

HE Student Academic Misconduct Policy

DOCUMENT CONTROL:

Document No:	2.12	Document Type:	HE Student Academic Misconduct Policy		
Formal Review Cycle:	Annual				
Latest Formal Review (month/year):	2021-08	Next Formal Review (month/year):	Review Due	2022-08	
Policy Owner:	HE Business & Development Leader				
Policy Sponsor:	Vice Principal Curriculum & Quality				

APPROVAL REQUIRED:

SMT Y/N	Y	SMT Date approved:	12 October 2021		
Governor Y/N	N	Committee:	N/A	Governor Date approved:	N/A

PUBLICATION:

Website Y/N	Y	Intranet Y/N	Y	Student VLE Y/N	N	Date published:	15 October 2021
Audience:	HE Staff, Students						
Area/s of Staff Intranet:	SPP						

HE Student Academic Misconduct Policy

1. Introduction

This policy defines what the College means by academic misconduct, particularly plagiarism, and will not conflict with awarding organisations' policies and regulations. In establishing this policy, the College is seeking to maintain the integrity of its academic awards and procedures and to give any student affected, a fair opportunity to respond to any allegation of academic misconduct. This policy applies to all the qualifications delivered by the College at higher education level.

2. Key Principles

- This policy seeks to maintain the integrity of the College's academic awards and procedures and to give any student affected a fair opportunity to respond to any allegation of academic misconduct
- This policy will not conflict with partner institution or awarding organisation policies and regulations
- The procedures in this policy are not contractual in nature and there is no right to compensation for any amendment to the procedures

3. Responsibility

- The HE Business & Development Leader has overall responsibility for applying this policy fairly and accurately and for the consideration of all cases of suspected academic misconduct
- The HE Business & Development Leader and the Senior Academic Quality Officer (HE) are responsible for the correct implementation of the policy
- Module Tutors have responsibility to ensure all suspected cases of academic misconduct are submitted to the Senior Academic Quality Officer (HE) for processing

4. Legislation

There is no legislation associated with this policy

HE Student Academic Misconduct Procedure

1. Introduction

Craven College is committed to developing a culture of academic integrity and to conducting fair and equitable assessment for all students. Academic integrity involves a commitment to the core values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility in all academic endeavours. Individuals sometimes fail to act with academic integrity in an attempt to gain an unfair advantage in an assessment. This is often termed academic misconduct and it will be dealt with by the College in accordance with the procedure set out in this document.

Academic misconduct includes, but is not limited to, the presentation of work created by others, or previously submitted by the student for assessment, without properly acknowledging the source, with or without permission. This can include words, images, opinions or discoveries, purchased or ghost written work.

1. Key Processes
2. Roles and Responsibilities
3. Objectives
4. Communication
5. Implementation
6. Monitoring
7. Reporting
8. Assessment of Impact
9. Continuous Improvement
10. Associated Documentation

2. Key Processes

- The concern will be raised with the Course Tutor, who will decide whether a further investigation is warranted
- If further investigation is warranted, the Course Tutor will complete a plagiarism report form (appendix 1) and submit it to the HE Office also sending a copy to the student (normally within ten working days of the concern first arising)
- The student will be invited to attend an Academic Misconduct Panel, in person or via Teams
- Following the meeting (within 5 days) the student will be informed in writing of the decision and the penalty incurred (appendix 2)

3. Roles and Responsibilities

- The Higher Education Business & Development Leader has overall responsibility for applying this policy fairly and accurately and for the consideration of all cases of suspected academic misconduct
- The Higher Education Business & Development Leader and the Senior Academic Quality Officer (HE) are responsible for the correct implementation of the policy
- Module and Course Tutors have responsibility to ensure all suspected cases of academic misconduct are submitted to the Senior Academic Quality Officer (HE) and all cases are recorded through the course annual report
- The Senior Academic Quality Officer (HE) is responsible for ensuring that all cases of suspected academic misconduct are recorded centrally and are reported to the Scheme Board of Examiners

4. Objectives

- To maintain the integrity of academic awards
- To ensure a fair and equitable process of investigation for all cases of suspected academic misconduct
- To ensure results of an investigation into academic misconduct are communicated in a clear and transparent manner
- To ensure that all requirements of partner university / awarding body are met

5. Communication

The following principles are fundamental to the communication of the HE Student Academic Misconduct Policy and Procedure

