

# Academic Misconduct Policy and Procedures Undergraduate

---

## Contents

---

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Definitions of Academic Misconduct .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Assessment Misconduct Statement .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Academic Misconduct Procedures .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Definitions of Level of Offence.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Tariff of Penalties.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Penalties relative to academic level.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Appendix .....</b>	<b>23</b>

Ownership	Pro-Warden
Approval	Academic Board
Last review date	October 2023
Next review date	May 2026

---

# 1 Introduction

---

## 1.1 General

- 1.1.1 The procedures set out in this document underpin the regulations which all staff and students are expected to follow. They provide greater details of the principles behind the regulations and the rules and processes that FIDI puts in place to positively impact on the student and staff experience and to ensure compliance with external regulatory frameworks.
- 1.1.2 The relevant regulations appear in text boxes at the start of each section.
- 1.1.3 Any meeting or hearing required under this Policy can be conducted in person or using College-approved technology. Support requirements of the student, and any witness called to a hearing, will be addressed to ensure that students and their witnesses (where these are necessary) can participate fully in any meeting or hearing that is required under this Policy. Any additional requirements for a student, will be addressed based on information disclosed by the student.

## 1.2 Academic Integrity and Responsibilities

- 1.2.1 Core values of academic integrity (honesty and trust) lie at the heart of our academic enterprise, and they underpin all activities within FIDI. The College values a culture of honesty and mutual trust and expects all members of the College (staff and students) to respect and uphold these core values at all times.
- 1.2.2 Advice about academic writing and study skills is available to students:
- within academic departments;
  - on FIDI's Moodle;
  - external websites;
  - specialist study skills assistance available from FIDI teaching assistants.
- 1.2.3 A diagnostic tool 'Draft Coach' is available to students on 'turnitin' on the FIDI Moodle, this programme checks student assessments before they are submitted to help prevent unintentional plagiarism.
- 1.2.4 Students must confirm that they have understood the 'Academic Misconduct Statement' (see section 3 below).

---

## 2 Definitions of Academic Misconduct

---

### 2.1 General Definition

- 2.1.1 Academic misconduct is defined as any attempt by a student to gain an unfair advantage in any assessment. The term academic misconduct includes all forms of cheating, plagiarism, and collusion.

### 2.2 Specific forms of Misconduct

- 2.2.1 The following is an indicative list of forms of misconduct but should not be considered exhaustive:
- 2.2.2 Aiding and abetting a student in any form of dishonest practice.
- 2.2.3 Bribery is paying or offering inducements to another person to obtain an advance copy of an unseen examination or test paper or to obtain a copy of a coursework assignment in advance of its distribution to the students concerned.
- 2.2.4 Collusion is where two or more students collaborate to produce a piece of work which is then submitted as though it was an individual student's own work. Where students in a class are instructed or encouraged to work together in the pursuit of an assignment, such a group activity is regarded as approved collaboration. Where there is a requirement for the submitted work to be solely that of the individual, collaboration is not permitted. Students who improperly work collectively in these circumstances will be regarded as being guilty of collusion.
- 2.2.5 Commissioning another person or persons to complete an assignment, which is then submitted as your own work. This includes the use of the services of 'ghost-writing' agencies (for example in the preparation of essays or reports), or essay mills. This is sometimes referred to as 'contract cheating'. Professional editorial services, which offer 'correction/improvement of English', should not be used. (Candidates are strongly advised to retain copies of any drafts produced while preparing assessed work, as this will be of assistance in demonstrating that the work is their own).

