedures.

9.8 Where an appeal has been rejected, the Deputy Chief Examiner will issue the student with a Completion of Procedures Letter.

10. Consideration of Appeals

10.1 If the Deputy Chief Examiner decides that the Academic Irregularities Appeal against the decision of the Chief Examiner does satisfy one or more of the permitted grounds, the Deputy Chief Examiner will either:

- a. Refer the submission back to the Chief Examiner for reconsideration and action and inform the student of the decision and actions; or
- b. Convene an Academic Irregularities Appeal Panel Hearing.

10.2 Where the appeal has been referred back to the Chief Examiner for reconsideration and action, the Chief Examiner will have discretion to amend the original penalty.

10.3 Where the Chief Examiner reconsidered the penalty the Academy will notify the student and the Deputy Chief Examiner of the outcome within 10 working days.

10.9 Where it is not appropriate for the Chief Examiner to take Chair's Action, the Deputy Chief Examiner may require the Academy to convene an Academic Irregularities Appeals Panel with membership from the Board of Examiners to consider the allegation afresh in accordance with section 11 of this procedure. The student will retain the right of further appeal following the outcome.

10.5 The AIAP hearing shall be convened within 20 working days of the Deputy Chief Examiner confirming that the appeal has been made on one of the permitted grounds, ie no later than 35 days from initial receipt of the appeal.

11. Academic Irregularities Appeal Panel - Composition

11.1 The AIAP shall comprise four members taken from the Board of Examiners. The Panel Chair shall be the Deputy Chief Examiner or other suitably senior and experienced member of staff.

11.2 Persons who have been affected by, or involved in dealing with the alleged academic irregularity, including members of the BofE, shall not be eligible to serve on the AIAP.

11.3 A nominated member of Academy staff shall act as Secretary to the AIAP for administrative purposes, including the handling of formal communications between parties involved in the AIAP hearing.

12. Academic Irregularities Appeal Hearing - Preparatory Steps

12.1 The student shall be given at least 10 working days' written notice of the AIAP hearing and shall be provided with a copy of the record taken by the Chief Examiner and any report that the Chief Examiner may have prepared for the AIAP hearing.

12.2 If the student cannot attend the AIAP hearing due to illness or other mitigating circumstances, they must inform the Chair of the AIAP as soon as possible. Supporting evidence, such as a medical note, will be required. In such circumstances, the Chair of the AIAP will decide whether to reschedule the AIAP hearing or to proceed in the student's absence.

13. Conduct of the Academic Irregularities Appeal Hearing

13.1 At the AIAP hearing the student may be accompanied or represented by one other person. This person may be, for example, a friend, partner, parent or Students' Union representative. The Chief Examiner does not permit students to be legally represented at the AIAP except in exceptional circumstances. For the avoidance of doubt, the definition of "exceptional circumstances" in this context is a matter for determination by the Chief Examiner.

13.2 The student must inform the Chair of the AIAP of the name and capacity of any person accompanying them to the AIAP hearing at least 5 working days before the AIAP hearing.

13.3 The AIAP hearing shall not be a re-run of the original case but a review of the original decision based on the grounds of the Academic Irregularities Appeal that the student has submitted. The student will present the grounds for their Academic Irregularities Appeal to the AIAP. The Chief Examiner will present the grounds on which the original decision was based.

13.4 The Chair of the AIAP shall have the discretion to allow the introduction of new evidence during the AIAP hearing.

13.5 The Secretary to the AIAP shall take formal notes of the proceedings.

14. Academic Irregularities Appeal Outcomes

14.1 The AIAP has the power to uphold the original decision of the Chief Examiner, overturn or amend the original decision.

14.2 The Chair of the AIAP shall inform the Chief Examiner and the student of the Panel's decision (including the rationale for that decision) in writing within 5 working days of the AIAP hearing.

14.3 The decision of the AIAP is final and there is no further right of appeal regarding the academic irregularity case in question within the procedures.

Appendix 1:

Types of academic irregularity

The Cambridge Academy of Dental Implantology considers that committing an academic irregularity is wrong because it undermines academic integrity and the value of the Academy's awards. The Academic Irregularities policy seeks to ensure that this principle is defended and upheld for the benefit of former, current and future students. The policy is part of a balanced institutional approach which also seeks to develop good academic practices, including:

- Supporting students in understanding what constitutes an academic irregularity;
- Supporting students in developing skills to avoid academic irregularities;
- Supporting students in developing their academic writing skills;
- Designing assessment activities that reduce the opportunities for academic irregularities.

Academic Irregularity includes the following:

Poor Academic Practice

- Poor scholarly work which is not considered Academic Misconduct or an Academic Offence is regarded as Poor Academic Practice. This could include the inclusion of text from other sources with attribution that is inadequate. One example is where a student uses a phrase from an author without using quotation marks, even though the author is listed in the references
- Such cases do not require an Academic Irregularity Panel, and will be managed by the Course Team in discussion with the Chief Examiner
- In cases of Poor Academic Practice, the student will receive a written warning which is held on their file, the mark attained may be revised, and the student is advised that proven Poor Academic Practice might affect future allegations. No further action is taken at this stage
- Multiple instances (two or more) of Poor Academic Practice will be dealt with as Academic Misconduct

Cheating, examples include:

- Communicating with another candidate during an examination or assessment, except if the assessment regulations specially permit this, e.g. group assessments;
- Communicating during an examination with anyone other than the authorised invigilator or another authorised member of staff. This includes oral, written or any other electronic means of communication;

- Introducing any written or electronic materials into the examination room, unless expressly permitted;
- Gaining access to unauthorised material relating to an examination before or during the exam;
- Obtaining a copy of an 'unseen' written examination paper in advance of the date and time for its authorised release.

