



UKMC Academic Misconduct Policy

Date	Author	Summary of Changes	Version	Authorised
21/08/2024	Academic Registrar and Head of Academic Services	Version 1 amended to be ratified by	1	Academic Board on 21st August 2024
14/12/2025	Academic Registrar and Head of Academic Services	Reformatted coversheet	2	Academic Board December 2025
Policy/Procedure Management and Responsibilities				
Policy/Procedure Owner	The policy is overseen by the Academic Registrar and overseen by the Dean. Day-to-day implementation and communication responsibilities are delegated as appropriate to reasonably support the appeals procedure via registry and academic services.			
Equality Impact / Analysis	EDI Committee			
Authorised By	Academic Board			
Effective From	Sept 2024			
Next Review	July 2027			
Version	2			
Internal/External	Both			
Document Location	UKMC Policies and Legislation			
Linked Documents Internal	Academic Appeals Student Complaints procedure			
Linked Documents External				
Dissemination Plan	The document will be distributed through staff communication channels, leadership meetings, relevant training events and student induction events. Available on the UKMC Website			
Accessibility	Alternative formats on request. Email Quality@ukmc.ac.uk			

Contents

Introduction.....	3
Scope	3
Principles.....	3
Good Academic Practice.....	4
Definition of Poor Academic Practice	5
Definition of Academic Misconduct.....	5
Plagiarism.....	6
Collusion.....	7
Contract Cheating.....	7
Fabrication.....	7
Cheating.....	8
Failure to have ethical approval.....	8
PROCESS FOR DEALING WITH SUSPECTED CASES OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT (STAGE 1: COURSE TEAM ACTIVITY)	9
Consideration by the Course Leader	9
Actions if no offence has been deemed to have been committed	10
Actions if academic misconduct is deemed to have been committed	11
PROCESS FOR DEALING WITH SUSPECTED CASES OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT (STAGE 2: FORMAL ALLEGATION)	12
Academic Misconduct Panel	13
Standard meeting of the Academic Misconduct Panel.....	15
Investigative meeting of the Academic Misconduct Panel.....	15
Notification to Student and Assessment Board.....	17
Action by Assessment Board	17
Appeals Procedure	18
Plagiarism Detection Software	18
Monitoring and Evaluation.....	18
APPENDIX A: PENALTIES FOR ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT	19
APPENDIX B: INDICATIVE OFFENCES AND STANDARD PENALTIES FOR FIRST OFFENCES	20
Examinations and Time Constrained Assignments (including, but not limited to, written, online, viva and practical).....	21
APPENDIX C: GUIDANCE ON TYPES OF EVIDENCE TO EVALUATE AND PRESENT IN SUSPECTED INFRINGEMENTS OF POLICY	22
Evidence to evaluate in cases of suspected collusion.....	22
Evidence to evaluate in cases of suspected contract cheating.....	22

Introduction

1. UK Management College has a duty to maintain academic standards by ensuring the integrity of all aspects of the assessment process and is confirming that the regulations and policies governing the assessment of courses at the College are fully and fairly implemented. To this end, the College will take action against any student who contravenes these regulations and policies, whether inadvertently or through negligence or deliberate intent, and who, by so doing, could gain unfair advantage over other students. This aligns with the [Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education's \(QAA\) Quality Code Advice and Guidance for assessment](#) that institutions ensure that “students do not obtain credit or awards through any form of unacceptable academic practice relating to assessment.”
2. The College also recognises its responsibility stated in the Quality Code advice and guidance to “implement effective measures to encourage students to develop and internalise academic values and good academic practice.”

Scope

3. This policy applies to all students enrolled on undergraduate courses at UKMC and its partner institutions. It covers academic misconduct in any form of assessment including written examinations, assessed coursework (in whatever form the coursework might take) and oral/ practical assessments.
4. There is no time limit beyond which academic misconduct will not be investigated. Suspected academic misconduct, whether discovered before or after graduation, will be investigated and dealt with in accordance with this policy. Where academic misconduct is proven after work has been formally assessed, this may lead to the withdrawal of credit previously ratified by an Assessment Board or withdrawal of a conferred award.
5. Depending on the nature of the offence, students may also be subject to additional action under the Student Discipline Procedure.

