



Fairfield School of Business

Academic Misconduct Policy and Procedure Ravensbourne University London (RUL) Taught Degree Programmes

Version: 4.0

Category: Policies – Student Support (HE)

Owner(s): Academic Board: Head of Registry

Approved by: The Board of Governors

Access: **Public** – Anyone can view this document

Scope: This Policy applies to students enrolled on higher education programmes leading to an award from Ravensbourne University London.

Contents:

1. Introduction.....	2
2. Identifying Plagiarism	2
3. Categories of Academic Misconduct	3
4. Penalties for Academic Misconduct.....	5
5. Indicative level of offence.....	6
6. Guidance of Handling Poor Academic Practice and Academic Misconduct	7
7. Review.....	8

1. Introduction

- 1.1. FSB is committed to maintaining academic integrity. It is required of students to be truthful in their academic work, to recognise and value the contributions of others when necessary, and to provide credit when referencing someone else's ideas in a way that complements their own work.
- 1.2. Every student will be evaluated according to their own abilities, and all assessment materials turned in must be unique. Any behaviour on the part of a student that is unfair to them academically and gives them an edge over others is considered academic misconduct. Typically, academic misconduct is referred to as "unfair practice" or "cheating."
- 1.3. Academic Misconduct is not the same as Poor Academic Practice, which is defined by the school as a small violation of standard academic norms, such as improperly cited or poorly attributed work, or a limited over-reliance on sources. These instances are typically the consequence of a lack of understanding or confidence in academic norms and indicate a clear lack of intent to mislead.
- 1.4. Because it indicates a disregard for the evaluation and marking standards, poor academic practice will be addressed as part of the marking and feedback process.
- 1.5. In your writing, you should convey your ideas in your own terms and with your own analysis and justifications. Using other people's work to bolster arguments and analyses is permissible, and tutors can advise you on best practices and assist with formatting requirements like citing and footnotes. You should ask your tutors for guidance if you're unsure about the differences between plagiarism and excellent practice. It is also advised that you consult the Academic Support Centre on the campus that applies to you for guidance on referencing and academic writing.
- 1.6. The School will adhere to the tutorial misconduct policy described below in circumstances when cases of educational misconduct are suspected. Being aware that academic misconduct is considered a very serious violation in higher education should not be a mystery to students. Under no circumstances will claims that a student was unaware of the offence, its penalties, or what constituted academic misconduct be accepted. Academic misconduct, regardless of how inadvertent or unintentional, will result in consequences.
- 1.7. Students must be aware that, even after graduating and ceasing to be a current student, cases for academic misconduct may be filed at any moment.

2. Identifying Plagiarism

- 2.1. As an affiliate in the Turnitin UK service, FSB makes use of this tool to assist in the identification of academic misconduct. Every student project is submitted through the online Turnitin system, which evaluates it by comparing it to a database that contains billions of web pages, past student papers, and journals, among other things. For each document posted to Turnitin, there is an originality report that displays the degree of similarity with other sources.
- Using Turnitin isn't the only way to identify plagiarism. Moreover, tutors will search for proof of the following:
 - Plagiarism from works that have been published but aren't always accessible online
 - Work that shares similarities to that of other learners, which may indicate collusion
 - Content that seems blatantly beyond a student's known capabilities; work presented in a way that deviates from the student's known proficiency in language or writing.

3. Categories of Academic Misconduct

- 3.1. Academic Misconduct may take a multitude of forms, and therefore the following explains some of the most common types of Academic misconduct. This list isn't definitive; any activity which meets the School's definition of Academic Misconduct may be considered under this policy.

Plagiarism

- 3.2. Submitting someone else's ideas or work as your own without giving due credit is plagiarism. Instances consist of, but are not restricted to:
- 3.3. Replicate parts of books, articles, or other published sources without giving credit to the original author(s). If you copy passages from multiple sources rather than just one, it's still considered plagiarism.
- 3.4. Reliance on one or a small number of sources too much, regardless of whether the original content has been paraphrased, is plagiarism if the sources are not properly cited.
- 3.5. Copying from other members while working with a group.
- 3.6. Turning in your own prior work, whether in its entirety or in part, from a different course or module, regardless of whether it was completed at a different university.
- 3.7. This is also referred to as "double-counting" or "self-plagiarism."
- 3.8. Turning in the work of other people, including past and present pupils.

