



Proposed updated plagiarism policy and changes to existing procedures for consultation

October 2023

Proposed updated plagiarism policy

ARB's definition of plagiarism

The representation of someone else's work or ideas as your own without proper citation or acknowledgement that could provide an advantage over others. Not only have you demonstrated you do not have the sufficient knowledge to join the Register, but you may also have shown dishonesty and a lack of integrity in presenting someone else's work as your own. Both accidental and intentional plagiarism are an offence under the policy. This means it is plagiarism if it is either:

- Accidental, meaning, for example, the individual did not consider that they were committing plagiarism by not including proper citations in their work.
- Intentional, meaning the individual knew they were committing plagiarism in their submitted work. This also includes colluding with other individuals to submit work that is not the applicant's own.

As examples, ARB considers all of the following to be plagiarism:

- Accidentally or intentionally submitting or using someone else's work as your own in an accredited examination.
- Accidentally or intentionally failing to properly credit someone else's work in your own submission.
- Intentionally copying someone else's work but changing the wording slightly to make it appear as your own.
- Fabrication or falsification, wherein you provide fake quotations, manipulated figures or false information about a source or individual in an attempt to pass it off as genuine.
- Collusion, wherein you conspire with one or more individuals to gain an advantage over others in examinations.

This policy applies to any material submitted for assessment, including written text, designs, models, plans, images, video or audio.

ARB considers any of the above plagiarism offences cause to call into question the character and fitness to practise of the individual found to have committed them.

Process

Examiners will check references are correct and all material that is not the individual's own is correctly cited in the submission.

Examiners will highlight to ARB staff any submission that they suspect includes the following:

- The submission provided includes improper referencing of their sources

- The submission contains no references at all, but the Examiner has identified it includes the work of others
- The submission contains fabricated material

ARB will then deliberate the extent of the offence and any penalties to impose upon the applicant at ARB's discretion. As part of their deliberation, the ARB decision maker will contact the applicant to give them the opportunity to provide an explanation.¹

Declaration

All applicants to an exam or application covered by this policy must confirm that they have read and understood the guidance on plagiarism and cheating, and are aware of ARB's policy.

Applicants should be cautious that, while there may be legitimate uses of software (including artificial intelligence and large language models) to aid writing and translation, users of this should be particularly vigilant that they do not inadvertently plagiarise.

Guidance for ARB on penalties

Outcome or grade:

Potential penalties for plagiarism are at ARB's discretion and are separated into two categories:

- 1) The effect on the applicant's current application and whether it is rejected
- 2) The impact on their eligibility to reapply should their current application be rejected

Reapplication:

Impacts on the applicant's eligibility to reapply can include:

- None, whereby the applicant will automatically be able to reapply at the next opportunity, or
- The applicant will automatically be able to reapply after 1 year, or
- The applicant will not automatically be able to reapply. Instead, reapplication will be at the discretion of the Registrar and after at least 2 years. The Registrar will take into account the severity of the offence and any reflection or steps taken by the applicant.

Considerations for the ARB decision maker:

When deciding on the most appropriate penalty, the ARB decision maker should give reasons, taking into account the following examples of mitigating circumstances:

- Plagiarism is limited to an isolated or small number of mistakes that appear to be incompetence rather than intentional dishonesty.
- The applicant has voluntarily contacted ARB to correct mistakes after submitting their application.

¹ 'Decision maker' would normally be the ARB registration team processing the application, with the Registrar as appropriate.

- Any explanation provided by the applicant after being contacted by ARB.
- Any other mitigation that they consider to be relevant in determining the applicant's level of dishonesty.

Proposed changes to procedures

Proposed changes are struck through and highlighted in red

Prescribed exam: Examination Procedures

02. The Procedures for Examination

2.1 Principles

~~2.1.3 A candidate whose work is found to be plagiarised at any point in the examination process will not be permitted to continue with their examination. The Board may wish to use any standard tool for the purpose of investigating plagiarism. Re-application will be at the discretion of the Registrar.~~

An applicant who is suspected to have plagiarised at any point in the examination process will be subject to investigation and potential sanction under ARB's Plagiarism Policy.

UK Adaptation Assessment Process: Assessment Procedures

2. The Procedures for the UK Adaptation Assessment

2.1 Principles

~~2.1.3 An applicant, any part of whose submission is determined by the Registrar to be misleading or untrue at any point in the assessment process will not be permitted to continue with their assessment, and their application will be refused. Re-application will be at the discretion of the Registrar.~~

An applicant who is suspected to have plagiarised at any point in the application process will be subject to investigation and potential sanction under ARB's Plagiarism Policy.