

Malpractice Policy

1.1 Introduction

Honesty, trust, and personal responsibility are fundamental attributes of Upgrade Me Training values. Academic dishonesty by a student will not be tolerated, for it threatens the foundation of an organization dedicated to the pursuit of knowledge.

To maintain its credibility and reputation, and to equitably assess learners' performance, Upgrade Me Training is committed to maintaining a climate that upholds and values the highest standards of academic integrity.

1.2 Academic Dishonesty

Academic dishonesty involves violations of procedures, which protect the integrity of the coursework completed by a student. Academic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to the following:

- **Violations of procedures** which protect the integrity of a quiz, examination, or similar evaluation, such as:
 - Possessing, referring to, or employing open textbooks or notes or other devices not authorized by the staff member;
 - Copying from another person's paper;
 - Communication with, providing assistance to, or receiving assistance from another person in a manner not authorized by the staff member;
 - Possessing, buying, selling, obtaining, giving, or using a copy of any unauthorized materials intended to be used as or in the preparation of a quiz or examination or similar evaluation;
 - Taking a quiz or examination or similar evaluation in the place of another person;
 - Utilizing another person to take a quiz, examination, or similar evaluation in place of oneself;
 - Changing material on a graded examination and then requesting a re- grading of the examination;
 - The use of any form of technology capable of originating, storing, receiving or sending alphanumeric data and photographic or other images to accomplish or abet any of the violations listed above.
- **Plagiarism** or violations of procedures prescribed to protect the integrity of an assignment, such as:
 - Submitting an assignment purporting to be the student's original work which has been wholly or partly created by another person;
 - Presenting as one's own work, ideas, representations or words of another person without customary and proper acknowledgment of sources;
 - Submitting as newly executed work, without staff member's prior knowledge and consent, one's own work which has been previously presented for another class;
 - Knowingly permitting one's work to be submitted by another person

If it were the submitter's original work.

- **False claims** of having completed work during an assignment.
- **Cooperating with another person** in academic dishonesty, either directly or indirectly as an intermediary agent or broker.
- **Knowingly destroying or altering another student's work whether** in written form, computer files, art work, or other format.
- **Aiding, abetting, or attempting** to commit an act or action which would constitute academic dishonesty.

1.3 Accusation of Discrimination

If the student believes the accusation of academic dishonesty is in whole or in part due to unlawful discrimination relating to race, religion, color, sex, sexual orientation, physical or mental disability, national origin, ancestry, or age, the student must inform the Head of Center of Upgrade Me Training, in writing of this belief immediately after an accusation has been made.

The charge of unlawful discrimination shall be dealt with prior to or in conjunction with any consideration under the academic dishonesty procedures which follow.

- When a student involved in an academic dishonesty case alleges as a partial or complete defense, discriminatory treatment on the part of the staff member, then the student must at the first opportunity cite the specific treatment engaged in by the staff member.
- When raising such defense, the student must also provide a summary of the constitutionally or statutorily prohibited reasons upon which he or she believes the decision or accusation was based and a detailed summary of the evidence which supports the appellant's allegation. Discriminatory treatment is defined as decisions based upon constitutionally or statutorily prohibited reasons, including unlawful discrimination.
- When a student involved in an academic ethics case alleges discriminatory treatment on the part of the staff member, Upgrade Me Training's QA Manager, or his or her designee, shall serve in an advisory capacity to the committee or hearing panel at each level of appeal.
- All appeals alleging discriminatory treatment in cases that begin as academic ethics cases shall be pursued under the procedures set forth in this document.
- In all cases, the appellant has the burden of proving his or her allegations.

1.4 Implementation Procedures

Throughout this document, written notice is defined as Recorded Delivery Mail and/or electronic communication with a read/receipt request attached to the document. No statute of limitation shall exist for issues of academic dishonesty. However, before the procedures may begin, the individual in question must be located and contacted. Once located, the Head of Centre will send a certified letter or email to the individual, containing all required information. When the Head of Centre receives confirmation that the letter or email has been delivered, the timetable of events begins.