Impersonation

- 3.9. Turning in work that has been prepared by someone else for evaluation is known as impersonation. Instances consist of, but are not restricted to: Getting essays
- Purchasing essays
 - Composing an assignment for a different pupil.

Collusion

- 3.10. The act of collusion involves failing to operate independently when it is frequently necessary and passing off the work as your own original creation.
- 3.11. Students should be aware that collusion and collaboration are not the same thing, and some tasks could require them to collaborate in order to turn in their work. Unless it is explicitly specified in the written material of the programme, students should never turn in joint work. In these situations, they should ask their instructors to clarify what constitutes appropriate collaboration.
- 3.12. Even if one student is thought to have copied from another, all students involved in a case of collusion will be held accountable for violating academic practices. This usually occurs when failing to properly secure your work or share it with someone else, which could hold you accountable for collusion. Students will only be released from the charge of collusion if they can show unequivocal evidence that their work was pilfered or obtained in any way without their permission.

Exam misconduct

- 3.13. Exam misconduct refers to the violation of exam rules in order to obtain an undue advantage.
Examples include, but are not restricted to: utilising unapproved technology in the exam; using unapproved notes or other study materials; failing to turn in your paper by the deadline; and impersonating someone during an exam.
- 3.14. Exam misconduct refers to the violation of exam rules in order to obtain an undue advantage.
Examples include, but are not restricted to: utilising unapproved technology in the exam; using unapproved notes or other study materials; failing to turn in your paper by the deadline; and impersonating someone during an exam.

Falsification

- 3.15. Submission of data, observations, or other research that has been either fabricated or falsified in assessed work is referred to as falsification.

4. Penalties for Academic Misconduct

- 4.1. An allegation of unfair practice is said to be established when it has been sufficiently supported to satisfy the Academic Misconduct Panel. The Academic Misconduct Panel will typically take the following into account when deciding on an appropriate penalty:
- The degree of deception involved
 - Whether the student has been subject to a previous accusation of Academic Misconduct
 - The level of Academic misconduct
 - The extent of the Academic Misconduct
 - Any admission and/or explanation by the scholar of the Academic Misconduct.
- 4.2. If the Academic Misconduct Panel determines that other circumstances are relevant, they may also be taken into account for calculating the appropriate penalty.
- 4.3. Students should keep in mind that serious repercussions could befall a student enrolled in a course that places a strong emphasis on honesty, integrity, and ethical behaviour if they are found guilty of academic misconduct.
- 4.4. The Academic Misconduct Panel's possible sanctions are displayed in a table of categories that the institution has published. It is impossible to give a precise list of infractions and the penalties they will get because the Panel considers a wide range of factors when deciding on a suitable punishment. For this reason, the following table is meant to serve as merely an indicative estimation:

Category	Action regarding progression	Action re mark	Counted for classification	Record on transcript	Notes (these to be used as a guide only)
N/A	None	No action taken	N/A	N/A	No evidence of academic misconduct, student exonerated.
0	None	Student notified of Category 0 penalty, but no action taken against any assessment item or module	No	No	Unwitting offence. Evidence of academic misconduct, but clear that this was not substantial and was unintended (first offence).
1	None	Assessment capped at pass mark	No	No	Unwitting offence. Evidence of academic misconduct, but clear that this was not substantial and was unintended (second offence or high level of study).
2	Fail assessment	Assessment capped at pass mark	No	No	Evidence of very minor infringement.
3	Fail assessment	Module capped at pass mark	No	No	Evidence of very minor infringement (second offence); evidence of minor to moderate infringement (first offence).
4	Fail module, may retake	Module capped at pass mark	Yes	Yes	Evidence of minor to moderate infringement (second offence); evidence of serious infringement (first offence).
5	Fail module, may retake	Module capped at zero	Yes	Yes	Evidence of serious infringement (second offence). Can also be used for repeat offenders in lower categories.
6	Fail module	No right to retake module	n/a	Yes	Evidence of very serious infringement with clear attempt to deceive.
7	Fail course	Dismissal from University	n/a	n/a	Gross misconduct.