Principles

6. UKMC bases its Policy on the expectations and core practices of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (2018) and the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) Good Practice Framework for Disciplinary Procedures (2018).
7. Academic integrity is the basis for ethical decision-making and behaviour in an academic context. This is reflected in norms of acceptable academic practice (see paragraphs 16 to 18 below) and is informed by the values of honesty, trust, responsibility, fairness, respect and courage.

8. UKMC endeavours to ensure that all policies, procedures and guidance relevant to academic integrity are clear, accessible and actively promoted
9. UKMC will work with students to strive towards early achievement of academic integrity. We recognise that students who are new to higher education will need some time to achieve this goal. For these early stages this policy reflects the intention to address poor academic practice through pedagogical, formative approaches.
10. UKMC will support students so that they can take responsibility in the process of familiarisation with the rules governing assessment including conduct in examinations and the correct academic conventions for referencing and acknowledging the work of others.
11. Ultimately, it is the student's responsibility to avoid infringements of regulations and policies and to ensure that they have behaved with academic integrity. Ignorance of this policy cannot be used to excuse infringements.
12. UKMC will act on all identified infringements of this policy whether inadvertently or through negligence or deliberate intent.
13. UKMC expects that all work submitted for assessment by students is the student's own work, without falsification of any kind.
14. Allegations of academic misconduct will be treated in the strictest confidence. No student will be recorded, or referred to, as having committed an academic misconduct offence until the full process (as detailed in paragraphs 40 to 89) has been completed and the allegation proven.

Good Academic Practice

15. Key aspects of good academic practice include:
 - acknowledging the ideas of others through appropriate referencing and citation
 - meeting expectations about ethical behaviour
 - fulfilling confidentiality requirements in particular subjects
 - understanding the permitted boundaries between individual and group contributions.
16. Students are expected to offer their own analysis and presentation of information gleaned from research, even when group exercises are carried out. Insofar as students rely on sources, they

should reference these in accordance with the appropriate convention in their discipline.

17. In cases where the assessment is of an artefact (image/performance/song etc.) students will be required to show self-awareness of the creative sources for their material in written or oral narratives.

Definition of Poor Academic Practice

18. Poor academic practice can be defined as poor scholarship resulting from an individual's lack of knowledge, understanding and practice of the skills required to be academically literate.

19. For the purposes of this policy the understanding of poor academic practice is based on the following considerations:

- A student in their early stages of HE (level 3 and 4) or without recent experience of HE in the UK may not have gained the knowledge and skills to demonstrate good academic practice
- Instances of unintended plagiarism, or collusion, as defined below, that occur at the early stages of a student's studies can normally be considered as poor academic practice.
- A student who shows intent to meet good academic practice, but fails in its execution, can be considered to show poor academic practice.
- A student who shows limited intent to meet good academic practice in spite of having had adequate prior teaching, or as a repeat instance, can be deemed to show academic misconduct.

20. Addressing cases of poor academic practice requires supportive, constructive and pedagogical approaches by course teams and members of the learning support services, working with the active participation of the student.

Definition of Academic Misconduct

21. UKMC employs the OIA definition of academic misconduct as provided in its good practice framework for disciplinary procedures: "Any action by a student which gives or has the potential to give an unfair advantage in an examination or assessment, or might assist someone else to gain an unfair advantage, or any activity likely to undermine the integrity essential to scholarship and research."

22. Academic misconduct typically falls under one of the following headings:

- Plagiarism
- Collusion
- Contract Cheating
- Fabrication
- Cheating

- Failure to have ethical approval

Plagiarism

23. Plagiarism is defined as the presentation of another person's work or ideas as the student's own, without proper acknowledgement. This could be in direct copy or close paraphrase.

24. In the context of the policy, another person's work or ideas includes text, images (graphics, illustrations or photographs), designs, computer code, diagrams, data and formulae or any other representation of ideas (written, visual or oral) in print, electronic or other media, and may be from any published or unpublished source including books, journals, newspapers, the internet, course handouts or another student's work.

25. Plagiarism can occur in examinations and/or coursework assessment which may take a variety of forms including, but not limited to, essays, reports, presentations, dissertations and projects.

26. The reproduction of a student's own previously submitted work, without acknowledgement, is regarded as self-plagiarism and will be treated in the same way as any other form of plagiarism.

