



## Cambridge Muslim College Academic Misconduct Policy

### 1. Purpose

This sets out the policy, and associated procedures, for dealing with academic misconduct, with the aim of ensuring consistent and fair treatment for all.

### 2. Scope

This policy applies to students and faculty teaching on the BA (Hons) programme.

### 3. Principles

- 3.1. Academic integrity means acting with honesty to fulfil the requirements set for academic work by always acknowledging sources and by not relying on dishonest means to gain improper advantage.
- 3.2. Academic misconduct is any act whereby a student may obtain for themselves, or for another student, an advantage which may lead to a higher mark than their abilities would otherwise secure. The following is a list of examples of academic misconduct which will be considered under this policy.
  - 3.2.1. Plagiarism: Copying or paraphrasing without acknowledgement is deemed to be plagiarism. This includes the unacknowledged use of any published or unpublished material, including the work of other students. It also includes the commissioning, purchase and submission of a piece of work, in part or whole, as the student's own (also known as contract cheating).
    - 3.2.1.1. Poor Academic Practice - depending on the seriousness of the errors in presentation and referencing, and/or the source of the work re-used without reference, the misconduct may be considered poor academic practice, rather than plagiarism. Poor academic practice, which can normally be expected to occur in the early part of a student's career, is when an assessment fails to reference source material in such a way that it amounts to misconduct. More serious errors are deemed to constitute plagiarism. Poor academic practice is not considered to be academic misconduct. However, any subsequent offence of poor academic practice by the same student is likely to be considered as academic misconduct and treated accordingly.
    - 3.2.1.2. Initial Plagiarism - where a student is subject to these procedures for the first time. If a student has been accused of plagiarism, but the results of the investigation are not yet known or have not been communicated to the student, then each case will be dealt with as an act of initial plagiarism until the results of all investigations are known.

- 3.2.1.3. Repeated Plagiarism - where a student who has already been dealt with through these procedures and found guilty of plagiarism is found to have plagiarised at a later occasion.
- 3.2.1.4. Where a student has an acknowledged learning disability, a proof-reader may be used to ensure that the student's meaning is not misunderstood as a result of the quality and standard of writing. Where permitted, a proof-reader may identify spelling and basic grammatical errors. Inaccuracies in academic content should not be corrected nor should the structure of the piece of work be changed.
- 3.2.2. Cheating
  - 3.2.2.1. Cheating is dishonest behaviour in an examination or test, such as communicating with, or copying from, any other candidate; making use of any written or printed materials in the examination room; use of mobile phones or other unauthorised electronic devices in the examination room to gain an unfair advantage; obtaining a copy of a closed written examination paper in advance of the time and date for its release (examination papers which are given to students in advance are known as 'open' papers).
  - 3.2.2.2. Cheating includes falsely inventing data, for example for research purposes.
  - 3.2.2.3. Cheating amounts to misconduct at examinations, which is also dealt with by the AMBeR Tariff. Cheating will attract the same level of points as the highest level of plagiarism.
- 3.2.3. Collusion: This is the unauthorised and unattributed collaboration of students in the composition of a piece of assessed work to gain an unpermitted advantage. This may occur where two or more students have consciously colluded on a piece of work, in part or whole, and passed it off as their own individual efforts.
- 3.3. The BA Programme Manager has the right to check any previously marked pieces of work from that student if there is cause for suspicion that plagiarism has occurred in relation to one or more of these pieces of work.
- 3.4. A student accused of academic misconduct has the right to appeal against the outcome of the academic misconduct process, via the procedure outlined in the Academic Complaints and Appeals Policy.
- 3.5. Penalties are issued in line with the AMBeR Tariff, which is a points-based penalty system for Higher Education institutions (Appendix 2).
- 3.6. The penalties for proven academic misconduct operate on the assumption that all students have had the opportunity to acquire an understanding of academic misconduct; this applies especially to plagiarism.
- 3.7. All cases of academic misconduct, and associated complaints and appeals, are reported to the Academic Advisory Board, to allow an institution-wide overview.

#### 4. References

- Academic Misconduct Report Form (Appendix 1)
- AMBeR Project Plagiarism Reference Tariff (Appendix 2)
- QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education, Chapter B6 (Appendix 3)
- Competition and Markets Authority (CMA) Guidance
- Assessment Policy
- Moderation Policy
- Academic Complaints and Appeals Policy
- Extenuating Circumstances Policy

#### 5. Responsibility

- 5.1. The BA Programme Manager is responsible for the review and implementation of this policy.
- 5.2. It is the responsibility of students to understand what constitutes academic misconduct, particularly the correct use of sources and citation, and to seek advice where necessary.

