

# RADA

## Royal Academy of Dramatic Art

### Academic Misconduct Policy and Procedure

#### Introduction

1. This policy and procedure relates to suspected cases of academic misconduct in assessment by RADA students registered on taught programmes of study leading to a King's College, London (King's) award. As RADA is validated by King's it is their process we follow and which is described below, and can also be accessed at <https://www.kcl.ac.uk/aboutkings/orgstructure/ps/acservices/conduct/academic-misconduct>

#### Definitions of academic misconduct

2. Academic misconduct takes place when a student attempts to obtain an unfair advantage for themselves or others through means including, but not restricted to, the following:
  - a. **Plagiarism:** copying from sources without referencing and therefore presenting material as the student's own work (the extent of copying to be determined by members of the course team as being inappropriate for the work in question). This could include the use of others' work presented as the student's own, including the work of other current students, previous students, or obtained via the internet, or provided in any way by another party, such as an outside party commissioned by the student to provide the work on the student's behalf. It can also include the use of another person's copyrighted materials – not just written works but also intellectual property or ideas, musical compositions, computer programs, images, graphic designs, survey results, diagrams, graphs and drawings. The original sources are deliberately hidden from the marker by not referencing the source and are therefore presented inappropriately as the student's own.

Note that while summarising or paraphrasing material from a source is often necessary for an assignment, it must be properly cited by being enclosed in quotation marks and appropriately referenced. The guiding principle is that it is explicitly clear from where the material is taken and constructively informs the assessment task, and that verbatim quoted passages are kept to a minimum (<100 words if possible is a good guideline).

- b. **Self-plagiarism (double submission):** submission of the student's own previously or simultaneously assessed work for another assessment, whether previously/simultaneously submitted to the Academy or another institution.
- c. **Collusion:** two or more students having worked together inappropriately on an assessment to jointly produce work that is intended as an independent submission according to the requirements of the assessment.
- d. **Obtaining an unfair advantage for another student** by allowing them to copy one's own work and present it as their own, or obtaining an unfair advantage for another student by allowing them to copy the work of a student or other third party and present it as their own.
- e. **Impersonation:** knowingly allowing another person to impersonate oneself, or impersonating another student, in a formal timed assessment, submission of coursework, or other aspect of the programme of study.
- f. **Exam cheating:** for a formal timed assessment, introducing into the examination room any unauthorised materials such as manuscripts, printed text, books, dictionaries, self-produced crib-sheets, calculators and other electronic devices such as mobile phones, and any other

materials excluded by the regulations. This includes use of any such materials when outside the examination room for any reason during the period of the examination.

For a formal timed assessment, removal of any script, whether or not completed, unless specifically authorised to do so.

Obtaining, or seeking to obtain, questions in advance of a formal timed assessment, including from someone who has already seen the questions, whether for oneself or on behalf of another student

- g. **Falsification:** fabrication of materials associated specifically with work/practice placement or workplace learning such as timesheets and workplace supervisor assessments. Also, fabrication of the results of interviews/surveys/questionnaires and any other information or data required as part of an assignment.
- h. **Bribery or paid services:** submitting work for assessment that you have purchased from an essay procurement website or offering a bribe to another student, a member of staff or another third party.
- i. **Sabotage:** attempting to prevent others from completing their work.

### Academic misconduct procedure

- 3. Any instances of suspected academic misconduct should be reported as soon as possible to the Course Director and will initially be discussed before a decision is made to progress the case to the King's procedure if it seems sufficiently serious. Staff and students should refer to King's Academic Integrity guidance in the first instance for further information: this can be accessed at these pages:

[King's College London - Academic Honesty and Integrity \(kcl.ac.uk\)](https://www.kcl.ac.uk/academic-integrity)

[academic-honesty-integrity-policy.pdf \(kcl.ac.uk\)](https://www.kcl.ac.uk/academic-integrity-policy)

[student-guidance-on-academic-honesty-integrity.pdf \(kcl.ac.uk\)](https://www.kcl.ac.uk/student-guidance-on-academic-honesty-integrity)