27. Guidance on sources of evidence to evaluate cases of suspected plagiarism is set out in Appendix C.

Collusion

28. Collusion is the unauthorised co-operation between at least two people, normally with the intent to deceive. It can take the following forms:

- a. the conspiring by two or more students to produce a piece of work together with the intention that at least one passes it off as their own work;
- b. the willing provision of previously assessed work or examination questions and/or answers by one student to another student where it should be evident to the student providing the work that by so doing an advantage could be gained by the other student. In this case both students are guilty of collusion;
- c. the unauthorised co-operation between a student and another person in the preparation and production of work which is presented as the student's own work;

29. Guidance on sources of evidence to evaluate cases of suspected collusion is set out in Appendix C.

Contract Cheating

30. Contract cheating is the commissioning and submission of work as the student's own where the student has paid or solicited another person to produce the work on the student's behalf. This includes the use of third party services such as essay mills and essay banks.

31. Contract cheating can also include sections of work that are improved by third parties, either for payment or for free.

32. While the use of proofreading services to help students identify deficiencies in their work does not constitute contract cheating, students must retain ownership of their work, and allowing third parties such as proof-readers to edit the work themselves could be deemed as contract cheating.

33. Guidance on sources of evidence to evaluate cases of suspected contract cheating are set out in Appendix C.

Fabrication

34. Fabrication is the invention, alteration or falsification of data and evidence that contributes towards assessment. This includes data such as: the origin and results of questionnaires; research data; certificated or portfolio evidence in claims for the recognition of prior learning; and entries and signatures

in records of assessment of practice in the workplace.

35. Allegations of fabrication of research data may instead or additionally be considered under the Research Misconduct Policy.

Cheating

36. Cheating includes any behaviour which the student would reasonably know would interfere with the fair operation of the assessment process and could gain unfair advantage, such as:

- any transgression of UKMC's examination room rules, as set out in the Regulations for the Preparation and Conduct of Examinations;
- obtaining or seeking to obtain access to examination papers prior to an examination;
- behaviour in a manner likely to prejudice the chances of another student in an assessment;
- offering a bribe or inducement to invigilators, examiners or other persons connected with the assessments;
- being party to an arrangement whereby a person other than the student would fraudulently represent them at an assessment;
- submitting a fraudulent claim for extenuating circumstances.

Failure to have ethical approval

37. Failure to have ethical approval includes instances where students embark on research activities which require ethical approval without that approval being formally granted. It is the student's responsibility to apply for ethical approval and to seek clarification on whether ethical approval is required if unsure. Allegations of failure to have ethical approval may instead or additionally be considered under the Research Misconduct Policy.

38.

PROCESS FOR DEALING WITH SUSPECTED CASES OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT (STAGE 1: COURSE TEAM ACTIVITY)

39. All potential instances of poor academic practice or academic misconduct will require action.

40. All suspected infringements must be reported to the Course Leader for consideration before any allegation of academic misconduct is put to the student. Where the suspected infringement is discovered by the Course Leader (for example in work submitted for a module they teach), they should discuss their suspicions with the Head of Learning and Teaching (HLT) or nominee.

41. It is the responsibility of the person identifying the suspected infringement to clearly set out the nature of their suspicions and provide supporting evidence showing how and where the suspected infringement has taken place.

42. Where a marker suspects an infringement, they will, if appropriate, note on the student's work the nature of the alleged offence and report their concerns to the Course Leader.

43. Where an invigilator suspects a student of infringing examination room rules or any other requirements relating to the conduct of the examination, they shall take the appropriate action as detailed in the Regulations for the Preparation and Conduct of Examinations. A report of the incident should be provided to the Course Leader.

44. Any suspected infringement should be reported to the Course Leader as soon as possible after initial discovery, and normally no later than ten working days after the relevant submission or examination date to allow time for consideration by the Course Leader before the normal release of feedback to students.

Consideration by the Course Leader

45. Upon receipt of any reports of suspected infringement, the Course Leader will consider the evidence provided and decide how to proceed. Training and guidelines for the consideration of suspected academic misconduct will be provided to all Course Leaders.

46. It is important for Course Leaders to be aware that in some instances, particularly in the early stages of a course, it will not always be appropriate to proceed to a formal allegation. In particular, if the

assessed work, or student's conduct, can be considered as poor academic practice then it should not normally be considered as a potential case of academic misconduct. The Course Leader should also satisfy themselves that the student has been given appropriate advice on attributing sources and the production of bibliographies prior to assessment.