#### 6. Procedure

- 6.1. When a person identifies a case of academic misconduct, it must be reported using the Academic Misconduct Form (Appendix 1).
- 6.2. The completed form should be sent to the BA Programme Manager for review.
- 6.3. The BA Programme Manager determines if the case should be treated as academic misconduct by collating, analysing, and documenting all evidence to establish the facts and whether misconduct has taken place.
- 6.4. If the BA Programme Manager determines that it is indeed academic misconduct, s/he must hold a meeting to notify the student. In the meeting the BA Programme Manager must:
  - 6.4.1. Inform the student of the allegation and its reasons.
  - 6.4.2. Ask the student if s/he agrees to the offense.
    - 6.4.2.1. If the student denies the offence, the BA Programme Manager, together with the Course Convenor for the module in question, shall reconsider the case. If they want to uphold the charge of academic misconduct, the BA Programme Manager shall continue with this procedure.
    - 6.4.2.2. A student may submit mitigating circumstances for consideration regarding allegations of academic misconduct via the procedures outlined in the Extenuating Circumstances Policy. They will not be used to determine if an offence has taken place but might, if found valid, have an impact upon a penalty.
- 6.5. The BA Programme Manager must notify the College Coordinator (BA) to ensure the outcome of the conversation is reflected on the mark spreadsheet and the Academic Misconduct Form, which is kept in the student's record.

- 6.6. The BA Programme Manager will then report the case, with relevant supporting evidence, to the Faculty Board, asking them to judge the academic misconduct and reach a decision on the candidate's result.
- 6.6.1. Where evidence becomes available after the recommendation of the Faculty Board, it is possible for the matter to be reopened.
- 6.6.2. If plagiarism is established, the Faculty Board will apply the penalties set out in the AMBeR Tariff (Appendix 2).
- 6.6.3. The penalties for collusion will be determined by the Faculty Board, using their discretion and taking into the account the extent of collusion and whether it is a first or subsequent offence. Those who pass their assignments to others, with the knowledge that another student may plagiarise the assignment, are equally guilty of academic misconduct and will also be subject to a penalty. Penalties will be in line with the AMBeR Tariff in terms of proportion to the offence and seriousness.
- 6.7. The BA Programme Manager will convey the Board's decision and penalty to the student, ensure that the College Coordinator makes a note on the mark spreadsheet and completes the Academic Misconduct Report Form, which is kept in the student's record.

*This policy has been adapted with reference to All Nations College, with grateful acknowledgment.*

#### REVISION HISTORY

Revision Number	Effective Date	Description of Change
00	March 2017	New Document
01	25 April 2018	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Formatting change</li> <li>2. Policy number assignment</li> <li>3. Form changes</li> <li>4. Policy ownership reassigned to BA programme manager</li> </ol>

Appendix 1



**Cambridge Muslim College  
Academic Misconduct Report Form**

<b>Student name</b>	
<b>Student ID #</b>	
<b>Title of work concerned</b>	
<b>Nature of issue</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor Academic Practice <input type="checkbox"/> Cheating <input type="checkbox"/> Collusion <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism <input type="checkbox"/> Other – please explain
<b>Rationale for decision to treat as academic misconduct</b>	
<b>Person who identified misconduct</b>	Name:
	Title:
	Date:
	Signature:

<b>CASE EVALUATION</b>	
Is this a case of academic misconduct? If so, what type?	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor Academic Practice <input type="checkbox"/> Cheating <input type="checkbox"/> Collusion <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism (Initial/Repeated) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Other – please explain <input type="checkbox"/> This is not academic misconduct

Has the student been notified of the allegation and presented with the reasons for this conclusion?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO
Has the student admitted the offence?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO
Is this the student's first offence?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO
Has the student been given an official warning and been instructed how to avoid repeating the offence?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO
Has a note been added to the mark sheet?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO
Meeting Notes:		

<b>PENALTY CALCULATION FOR ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT</b>	
Points for History:	
Points for Amount/Extent:	
Points for Level/Stage:	
Points for Value of Assignment:	
Points for Additional Characteristics:	
Total Points:	
<b>PENALTY AWARDED (as per AMBeR Tariff):</b>	