In the context of the above the term 'examination' is deemed to include 'phase tests' or any other tests carried out under examination conditions.

Plagiarism

The incorporation of material derived from the work (published or unpublished) of another, by unacknowledged quotation, paraphrased imitation or other device in any work submitted for progression towards or for the completion of an award, which in any way suggests that it is the student's own original work. Such work may include printed material in textbooks, journals and material accessible electronically for example from web pages.

Examples of plagiarism include:

- The inclusion in a candidate's work of material from another person's work without the use of quotation marks and full acknowledgement of the source;
- The summarising of another person's work by simply changing words or altering the order of presentation, without full acknowledgement;
- Self-plagiarism. Students are not permitted to reuse work they have previously submitted, without proper reference and acknowledgement in the current assessment being submitted.

Collusion

Is an understanding or agreement between two or more people to intentionally cooperate for either or both to gain an unfair advantage in assessment and may include:

- Unauthorised and unacknowledged joint authorship in an assessment task;
- Unauthorised and unacknowledged copying or use of material prepared by another person for use in submitted work. This may be with or without their consent or agreement to the copying or use of their work. If copied with the agreement of the other candidate both parties are guilty of Academic Irregularity.

NB The Academy encourages students to share ideas and exchange reference material prior to each student writing up their own personal presentation of an assessed piece of work. Some course teams may stipulate an assessment as "assessed group work". In this instance, course teams will indicate the criteria and manner in which work is assessed and the way in which individual marks are ascribed to members of the group.

Personation

Personation or impersonation is the assumption by one person of the identity of another person with the intent to deceive, or to gain unfair advantage.

Examples include:

- One person assumes the identity of a candidate, with the intention of gaining unfair advantage for that candidate
- The candidate is knowingly and willingly impersonated by another with the intention of gaining unfair advantage for the person personated

Unreasonable Conduct

Where the case is such that no reasonable person would have deemed it academically appropriate.

For example:

- The entirety of the assessment is copied from one or a few sources with little or no further input from the student;
- Unauthorised material is taken into an examination or assessment under exam conditions;
- Impersonation;
- The submission of an assessment as the student's own original work which has been commissioned from and produced by a third party (either paid or unpaid). This form of academic irregularity is known as contract cheating, paid plagiarism, or academic fraud.

Dishonest Practice

The use of any form of dishonest academic practice not identified within the above categories and definitions. The Academy has the final decision on what constitutes Dishonest Practice. In the most severe cases of Academic Irregularity, the Academy will have the authority to terminate the student's studies.

Appendix 2: Academic Irregularities Penalty Framework

1. Principles of the Penalty Framework

Principles of the Academic Irregularities Penalty Framework (AIPF):

- It demonstrates transparency, fairness and consistency.
- It is designed to apply to all forms of academic irregularities.
- It includes some flexibility to accommodate more complex cases.
- If the student admits the allegation in a timely manner (i.e. before the Chief Examiner's investigation has been held), the Chief Examiner may take this into account when determining the penalty to be applied. The reasons given should be clearly minuted.
- The Board of Examiners considers the penalty applied by the Chief Examiner and will take into account the student's assessed marks and any Extenuating Circumstances that may apply.
- Where applicable, students will be directed to appropriate sources of support.

2. Key considerations

The AIPF reflects the following significant considerations:

- The number of previous offences
- The extent and amount of the academic irregularity
- The stage of the student in their course
- There may be circumstances when a particular case and set of circumstances do not easily fit within the AIPF. On the basis of such exceptional situations, the Chief Examiner reserves the right to apply a penalty which varies from the AIPF since it is impossible to pre-judge every situation which might occur. In such cases, approval should be sought from the Board of Examiners, and any decisions and their grounds noted clearly in the minutes.
- General Dental Council requirements may require adjustments to the AIPF. These adjustments to the AIPF should be approved by the Chief Examiner and communicated to all staff and students

3. The Penalty Framework – possible penalties

Poor Academic Practice	Academic Misconduct	Academic Offence
Warning and advice to student	Element capped at pass	Module awarded zero grade
	Element awarded zero grade	Studies terminated
	Module awarded zero grade	

1. Where an allegation is upheld against an assessment at the final attempt stage and deemed Academic Misconduct or an Academic Offence, the student will not be permitted to resubmit the assessment.
2. Where the student makes a timely admission that they have committed academic misconduct or an academic offence, the Chief Examiner has the authority to take this into consideration and reduce the penalty to be applied. The panel is not obliged to reduce the penalty, but has this authority if it deems this is appropriate.
3. Timely would be typically an admission before an investigation has been conducted.
4. Reduction in Penalty would be typically applying a lower penalty at a point down one stage of the Penalty Framework, e.g. movement from an element capped at 0 to the element being capped at a Pass

Appendix 3: Flowchart for the process of an Academic Irregularity