47. In considering second or subsequent instances of poor academic practice, the Course Leader may decide to proceed to a formal allegation, however:

- Concurrent instances of infringements should be treated as one instance.
- Repeat infringements may still be treated as poor academic practice if the student has not had sufficient time to engage with academic support.
- Repeat infringements can be deemed to be academic misconduct if:
 - o the student has failed to engage with academic support, or
 - o the principle of unfair advantage is breached.

48. Having reviewed the evidence, the Course Leader will decide that either:

- no offence has been committed;
- there is insufficient evidence of an offence;
- no offence has been committed but there is evidence of poor academic practice; or
- there is sufficient evidence of academic misconduct.

49. Records should be maintained, in line with GDPR requirements, to enable the identification and monitoring of students who have been judged to have demonstrated poor academic practice.

These records will be made available to the relevant assessment board. Anonymised data on instances of poor academic practice will be monitored in line with OIA recommendations.

Actions if no offence has been deemed to have been committed

50. If the Course Leader decides that no offence has taken place, or that there is insufficient evidence of an offence, they shall request the marker to consider the work on its academic merits and mark it in accordance with the assessment criteria. They may also recommend that the student is made aware of the concerns and offered further support and guidance to avoid any similar concerns about their academic practice in future. This advice, along with details of where to go for further support, should be given to the student with the feedback on their assessment. No further action will be taken with the student.

51. If the Course Leader decides that the case constitutes poor academic practice, they shall:

- a. request the marker to consider the work on its academic merits and mark it in

- accordance with the assessment criteria;
- b. ensure that the feedback to the student identifies their poor academic practice and how this can be addressed; and
 - c. issue the student with an informal warning about their academic practice and require them to engage with appropriate Academic Learning Services support and/or to complete the online academic skills course.

Actions if academic misconduct is deemed to have been committed

52. If the Course Leader decides that there is sufficient evidence that an offence may have been committed, they shall proceed to a formal allegation.

53. To proceed to a formal allegation, the Course Leader should:

- a. complete the *Allegation of Academic Misconduct* form with the following information:
 - the student's name, ID number, level of study and course/programme/route details;
 - module details, including information about the weighting of the component of assessment;
 - the formal allegation to be put to the student;
 - a summary of the alleged offence.
- b. collate the relevant supporting evidence. This may include:
 - a report of the incident, where relevant;
 - the invigilator's report, where relevant;
 - a copy, or the original of, unauthorised material used in an examination;
 - a copy of the original script marked with the allegedly plagiarised passages or passages where there is suspected collusion;
 - a copy of source material marked with passages which have allegedly been plagiarised or where there is suspected collusion;
 - a copy of the plagiarism detection software report, where relevant;
 - a copy of the instructions given to the student regarding the component of assessment and a copy of the referencing instructions given to the student where relevant;
 - a copy of any relevant material that has allegedly been fabricated (for example: the record of practice or work-based evidence; research data; and certificated or portfolio evidence in claims for recognition of prior learning);
 - any other evidence to support the allegation.

Where an allegation of collusion implicates more than one student, a single allegation of Academic Misconduct form should be completed including details of each student.

54. The completed *Allegation of Academic Misconduct* form and supporting documentation should be submitted to the Student Academic Office (SAO) for the formal allegation to be put to the student.

55. Following notification to the student of an allegation by the SAO (see 57 below), the Course Leader is responsible for ensuring the student is provided with support to enable them to understand the allegation and respond appropriately.

PROCESS FOR DEALING WITH SUSPECTED CASES OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT (STAGE 2: FORMAL ALLEGATION)

56. Upon receipt of the *Allegation of Academic Misconduct* form and supporting documentation from the Course Leader, The SAO shall write to the student concerned to:

- a. put the allegation as defined by the Course Leader;
- b. request a written statement in response to the allegation and submission of any evidence they deem appropriate;
- c. signpost support available to the student to enable them to respond, including from their course team and student support;
- d. request confirmation of whether the student also wishes to attend an investigative meeting of the Academic Misconduct Panel to respond in person;
- e. request a reply within ten working days of the date on which the letter is sent;
- f. enclose a copy of this policy;
- g. enclose copies of any evidence or reports.