5. Indicative level of offence

Indicative Level of Offence	Example	Indicative penalty category
Minor	Poor referencing	0-1
	Very minor plagiarism	
Moderate	Repeated minor misconduct	2-5
	Substantial portions of directly copied / unreferenced text	
Severe	Stealing a test paper	6-7
	Purchasing essays	
	Falsifying research data	

- 5.1. Students should be aware that results at Penalty Category 4 and higher will be permanently recorded on their transcript, necessitating the counting of any capped mark—which could be zero—for classification reasons (above Level 4).
- 5.2. Upon failing a module for which an academic misconduct penalty has been imposed, students will have their penalty carried over to any following modules that are added to their record as a result of the failed module. Students need to be aware that very serious cases of academic misconduct could also result in disciplinary action.

6. Guidance of Handling Poor Academic Practice and Academic Misconduct

- 6.1. The suspected academic misconduct will be investigated by the Course Leader for the relevant course, or an appointed member of staff who will act as the official investigation officer.
- 6.2. Within 10 working days from when the academic misconduct has been discovered, the investigation officer will meet with the student to discuss the allegation. The 5 working day will be extended if the student has already graduated more information is needed to ascertain whether there is enough evidence to ascertain the allegation.
- 6.3. Within 5 working days the investigation officer will determine if:
- no academic misconduct has been committed and close the investigation.
 - the actions indicate poor academic practice and recommend appropriate remedial action
 - the actions amount to academic misconduct and call for an Academic Misconduct panel
- 6.4. In the event that academic misconduct is suspected, the tutor(s) should fill out a copy of the form below, describing the nature of the offence and attaching the necessary documentation (such as a coloured Turnitin report with similarity scores). The exams department's email address is examination@fairfield.ac, where you can send this.

- 6.5. Exams will send an email to the student requesting a written response by a given deadline, together with the report and a copy of the Academic Misconduct policy. Students have ten business days to respond to the charge. The student's response will be the subject of a request for commentary from the tutor(s).
- 6.6. If during the meeting with the Investigation Officer the student admits to the allegation, the student will be sent a letter outlining the date and time of the meeting, allegations in relation to Academic Misconduct, the response from the student and the penalty applied.
- 6.7. Where a student does not accept the allegations, the Investigation Officer may refer the case to an Academic Misconduct panel or treat the case as poor academic practice
- 6.8. If the case will be referred to an Academic Misconduct panel, the panel will comprise of:
- One representative from the Registry (Minute Taker)
 - One representative Exams
 - Course manager(s)
 - Module leader
 - An additional member of academics, where required
 - The student(s) under investigation for academic misconduct
- 6.9. The Academic Misconduct Panel will take into account all relevant information, including the scholar's answer, the tutor(s)' report, and any further remarks from the tutor(s).
- 6.10. In cases where academic misconduct is suspected, it is crucial that the tutor(s) provide the exams department with a report and supporting documentation as soon as possible. This will allow the Academic Misconduct Panel to review the case in its entirety and notify the awarding body and the following Assessment Board of the Panel's ruling.
- 6.11. Students are recommended to request a meeting with their module tutor(s) to discuss the situation after receiving a copy of the accusation of academic misconduct.
- 6.12. The FSB's student union might offer the under investigation student with unbiased guidance.
- 6.13. The student and the awarding body will then be informed of the panel's judgement and any applicable sanctions.

7. Review

- 7.1. The student may want to file an appeal of the panel's ruling. The Appeal Policy and Procedure has more information.