- The HE Student Academic Misconduct Policy will be published on a standardised template
- The HE Student Academic Misconduct Policy will be reviewed by the Higher Education Business and Development Leader (owner) and the Senior Academic Quality Officer (HE) (deputy owner) before being escalated to the approval process
- This policy will apply to all those studying higher education courses at Craven College. It will be the responsibility of the Course Team and the Senior Academic Quality Officer (HE) to communicate the content of the policy with the students
- This policy will be published on the College's intranet and website

6. Implementation

Each case will be determined on its own facts and merits. Accordingly, it may be necessary to adjust the procedures to allow a proper investigation or to ensure fairness to the student concerned in any particular case. It may be necessary for the College to seek legal advice in specific cases. The procedures in this policy are not contractual in nature and there is no right to compensation for any amendment to the procedures.

If a student is suspected of academic misconduct:

- The concern will be raised with the Course Tutor
- The Course Tutor will decide whether a further investigation is warranted
- If further investigation is warranted, the Course Tutor will complete an academic misconduct report form and submit it to the HE Office also sending a copy to the student (normally within ten working days of the concern first arising)
- The student will then be invited to attend an Academic Misconduct Panel in person or via Teams. At least two members of staff will be present at the panel, normally the Higher Education Business & Development Leader and Senior Academic Quality Officer (HE)
- Students may be accompanied by a fellow student or family member to provide support
- Students may also request the presence of the Course Tutor
- If the style suggests the assessment is ghost written or purchased the student may be questioned or asked to produce an earlier draft to ascertain that the work is their own.

The Academic Misconduct Panel will decide whether:

- a) There is insufficient evidence to justify a finding of academic misconduct. If so, no further action will be taken under these procedures.

OR

- b) The matter should be considered poor scholarship rather than academic misconduct. No further action will take place under these procedures, although the poor scholarship will be taken into account through the normal marking process. The finding will be noted on the student record and may be taken into account in the context of any future allegations that the student has committed academic misconduct.

OR

- c) That academic misconduct has indeed taken place and a penalty determined

Following the Panel (within 5 days) the student will be informed in writing of the decision and the penalty incurred. Students may also be referred to the Study Support Centre.

The decision of the Academic Misconduct Panel may be subject to appeal on the following grounds:

- That there were procedure irregularities on the part of the Academic Misconduct Panel
- That there were mitigating circumstances which affected the student's ability to determine right from wrong, and which, for good reason, were not disclosed at the time of the Academic Misconduct Panel

An appeal must be submitted, in writing, to the Head of Quality within 5 working days of notification of the decision of the Academic Misconduct Panel.

7. Monitoring

- The Higher Education Business & Development Leader has responsibility to monitor the implementation of the policy
- The Higher Education Business & Development Leader and the Senior Academic Quality Officer (HE) are responsible for the annual review of the policy

8. Reporting

- Course Tutors have responsibility to ensure all suspected cases of academic misconduct are recorded through the course annual report
- The Senior Academic Quality Officer (HE) is responsible for ensuring that all cases of suspected academic misconduct are recorded and reported to the Scheme Board of Examiners

9. Assessment of Impact

- The impact of this policy is in line with The Good Practice Framework published by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator, and has been authorised through the validating partner / awarding organisation
- The policy is considered to have no impact on current College policy

10. Continuous Improvement

- This policy will be evaluated and reviewed annually
- Should the policy be amended, this will be approved by the partner university and reported to the College's HE Scheme Management Board for approval before being forwarded to the College's SMT

11. Associated Documentation

1. [HE Academic Misconduct Report Form](#)
2. [HE Academic Misconduct Penalties \(The Open University / Pearson\)](#)
3. [HE Academic Misconduct Penalties \(University of Hull\)](#)

End – add flowchart here if appropriate and any additional forms or guidance in appendices. Use a page break and start these on new pages as appendices. Please ensure appendices are referred to in the policy or procedure area (e.g. see Appendix 1) so that the audience is aware of where to refer to these and why.

Appendix 1 HE Academic Misconduct Report Form

Please complete this form where you suspect a student may have plagiarised.