57. The letter from the SAO to the student shall be copied to the Chair of the Assessment Board and Course Leader. Where possible, every effort should be made to resolve the matter before the meeting of the Assessment Board. However, where it remains unresolved, the Assessment Board will record a deferred decision (DD) on the electronic student record.

58. If no written reply to the allegation is received from the student within ten working days of the date on which the letter is sent, this is deemed to be acceptance of the allegation. In such cases, the SAO will refer the case to the Academic Misconduct Panel for consideration (see paragraphs 63 to 75 below).

59. If the student replies accepting the allegation and does not wish to also respond in person,

the SAO will refer the case to the Academic Misconduct Panel for consideration (see paragraphs 63 to 75 below).

60. If the student replies denying the allegation, or if they ask to also respond in person, the SAO shall invite the student to attend an investigative meeting of the Academic Misconduct Panel (see paragraphs 63 to 72 and 76 to 87 below). The student should be given at least five working days' notice of the meeting.

61. While the allegation remains unresolved, the student shall have the right to continue on the course or commence the next part or stage of the course (where permitted within the relevant assessment regulations) unless the alleged offence is deemed by the HLT or nominee to jeopardise the welfare of those involved (whether student, cared for or client).

Academic Misconduct Panel

62. The Academic Misconduct Panel (the Panel) shall comprise:

- Head of Learning and Teaching (HLT) or nominee (Chair); and
- One/two members of academic staff (to be drawn from a pool of academics who have been trained for the role)

Membership of the Panel may be varied to ensure that the academic staff members are not considering any allegations concerning their own modules, but have the necessary understanding of the discipline to inform discussions.

63. The Panel will be convened at regular intervals to consider all formal allegations of academic misconduct. This will ensure consistency of approach across the range of courses offered within the College and its partner institutions. The Panel has the authority to determine:

- a. that no offence has been committed, or there is insufficient evidence of an offence, in which case the allegation will be removed from the student's record, and the case should be referred back to the course team to be dealt with by them in accordance with paragraph 51;
- b. that this is a case of poor academic practice, and the case should be referred back to the course team to be dealt with by them in accordance with paragraph 52; or

- c. that an offence has been committed and recommend the penalty to be imposed, as set out in the Academic Misconduct Penalties table in Appendix A.

64. The decision of the Panel as to whether an offence has been committed is final and will be reported to the student and relevant Assessment Board. The Assessment Board will consider the penalty recommended by the Panel and inform the student of the penalty imposed and the impact of that penalty on their studies and/or award.

65. In determining whether an offence has been committed, the judgement will be made on the balance of probability.

66. In determining the recommended penalty, the Panel will take into account:

- a. the severity of the offence;
- b. the intent;
- c. whether it is a first or subsequent offence;
- d. the academic stage of the student;
- e. any mitigation;
- f. the proportionality of the penalty to the offence.

A guide to the standard penalty to be imposed for first offences is provided in Appendix B.

67. The College does not normally accept a student's medical or personal circumstances as an excuse or reason for academic misconduct. However, where the Panel deems that the evidenced circumstances have severely impaired the student's capacity for rational judgement, the Panel may take account of the circumstances in determining the recommended penalty for the offence.

68. The Panel shall normally recommend the standard penalties suggested for first offences. However, the Panel may vary the penalty in such circumstances where the suggested penalty is deemed to be too lenient or too harsh to ensure that the outcome is not disproportionate to the offence. In all cases, the penalty should normally exceed that which would follow if the student had merely been referred in the assessment.

69. The penalty recommended for second or third offences will normally be one penalty point higher than the standard penalty for the offence or one point higher than the penalty previously imposed, whichever is higher. Any student with three sequential offences will automatically receive a minimum of penalty 6 and be required to withdraw.

70. In the context of this policy, sequential offences are offences that do not occur in the same assessment period (be that mid-semester or end of semester). Where a student has two or more allegations in the same assessment period, these will be considered concurrently (where possible) and the penalty imposed for all pieces of work will be the same.

71. Where a student receives a penalty resulting in the recording of a component mark as 0% refer infringement (RI) or fail infringement (FI) at any attempt, no component of that module can subsequently be considered for in-module compensation (meaning all components marks must be at or above the pass mark defined in the relevant assessment regulations in order for the module to be passed) and the module itself cannot be condoned.

