



Cambridge Muslim College Academic Misconduct Policy

Committee: AAAC

Next Review Date: April 2023

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 OU validated provisions.

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 or group of students, 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 This includes the unacknowledged use of any published or unpublished material, including the work of other students, or even using a previously submitted work from the same student another time (Self-plagiarism). 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 AAAC Chair 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
- 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 suspected academic misconducts and academic misconduct, and associated complaints and appeals, are reported to the Faculty Board, to allow an institution-wide overview.

4. References

- Academic Misconduct Timeline (Appendix 1)
- Academic Misconduct Report Form (Appendix 2)
- [AMBeR Project Plagiarism Reference Tariff](#)
- [QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education, Advice and Guidance- Assessment](#) (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 Chair of AAAC 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 marker identifies a case of academic misconduct, it must be reported using the Academic Misconduct Form (Appendix 2), following the Timeline in Appendix 1
- 6.2. The completed form should be sent to the secretary of the AAAC via email on AAAC@cambridgemuslimcollege.ac.uk.
- 6.3. The AAAC committee members should review the case and determines if it is treated as academic misconduct by collating, analysing, and documenting all evidence to establish the facts and whether misconduct has taken place. For all academic misconduct cases, the Academic Director should be part of the AAAC.
- 6.4. If the AAAC committee members agreed that it is indeed academic misconduct, the AAAC secretary must inform the student of the allegation by email, providing the evidence and asking for their response to these allegations within the timeline in appendix 1. The email should also advise the student to explain any extenuating circumstances, if any, for consideration regarding the allegation of academic misconduct via procedure outlined in the [Extenuating Circumstances Policy](#). These circumstances 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. Students to be given a chance to request a meeting with the AAAC to defence themselves, within the timeline mentioned in Appendix 1
- 6.6. The AAAC committee to review the student response alongside any evidences or extenuating circumstances forms submitted by the student within the timeline in the Appendix 1

- 6.7. AAAC secretary to minute the meeting between student and AAAC committee, if took place, and keep in the related student's records and to be shared with Faculty Board members as per the timeline in the Appendix 1.
- 6.8. The AAAC Chair to report the case, with relevant supporting evidence, as well as the committee's recommendations to the Faculty Board, who will approve the AAAC recommendations or propose new recommendations.
- 6.9. Recommendations on academic misconduct cases will be shared with the Board of Examiners, who will take the final decision on the penalty of each case.
- 6.9.1. Where evidence becomes available after the recommendation of the Faculty Board, it is possible for the matter to be reopened.
- 6.9.2. If plagiarism is established, the Board of Examiner will apply the penalties set out in the [AMBeR Tariff](#)
- 6.9.3. The penalties for collusion will be determined by the Board of Examiners, 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.
- 6.10. The Chair of Board of Examiner to ensure that Board's decision and penalty is recorded in students' marking sheet and the Academic Misconduct Report Form. which is kept in the student's record. The secretary of Board of Examiner to inform the student to be informed by email of the final outcome at this stage.

REVISION HISTORY

Revision Number	Effective Date	Description of Change
00	March 2017	New Document
01	25 April 2018	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Formatting change 2. Policy number assignment 3. Form changes 4. Policy ownership reassigned to BA programme manager
02	March 2021	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Update the References of QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education 2. All cases of academic misconduct, and associated complaints and appeals, are reported to the Faculty Board instead of Academic Advisory Board

03	June 2022	<p>Update the policy in response to the IR conditions from the OU.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Responsibility of reviewing Academic Misconduct cases is with the AAAC committee instead of the BA Manager 2. Add timeline in Appendix 1 3. Remove the AMBeR Tariff from appendix 3 and add link to the most recent AMBeR Tariff 4. Update the procedure to make it clearer and detailed. 5. Make it clear that Board of Examiners is the main taking decision body in the Academic Misconduct cases 6. Update the Misconduct Report form to reflect the current procedure
----	-----------	---

Appendix 1



**Cambridge Muslim College
Academic Misconduct Timeline**

Deadline	Who	Misconduct Case
Submit form	Marker	within 5 calendar days of marking the paper
Share the form with AAAC members	Secretary of AAAC	within 2 calendar days of receiving the form
AAAC members to review the case	AAAC members	within 5 calendar days of receiving the form
Inform the student about the allegation	Secretary of AAAC	within 2 Calendar days of reviewing the form
Time for student to respond and ask for meeting if needed	Student	Within 5 calendar days of being informed of the allegations
Review student response/meeting and reach final recommendations	AAAC members	within 7 days of receiving student response/meeting
Share the recommendations with Faculty Board	AAAC Chair	within 5 calendar days of reaching the recommendations
Faculty Board to share recommendations with Board of Examiners	Chair of Faculty Board	within 5 days of reaching out the recommendations
Board of Examiner to reach final decision	Chair of Board of Examiners	Within 7 days of receiving the recommendations

Appendix 2



**Cambridge Muslim College
Academic Misconduct Report Form**

Section 1: to be filled by the marker

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

Section 2: to be filled by the AAAC Chair

CASE EVALUATION	
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:		

Section 3: to be filled by AAAC Chair and approved by Chair of Faculty Board:

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

Section 4: Final Decisions by Board of Examiners

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

Section 5: Signatures

Marker Name		Date:
Marker Signature		Date:

AAAC Chair Signature		Date:
Faculty Board Chair Signature		Date:
Chair of Board of Examiners Name		
Chair of Faculty Board Signature		Date:

Form 200.005.02

Appendix 3

[QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education, Advice and Guidance- Assessment](#), states the following Expectation:

Expectations for Standards

The academic standards of courses meet the requirements of the relevant national qualifications framework.

The value of qualifications awarded to students at the point of qualification and over time is in line with sector-recognised standards

Standards for Core Practice

The provider ensures that the threshold standards for its qualifications are consistent with the relevant national qualifications frameworks.

The provider ensures that students who are awarded qualifications have the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers.

The provider uses external expertise, assessment and classification processes that are reliable, fair and transparent.

Guiding Principles

1. Assessment methods and criteria are aligned to learning outcomes and teaching activities.
2. Assessment is reliable, consistent, fair and valid.
3. Assessment design is approached holistically.
4. Assessment is inclusive and equitable.
5. Assessment is explicit and transparent.
6. Assessment and feedback is purposeful and supports the learning process.
7. Assessment is timely.
8. Assessment is efficient and manageable.
9. Students are supported and prepared for assessment.
10. Assessment encourages academic integrity.