The completed form should be sent to the student and dward@craven-college.ac.uk

Student name:

Course Title:

Module:

Assessment title:

Level:

Module marked by:

First reported plagiarism: Yes/No (Include date and module title of previous case)

Evidence of plagiarism:

- Similarity to internet source:
- Similarity to text source:
- Copying from another student:
- Similarity to previously assessed own work:
- Indication of purchasing or ghost writing:
- Other issues:

Appendix 2: HE Academic Misconduct Penalties (The Open University)

Academic Misconduct Penalties (based on AMBeR Tariff)

Points are assigned based on the following criteria

History

1 st offence	100 points
2 nd offence	150 points
3 rd offence +	200 points

Amount/Extent

Below 5% AND less than two sentences	80 points
As above but with critical aspects or key ideas plagiarised	105 points
Between 5% and 20% OR more than two sentences but not more than two paragraphs	105 points
Between 20% and 50% OR more than two paragraphs but not more than 5 paragraphs	130 points
Above 50% OR more than five paragraphs	160 points
Submission purchased from essay mill or ghost-writing service	225 points

Level

Level 4	70 points
Level 5	115 points
Level 6/7	140 points

Value of assessment

Standard weighting (20 credits)	30 points
---------------------------------	-----------

Additional characteristics

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

Penalties are awarded based on points as below

Penalties (Summative Work)

In all cases a formal warning is given and a record made according to the appropriate level of the Student Disciplinary Policy, taking into account the student's previous history. Where the penalty is expulsion a Formal Hearing will take place and the final decision made by the Disciplinary Panel.

Points	Penalties (select one)
280 – 329	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No further action beyond formal warning Assessment awarded 0% - re-assessment required, with no penalty on mark
330 – 379	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment awarded 0% - re-assessment required, with no penalty on mark Assessment awarded 0% - re-assessment required but mark capped at 40% / Pass
380 – 479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment awarded 0% - re-assessment required but mark capped at 40% / Pass Assessment awarded 0% - no opportunity for re-assessment
480 – 524	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment awarded 0% - no opportunity for re-assessment Module awarded 0% - re-assessment required, but mark capped at 40% / Pass Module awarded 0% - no opportunity for re-assessment, but credit still awarded
525 – 559	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Module awarded 0% - re-assessment required, but mark capped at 40% / Pass Module awarded 0% - no opportunity for re-assessment, but credit still awarded Expelled from College but credits retained Expelled from College with credits withdrawn
560+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expelled from College but credits retained Expelled from College with credits withdrawn

Penalties (Formative Work)

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

Appendix 3: Academic Misconduct Penalties (University of Hull)

Poor academic practice

1. This may arise from a lack of understanding of the standard methods of acknowledging the source of words, ideas or diagrams in a piece of work or the appropriate levels of collaboration or the correct behaviour within an exam. It may also be applicable where the extent does not justify further investigative proceedings or a penalty, for example, for errors made through carelessness.

Academic Misconduct

2. This is behaviour which, if not detected, would give a student an unfair advantage in an assessment. The main difference between academic misconduct and severe academic misconduct is the extent of the alleged misconduct. Indicative examples of what constitute academic misconduct are:
 - a. Failure to correctly reference sources and claim an idea as original work (i.e. plagiarism);
 - b. Submitting for assessment an item which has been previously submitted for credit in another module with little change made to the assessment (i.e. self-plagiarism);
 - c. Submitting coursework in collaboration with another student (i.e. collusion);
 - d. Attempts to communicate with another candidate during an examination (i.e. cheating).

Severe Academic Misconduct

3. Where there is clear evidence of extensive or substantial attempts to gain an unfair advantage or where there has been a previous, proven case of academic misconduct or severe academic misconduct against a student. Any proven allegations of contract cheating, impersonation or fabrication or falsification of data will always initially be considered as a case of severe academic misconduct.

Penalty 1: Issue a formal warning.

Warning letter will remain on the student record. The original mark awarded will stand.

Penalty 2: Mark of 0 awarded in the assessment task at first attempt with the right to reassessment.

If the Academic Misconduct was for a first attempt at the assessment; you will have the right to undertake a second attempt in the reassessment period. The result of this reassessment attempt for this element will be capped at the pass mark. Student will also be issued with a University Warning.

Penalty 3: Mark of 0 in the module.
--

If the Academic Misconduct was for a first attempt at the module, you will be required to undertake reassessments in all assessment components of the module. The result of these reassessment attempts will be capped at the pass mark. Student will also be issued with a University Warning.
--

Penalty 4: Mark of 0 in the module with no right to reassessment.
--

This will result in a failed module which may affect your ability to progress on your programme of study. Student will also be issued with a University Warning.

Penalty 5: Termination of Study.

This should only occur where there is evidence of sustained attempts at Academic Misconduct.
--