Standard meeting of the Academic Misconduct Panel

72. Where a student accepts the allegation and does not want to respond in person, a standard meeting of the Academic Misconduct Panel will be convened, normally no later than twenty working days after the date of the letter putting the allegation to the student. The documentation, including any written response submitted by the student, will be distributed to the Panel for consideration, normally five working days before the meeting.

73. The consideration of accepted allegations of academic misconduct where the student does not wish to also respond in person need not involve a physical meeting of members of the Panel if alternative methods of discussion and mutual deliberation are available.

74. The Panel's decision and recommended penalty will be based on the documentary evidence provided.

Investigative meeting of the Academic Misconduct Panel

75. Where a student denies the allegation, or wishes to respond to the allegation in person, an investigative meeting of the Panel will be arranged. This will normally take place no later than twenty working days after the date of the letter putting the formal allegation to the student.

76. The SAO will inform the student, in writing, of the date, time and venue of the investigative meeting. The meeting will normally take place at the UKMC campus. Students enrolled at other locations will be given the option to attend the meeting in person or virtually via video call.

77. The student may be accompanied at the meeting by a friend. A friend is defined as a member

of staff of the College or a registered

student of the College. The role of the friend is to act as an observer, give moral support and to assist the student to make their case. In addition, where reasonable adjustments are required, a student may be accompanied by a supporter e.g. a sign language communicator or a notetaker, and a student with difficulty in understanding English may be accompanied by an interpreter.

78. If the student does not appear at the meeting, the Panel may proceed with the consideration of the allegation in the student's absence provided the Panel is satisfied that the student has received proper and timely notification of the meeting.

79. The Chair shall explain that the purpose of the meeting is to establish whether an offence of academic misconduct has been committed. They will put the allegation to the student and make available for scrutiny any relevant documentary evidence, including any statements by staff or students, sources of allegedly plagiarised passages and/or passages where collusion is suspected, annotated coursework or scripts, and falsified documents.

80. The student will make a statement in response to the allegation, following which the members of the Panel have the right to put any questions to the student.

81. At any time during the meeting, the Chair of the Panel may decide to suspend proceedings in order to seek more evidence. The student will be advised of the action that will be taken and the date of the reconvened meeting.

82. If the student admits the offence at the meeting, the Chair of the Panel shall invite the student to sign a written statement to this effect.

83. At the end of the questioning, the student will be asked to leave the meeting for the Panel to deliberate and reach its decision in private.

84. The Panel shall determine its decision based on the written and oral evidence. If the Panel finds that there is no case to answer, or that it is a case of poor academic practice, the Chair will inform the student accordingly, in writing, and all record of the alleged academic misconduct will be removed from the student's record. The Course Leader and the Chair of the Assessment Board will be informed of the decision and the work will then be marked on its academic merit.

85. In cases where it is determined that there is no case to answer or that it is a case of poor academic practice, the case will be referred to the course team to be dealt with by them in accordance with paragraphs 51 to 52.

86. If the Panel finds that an offence of academic misconduct has been committed, the Panel will agree a penalty to be recommended to the Assessment Board in accordance with paragraphs 67 to 72.

Notification to Student and Assessment Board

87. The decision of the Panel will be communicated to the student and the relevant Assessment Board in writing within five working days of the Panel meeting (or conclusion of the Panel deliberations if a physical meeting is not held).

88. The notification to the student will include the decision and the rationale for the decision. The Assessment Board will also be notified of the recommended penalty.

Action by Assessment Board

89. Following receipt of the Panel's decision, the Assessment Board will meet (where necessary as an extraordinary meeting) to consider the penalty recommended by the Panel and determine the penalty to be imposed and the consequence of that penalty in the context of the student's overall profile and the relevant assessment regulations. The Assessment Board do not have the authority to amend the decision of the Panel as to whether or not an offence has been committed but may apply a lower penalty where the recommended one will have a disproportionate impact. The Chair of the Assessment Board will notify the student, in writing, of the penalty imposed and the appropriate course of action within fifteen working days of the date of the letter informing the student of the Panel's decision.

90. Where the student concerned is in employment and where the employer has a material interest in the matter the Assessment Board will inform the employer of the decision and consequence, in writing, within the same timescale.