- 4. If a student's work is suspected to include academic misconduct, the Course Director will invite the student for a meeting to discuss the work. The student will be alerted to the problems identified with the work and given guidance on good academic practice including referencing in order to emphasise the learning aspects of the process. If both parties agree that misconduct has taken place, the student will receive a penalty and no further action will be taken. If agreement cannot be reached, the matter will be referred to a King's Misconduct Committee. Further information, including the penalty, can be found in the guidance documents linked from this page: <https://www.kcl.ac.uk/aboutkings/orgstructure/ps/acservices/conduct/academic-misconduct> where the [Misconduct Referral Form](#) can also be accessed for staff to make a formal allegation. This is also where students can access the [Misconduct Appeal Form](#).
- 5. When a Misconduct Committee is convened, the student shall normally receive at least 10 days' notice, and will be invited to present their case to the Committee. They may be accompanied by a friend, relative or fellow student for support but who cannot speak on their behalf. An appropriate staff member will present the case alleging misconduct. The Committee will determine whether the allegation(s) of misconduct have been substantiated. Where it concludes that the charge(s) is/are upheld, it may order one or more of the measures available to it under the King's misconduct regulations.
- 6. The decision of the Committee will normally be communicated to the student and examiners within 7 working days of the decision.
- 7. There is further guidance on Committee procedures and possible penalties, should a charge be upheld, on these pages:

<https://www.kcl.ac.uk/aboutkings/orgstructure/ps/acservices/conduct/201920-documents/student-guidance-on-attending-committee-hearings.pdf>

<https://www.kcl.ac.uk/aboutkings/orgstructure/ps/acservices/conduct/202021-documents/academic-misconduct-guidance-on-penalties.pdf>

## Appeals process

8. A student may appeal against the findings or order(s) of a Misconduct Committee. An appeal must be submitted on a Misconduct Appeal Form to King's Student Conduct & Appeals team within 10 working days of the written notification of the Misconduct Committee's decision. In accordance with the King's regulations an appeal will be heard if any of the following grounds are met:
  - a. There is new evidence that could not have been, or for good reason was not, made available at the time of the hearing, and sufficient evidence remains that the appeal warrants further consideration
  - b. Evidence can be produced of significant procedural error before or during the hearing, and sufficient evidence remains that the appeal warrants further consideration
  - c. Any other grounds, including grounds of compassion
9. The King's Principal will determine whether the criteria for an appeal have been met. Where they have, an Appeal Committee will be convened; otherwise the appeal will be dismissed. This decision will normally be communicated within 30 working days of receipt of the appeal.
10. Where an Appeal Committee is convened, the student shall normally receive at least 10 working days' notice of the hearing and will be invited to present their case to the Panel. They may be accompanied by a friend, relative or fellow student for support but who cannot speak on their behalf. The Committee will determine whether there is sufficient reason to challenge the decision of the original Misconduct Committee. Where it concludes such reason is present, they can modify or reverse the findings or order(s) of the Misconduct Committee. The decision of the Committee will normally be communicated to the student and relevant staff within 5 working days of the decision. Further guidance about Committee procedures can be found at:  
<https://www.kcl.ac.uk/aboutkings/orgstructure/ps/acservices/conduct/201920-documents/student-guidance-on-attending-committee-hearings.pdf>

## Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA)

11. The OIA is the external independent body which reviews unresolved complaints and disputes between students and their institutions. Once the RADA/King's internal procedures are completed, and there is no further action available for a student to take under RADA/King's process to address any concerns they may have, a *Completion of Procedures* letter will be issued to the student. This is the confirmation which is needed by the OIA before they will consider a complaint. The process is completed when the student has appealed against the outcome of the King's Academic Misconduct process and the appeal process is completed.

Further information about the OIA is available at [www.oiahe.org.uk](http://www.oiahe.org.uk)

## Student wellbeing

12. We recognise that it may be stressful for students going through this process. The Student Wellbeing team are available to discuss students' circumstances if they wish to do so – not to directly advise on the appeals process itself, but to talk about the circumstances of the procedure.

## Monitoring and review

13. It is important for us that we learn what we can from cases of alleged academic misconduct. The Deputy Registrar's team will maintain a record of all cases and annually report on them to the Academic Board. Through this process we aim to:

- review the process to ensure it remains effective
- identify emerging trends, themes and issues that we should address
- ensure our procedures remain aligned with King's and key external reference points
- feed the outcomes of this monitoring and review into our operation so we can improve the student experience wherever possible

14. We also undertake to make the results of this process known to the RADA community.

Original Policy created	King's Policy in RADA language
Policy Updated	June 2022
Document Approved by	Academic Board (Chairs Action)
Date Approved	08/09/2022
Version	2.0
Review Date	Annually - need to check with King's policy changes May 2023