<b>BA Programme Manager</b>		<b>Date:</b>
<b>BA Programme Manager Signature</b>		<b>Date:</b>
<b>Module Leader Name</b>		<b>Date:</b>
<b>Module Leader Signature</b>		<b>Date:</b>
<b>Chair of Faculty Board</b>		
<b>Chair of Faculty Board Signature</b>		<b>Date:</b>

## Appendix 2

# 1

## Assign points based on the following criteria

### HISTORY

1st Time	<b>100 points</b>
2nd Time	<b>150 points</b>
3rd/+ Time	<b>200 points</b>

### AMOUNT / EXTENT

Below 5% <b>AND</b> less than two sentences	<b>80 points</b>
As above but with <b>critical aspects*</b> plagiarised	<b>105 points</b>
Between 5% and 20% <b>OR</b> more than two sentences but not more than two paragraphs	<b>105 points</b>
As above but with <b>critical aspects*</b> plagiarised	<b>130 points</b>
Between 20% and 50% <b>OR</b> more than two paragraphs but not more than five paragraphs	<b>130 points</b>
As above but with <b>critical aspects*</b> plagiarised	<b>160 points</b>
Above 50% <b>OR</b> more than five paragraphs	<b>160 points</b>
Submission purchased from essay mill or ghostwriting service †	<b>225 points</b>

\* Critical aspects are key ideas central to the assignment

† Some institutions may consider this to be a separate form of academic malpractice

### LEVEL / STAGE

Level 1	<b>70 points</b>
Level 2	<b>115 points</b>
Level 3/Postgraduate	<b>140 points</b>

### VALUE OF ASSIGNMENT

Standard weighting	<b>30 points</b>
Large project (e.g. final year dissertation)	<b>60 points</b>

### ADDITIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Evidence of deliberate attempt to disguise plagiarism by changing words, sentences or references to avoid detection **40 points**

# 2

## Award penalties based on the points

### PENALTIES (Summative Work)

In all cases a formal warning is given and a record made contributing to the student's previous history

Points	Available Penalties (select one)
280 - 329	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No further action beyond formal warning</li> <li>Assignment awarded 0% - resubmission required, with no penalty on mark</li> </ul>
330 - 379	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No further action beyond formal warning</li> <li>Assignment awarded 0% - resubmission required, with no penalty on mark</li> <li>Assignment awarded 0% - resubmission required but mark capped or reduced</li> </ul>
380 - 479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assignment awarded 0% - resubmission required but mark capped or reduced</li> <li>Assignment awarded 0% - no opportunity to resubmit</li> </ul>
480 - 524	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assignment awarded 0% - no opportunity to resubmit</li> <li>Module awarded 0% - re-sit required, but mark capped or reduced</li> <li>Module awarded 0% - no opportunity to re-sit, but credit still awarded</li> </ul>
525 - 559	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Module awarded 0% - re-sit required, but mark capped or reduced</li> <li>Module awarded 0% - no opportunity to re-sit, but credit still awarded</li> <li>Module awarded 0% - no opportunity to re-sit, and credit lost</li> <li>Award classification reduced</li> <li>Qualification reduced (e.g. Honours -&gt; no Honours)</li> <li>Expelled from institution but credits retained</li> <li>Expelled from institution with credits withdrawn</li> </ul>
560+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Module awarded 0% - no opportunity to resit, and credit lost</li> <li>Award classification reduced</li> <li>Qualification reduced (e.g. Honours -&gt; no Honours)</li> <li>Expelled from institution but credits retained</li> <li>Expelled from institution with credits withdrawn</li> </ul>

### PENALTIES (Formative Work)

280 - 379	Informal warning
380+	Formal warning, with record made contributing to the student's previous history

Source: <https://www.educationforhealth.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/9.10-Penalties-for-Cases-of-confirmed-plagiarism-AMBeR-Tariff.pdf>

### **Appendix 3**

The QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education, Chapter B6: Assessment of students and the recognition of prior learning, states the following Expectation:

‘Higher education providers operate equitable, valid and reliable processes of assessment, including for the recognition of prior learning, which enable every student to demonstrate the extent to which they have achieved the intended learning outcomes for the credit or qualification being sought.’

Within this Expectation are the following Indicators relevant to academic misconduct:

‘Students are provided with opportunities to develop an understanding of, and the necessary skills to demonstrate, good academic practice.

Higher education providers operate processes for preventing, identifying, investigating and responding to unacceptable academic practice.’