Appeals Procedure

91. Students may appeal against the verdict of academic misconduct and/or the penalty imposed under the provisions of the Academic Appeals Procedure.

Plagiarism Detection Software

92. All work that is submitted electronically will be passed through plagiarism detection software.

Monitoring and Evaluation

93. Cases of academic misconduct will be reported annually to the Student Welfare Committee, Quality Committee and Governing Body. The reports will include equality monitoring data.

94. Further monitoring of cases of poor academic practice will be completed on a periodic basis to inform course delivery and institutional student guidance and support approaches.

APPENDIX A: PENALTIES FOR ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

The following table sets out the standard penalties for proven offences.

Minor offence	Penalty 1	The work submitted will be marked in accordance with the assessment / grading criteria but the component mark will be capped at the pass mark. The student will receive a formal written warning.
	Penalty 2	Refer component (mark of 0%, recorded as refer infringement (RI)) with reassessment opportunity where permissible under the relevant assessment regulations. On reassessment, the component mark will be capped at the pass mark. The student will receive a formal written warning.
Serious offence	Penalty 3	Refer component (mark of 0%, recorded as refer infringement (RI)) with reassessment opportunity where permissible under the relevant assessment regulations. On reassessment, the component and module mark will be capped at the pass mark. The student will receive a formal written warning.
	Penalty 4	Fail component (mark of 0%, recorded as fail infringement (FI)) with opportunity to retake module where permissible under the relevant assessment regulations. On retake, the component and module mark will be capped at the pass mark. The student will receive a formal written warning.
Grave offence	Penalty 5	Fail module (mark of 0% for all components, recorded as fail infringement (FI)) with no opportunity for reassessment or retake. The student can take an alternative module where permissible under the relevant assessment regulations, but the module mark will be capped at the pass mark. If the fail results in termination of studies, any work already submitted for outstanding modules will be ratified by the Assessment Board (with no opportunity for reassessment or retake) and the student considered for an exit award only. The student will receive a formal written warning.
	Penalty 6	Fail module (mark of 0% for all components, recorded as fail infringement (FI)) and the student required to withdraw. The Assessment Board will be instructed to ratify the marks for any work already submitted for outstanding modules (with no opportunity for reassessment or retake) and to consider the student for an exit award based on the credit achieved.
Gross misconduct	Penalty 7	Fail module (mark of 0% for all components, recorded as fail infringement (FI)) and the student required to withdraw immediately without being awarded a degree or exit award. Credits which have already been ratified by an Assessment Board will be recorded on a record of achievement only.

All students who receive a penalty between 1 and 5 will be offered support through an appropriate learning support package on plagiarism and academic writing. Uptake of the support will be monitored for evaluation.

APPENDIX B: INDICATIVE OFFENCES AND STANDARD PENALTIES FOR FIRST OFFENCES

Coursework and Time Constrained Assignments (including, but not limited to, written work, presentations, images, designs, artefacts and code)

	Indicative offence	Standard penalty
Minor offence	Limited use of quotes or close paraphrasing (not more than a few lines) without the use of quotation marks and/or correct referencing, where the student has cited the plagiarised material in the reference list and/or bibliography.	Penalty 2
	Using work previously submitted for another assignment without acknowledgement (self-plagiarism).	Penalty 2
Serious offence	Extensive use of quotes or close paraphrasing without the use of quotation marks and/or correct referencing, where the student has cited the plagiarised material in the reference list and/or bibliography.	Penalty 3
	Submission of work produced in collaboration by two or more students as the work of a single student.	Penalty 3
	Using another person's work or ideas and submitting some of it as if it were the student's own.	Penalty 3
	Submitting a fraudulent claim for extenuating circumstances.	Penalty 3
	Using another person's work or ideas and submitting all of it as if it were the student's own.	Penalty 4
	The presentation of data based on work purporting to have been carried out by the student but which has been fabricated (i.e. invented, altered or falsified).	Penalty 4
	Failure to have ethical approval where required and embarking on research activities which require ethical approval without that approval being formally granted.	Penalty 4
	Extensive use of quotes or close paraphrasing without the use of quotation marks and/or correct referencing, where the student has not cited the plagiarised material in the reference list and/or bibliography.	Penalty 4
	Commissioning another person to complete an item of assessment that is submitted as the student's own work. This includes, but is not limited to, the use of professional essay writing services and essay banks as well as friends and family members.	Penalty 5
Grave offence	Disguising work in a deliberate attempt to conceal its origins.	Penalty 5
	Offering a bribe or inducement to persons connected with the assessment in order to gain an unfair advantage.	Penalty 5
	Attempting to persuade another student or a member of staff to participate in any other actions in order to gain an unfair advantage.	Penalty 5