1.5 Informal Resolution

If a staff member accuses a student of academic dishonesty, the staff member must inform the student, either in person or by written notice, of the alleged violation within five working days after the staff member becomes aware of the initial circumstances giving rise to the accusation.

The staff member and student will discuss the alleged violation in a private Conference within five working days after the staff member notifies the student of the accusation.

The student's failure to respond to this accusation will be considered an admission of guilt.

If, as the result of the conference, the staff member thinks that the student is not responsible, the matter will be closed.

If, as a result of the initial conference, the student admits his or her academic Dishonesty, the student will be required to indicate this admission in writing to the staff member within five working days following the conference.

If, after receiving the written admission of a violation, an appropriate resolution and

Punishment is found which satisfies the staff member and the student, written documentation of the meeting will be sent to the Centre Manager. Both the staff member and the student must sign this written documentation.

Disagreement as to Violation.

If, as a result of the initial conference, the staff member thinks a violation has occurred and the student disagrees, the staff member must notify the student in writing within five working days following the initial conference that the staff member is proceeding with the **formal resolution** process.

Disagreement as to Punishment.

If the Upgrade Me Training staff imposes punishment after a student has admitted guilt (written admission or failure to respond), the student may appeal within five working days following the initial conference the appropriateness of the punishment imposed (but not his or her guilt) to Upgrade Centre Manager.

1.6 Formal Resolution

Centre manager will send written notification to the student that he or she is proceeding with the formal resolution process shall include a brief description (no more than five pages) of the circumstances giving rise to the accusation and inform the student of his/her right to appeal.

A copy of the written notice shall be given to the Head of Center. The student must respond in writing to the formal accusation within five working days after receiving the staff member's written notice.

The student's written response must indicate why he/she denies the accusation and wishes to appeal. If the student fails to respond in writing within the five working day period, the student shall be deemed to have admitted to the accusation.

If the student denies the accusation, in writing, the staff member shall refer the matter, in writing, to the Head of Centre within five working days from the date of the student's response.

At that same time, the staff member shall provide copies of the academic dishonesty

The staff member bears the burden of proof for establishing academic dishonesty. If the matter is not resolved informally, and if the staff member does not refer the matter to the head of centre, the student shall be deemed to be innocent of the accusation of academic dishonesty and no punishment may be imposed.

1.7 Timing of Grade

During the formal resolution process, the student's enrollment and participation in class shall not be affected. If the student's grade in the course has not been resolved by this process and the course ends, the student shall receive an "Incomplete" in the course until such time as a grade can be determined pursuant to this policy. If the student has already been assigned a grade in the course at the time the student is accused of academic dishonesty, the assigned grade shall not be changed unless and until the student is determined to be guilty of academic dishonesty pursuant to this policy.

1.8 Course Withdrawal

Withdrawal from a course when faced with an accusation of academic dishonesty in that course does not preclude imposition of a penalty for the violation, including failure in the course. If penalty shall be determined to be course failure, the instructor may submit a Change of result to admin or head of center in writing to reflect this on student file.

1.9 Multiple Offense Review

Upon receipt of a staff member's written notification of an informal resolution of a student academic integrity issue or of a need for a formal resolution process and if it is found that one or more prior offenses has occurred, the Head of center shall review all records and make a determination as to whether further action is warranted.

1.10 Informal Process Resolution

After review of past incidents, the Head of Center may close the matter with no further action, or may choose to impose additional penalty for the most recent violation. The Head Of Center may recommend no additional penalty or may recommend penalty up to and including suspension or expulsion from the Upgrade Me Training course or revocation of a previously awarded qualification.

Procedure

If malpractice is found on any course immediately report the incident to the center contact, Awarding body via a written report on the incident.