

Plagiarism Policy

Last reviewed	May 2021
Next review due	May 2023
Responsible division	Programme Operations
Responsible director	Director, Programme Operations
Applies to	Participants on all programmes leading to an award of a formal qualification by Ambition
Exceptions	Participants on the Masters in Expert Teaching are excluded from this policy and should instead refer to Plymouth Marjon University's Academic Integrity Procedure
Audience	Shared with all staff, external contractors involved in assessment processes, all participants and all delivery partners
Applicable laws	N/A
Other relevant regulations	N/A

1. Objectives.....	1
2. Background and Legal/Regulatory Framework.....	2
3. Policy and Procedures.....	2
Detecting Plagiarism	2
Procedure Following Detection.....	2
Actions Following Outcome	3
4. Links to Other Policies.....	3

1. Objectives

The objective of this policy is to ensure that all participants on our programmes or candidates from alliance partners who submit assignments for assessment are aware of the consequences of any form of plagiarism when taking part in an Ambition Institute or partner programme, course or project, and that staff and external contractors will know what to do if they suspect plagiarism and what process to follow (alongside the Malpractice and Maladministration Policy).

2. Background and Legal/Regulatory Framework

Plagiarism is the act of submitting another's work as your own without acknowledgement or reference. This can be done with or without intent to deceive. Plagiarism is viewed as a breach of trust between Ambition Institute and the participant.

Plagiarism can take many forms, including but not limited to: direct copying of another participant's work, copying work from other sources, quoting verbatim without acknowledgement and paraphrasing.

Ambition Institute is at the forefront of the education sector and expects a high standard of its participants. This policy is in place to maintain these and guarantee the moral and academic rigour of our organisation, stakeholders and participants. It also affects Ambition's reputation and credibility with customers, participants and funding partners and the value they put on our programmes.

This policy will be shaped in future with our partners and industry best practice, including university bodies and the regulatory and quality assurance bodies overseeing formal qualifications awarded by Ambition.

3. Policy and Procedures

Detecting Plagiarism

- > Ambition Institute will follow the Assignment Assessment Policy to apply a standardised approach for submission of all assignments leading to the award of formal qualifications on Ambition Institute programmes, whether delivered directly or through delivery partners.
- > The assessment process includes providing information to participants and delivery partners where applicable on plagiarism, a declaration this has not occurred to their knowledge, and extensive quality assurance and moderation.
- > Markers and moderators will be trained to detect and flag potential plagiarism in a submission, which will be then investigated by the affected Programme Leader, then sent to a Plagiarism Panel to decide on procedure before final moderation, including the Lead Assessor, the Programme Leader(s) for the programme(s) in question and the Associate Director, Faculty Planning and Assessment.
- > If plagiarism is found to be a systemic or endemic process (e.g. plagiarism encouraged or assisted by Ambition itself, delivery partners or schools / trusts), a thorough review will be undertaken as detailed in the Malpractice and Maladministration Policy. This will focus on process failures, with the individual participant submissions going through the process detailed below.

Procedure Following Detection

Where appropriate, the participant will be informed of the investigation into alleged plagiarism, and will be offered the opportunity to present evidence in their defence. There will be three procedures associated with three potential outcomes from the Plagiarism Panel: no case, no intent to deceive, intent to deceive.

- > **No case:** following a confirmation of no plagiarism by the Panel, submission is progressed as normal and the marker is informed of the outcome and reasoning.
- > **No intent to deceive:** following a confirmation of plagiarism without intent to deceive (aka accidental plagiarism) by the Panel, a conversation is had with the participant on plagiarism, the submission is sent back to the participant to amend and the submission is then progressed as normal.
- > **Intent to deceive:** following a confirmation of plagiarism with intent to deceive by the Panel, the participant and school/delivery partner are notified of the outcome, and a conversation is had with the

participant on plagiarism and the consequences of this. In the case of delivery partners, a review is undertaken to establish if the school and/or delivery partner were complicit in and/or aware of the plagiarism, and they will be subject to investigation as detailed in the Malpractice and Maladministration Policy. The submission is progressed to moderation and any area(s) where plagiarism is detected are awarded an automatic zero score. The participant can resubmit once after this, provided that external assessment costs are covered by the participant in full in advance. If the participant has plagiarised with intent to deceive a second time, they will be immediately withdrawn from the programme or qualification and be subject to sanctions as detailed in the Malpractice and Maladministration Policy.

Actions Following Outcome

- > Regulatory or quality assurance bodies who oversee the qualification will be notified in accordance with their guidelines.
- > If Ambition or delivery partners are found to be at fault, a review will be conducted in accordance with the Malpractice and Maladministration Policy.
- > Participants can request notes on their submission as stated in Ambition's Data Protection Policy.
- > The Faculty Planning and Assessment team will conduct analysis of numbers of submissions with plagiarism concerns detected and upheld during each assessment window, including regional, programme and trust breakdown and breakdowns by delivery partner where applicable.
- > Feedback is given to markers on detection on an ongoing basis, including outcomes of their flags.

4. Links to Other Policies

Other policies referenced here include:

- > [Assignment Assessment Policy](#)
- > [Data Protection Policy](#)
- > [Malpractice and Maladministration Policy](#)