Examinations and Time Constrained Assignments (including, but not limited to, written, online, viva and practical)

	Indicative offence	Standard penalty
Minor offence	Removing any script, question paper, or other official stationery (whether completed or not) from the examination room, unless specifically authorised by an invigilator or examiner.	Penalty 1
	Possession of devices (such as mobile phones, smart watches or personal multimedia devices) of any kind other than those specifically permitted.	Penalty 2
Serious offence	Communicating with another student or with any third party other than the invigilator or examiner during an examination.	Penalty 3
	Copying or attempting to copy the work of another student, whether by overlooking, asking for information, or by any other means.	Penalty 3
	Behaviour in a manner likely to prejudice the chances of another student.	Penalty 3
	Submitting a fraudulent claim for extenuating circumstances.	Penalty 3
	Possession or use of crib sheets, revision notes or unauthorised texts; unauthorised access of the internet; or use of devices (such as mobile phones, smart watches or personal multimedia devices) of any kind other than those specifically permitted.	Penalty 4
Grave offence	Being party to any arrangement whereby a person other than the student represents, or intends to represent, the student in an examination.	Penalty 5
	Taking into an examination a pre-written examination script for submission.	Penalty 5
	Obtaining, or seeking to obtain, access to an unseen examination paper prior to the start of an examination.	Penalty 5
	Offering a bribe or inducement to invigilators, examiners or other persons connected with the examination in order to gain an unfair advantage.	Penalty 5
	Attempting to persuade another student or a member of staff to participate in any other actions in order to gain an unfair advantage.	Penalty 5

Note

The tables above are provided as a guide to the recommended standard penalty to be imposed for first offences of academic misconduct with examples given as an indication of the type of offence. The penalty for a second or subsequent proven offence will normally be one penalty point higher than the standard penalty shown or one point higher than the previously imposed penalty, whichever is higher.

The examples given above do not represent an exhaustive list of potential offences and should not be interpreted as such.

APPENDIX C: GUIDANCE ON TYPES OF EVIDENCE TO EVALUATE AND PRESENT IN SUSPECTED INFRINGEMENTS OF POLICY

Evidence to evaluate in cases of suspected plagiarism

- Data from Turnitin (or equivalent plagiarism detection software) indicating matches in sections of text – cross referenced against student's referencing for absences of acknowledgment. **Note: a high similarity 'score' is not acceptable as a stand-alone justification for allegations of plagiarism;**
- Unacknowledged text/idea/image that in the marker's judgement is not 'in the public domain' but comes from an identifiable source/set of sources;
- Absence of clear acknowledgement of source of text/idea/image in citations or narratives;
- Heterogeneity of font/pica/style of sections of text; variations in spellings (UK/US);
- Absence of elements of bibliographical details;
- Students' use of language about their ownership of text/idea/image;
- Students' responses to viva/informal questions.

Evidence to evaluate in cases of suspected collusion

- Data from Turnitin (or equivalent plagiarism detection software) indicating matches in texts between two students in same cohort;
- Marker's comments and evaluation of students' assessments;
- Level of cooperation/group work that exceeds set parameters;
- Set requirements of assessment brief on acceptable limits of group work activity;
- Students' responses to viva/informal questions.

Evidence to evaluate in cases of suspected contract cheating

- Module leaders' and markers' familiarity with students' work – unexplained grade shifts;
- Failure of essay to align to assignments as set, and to content of lecture(s);
- Errors/inconsistencies in use of English (UK/US), changes in style, voice or syntax, heterogeneity in fonts/styles;
- Outcome of investigative interview / viva with student;
- Third party evidence (other students);
- IT forensics;
- E mail and other engagement with essay mill or essay bank services;
- Full guidance available from <https://www.qaa.ac.uk/docs/qaa/quality-code/contracting-to-cheat-in-higher-education.pdf>.