- 2.2.6 Computer fraud is the use of the material of another person located on the internet or stored on a hard, portable, or flash drive or other form of data storage, as if it were your own (also see plagiarism).
- 2.2.7 Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools to produce work that is presented as the student's own. The use of AI tools may be legitimate within some assessments, where this is the case, this will be set out in the module specification or assessment brief. The use of AI tools in this instance will be appropriately cited within the student's submitted assessment.
- 2.2.8 Duplication is the inclusion of coursework of any material, which is identical or similar to material, which has already been submitted for any other assessment within the University or elsewhere e.g. submitting the same piece of coursework for two different modules.
- 2.2.9 Failure to obtain formal ethical approval where there is an unambiguous requirement to do so, or to follow professional standards appropriate to the discipline.
- 2.2.10 False declarations in order to receive special consideration by Examination Boards.
- 2.2.11 Falsification of data is the presentation of data in projects, laboratory reports etc. based on work purported to have been carried out by the students which have been invented by the student or altered or copied or obtained by other unfair means.
- 2.2.12 Misconduct in examinations or tests such as:
- taking crib notes or other unauthorised material concealed in any manner into an examination or test;
  - taking into an examination or test an unauthorised electronic devices/storage devices containing pre-coded data;
  - the use of an unauthorised dictionary;
  - the use of unauthorised material stored in the memory of a pre-programmable calculator, watch, organiser, mobile telephone or pager;
  - obtaining or attempting to obtain an advance copy of an 'unseen' written examination or test paper;
  - attempting to persuade another member of the University (staff, student or invigilator) to participate in any way in actions that would breach the College assessment regulations;
  - communicating or trying to communicate in any way with another student during an examination or test;
  - copying or attempting to copy from another student sitting the same examination or test;

- being party to impersonation where another person sits an examination or test in the place of the actual student or a student is knowingly impersonated by another;
- leaving the examination or test venue to refer to concealed notes;
- taking rough notes, stationery, scripts or examination or test papers which indicate that they are not to be removed from the examination or test venue;
- failure to follow instructions of the Invigilators or other designated College officers

2.2.13 Plagiarism is an attempt (deliberate or inadvertent) to gain advantage by the representation of another person's work, without acknowledgement of the source, as the student's own. This includes the use of AI tools to produce work that has not been written by the student themselves (see also 2.2.7). Recognised forms of plagiarism include:

- the use in a student's own work of more than a single phrase from another person's work without the use of quotation marks and acknowledgement of the source;
- the summarising of another person's work by simply changing a few words or altering the order of presentation, without acknowledgement;
- the use of ideas or intellectual data of another person without acknowledgement of the source, or the submission or presentation of work as if it were the student's own, which are substantially the ideas or intellectual data of another person;
- copying the work of another person;
- the submission of work, as if it were the student's own, which has been obtained from the internet or any other form of information technology;
- the submission of coursework making significant use of unattributed digital images such as graphs, tables, photographs, etc. taken from books/articles, the internet or from the work of another person;
- the submission of a piece of work which has previously been assessed for a different award or module or at a different institution as if it were new work;
- a student who allows or is involved in allowing, either knowingly or unknowingly, another student to copy another's work including physical or digital images would be deemed to be guilty of plagiarism

---

## 3 Assessment Misconduct Statement

---

### 3.1 Confirmation of understanding and acceptance

- 3.1.1 Students are required to confirm that they have read and understood the Academic Misconduct Statement (3.2 below) online when they confirm their enrolment onto their programme of study each session. When submitting work for assessments, students will be reminded of this statement and by making the submission are reconfirming that they have read and understood the Academic Misconduct Statement.

### 3.2 Academic Misconduct Statement

#### SUBMISSION OF COURSEWORK EXAMINATION IRREGULARITIES

During the course of the year you will be submitting work for assessment. You are reminded that all work submitted, as part of the requirements for any examination must be expressed in your own words and incorporate your own ideas and judgements. In enrolling on your programme you have already confirmed that you have read and understood this statement. In making your submission you are agreeing to this statement and confirming that the submission you are making is your own work:

Plagiarism – this is the presentation of another person’s thoughts or words as though they were your own – must be avoided, with particular care in coursework and essays and reports written in your own time. This includes the use of AI tools to generate work that is not written by yourself (see also 2.2.7). Direct quotations from the published or unpublished work of others must always be clearly identified as such by being placed inside quotation marks, and a full reference to their source must be provided in the proper form. Remember that a series of short quotations from several different sources, if not clearly identified as such, constitutes plagiarism just as much as a single unacknowledged long quotation from a single source.

‘Unconscious plagiarism’ or ‘unintentional plagiarism’ – including an unattributed quotation in your essay is as much an examination offence as deliberate plagiarism and will be dealt with in the same way as any other examination offence. Equally, if you summarise another person’s ideas or judgements, you must refer to that person in your text, and include the work referred to in your bibliography. Unless specifically agreed and deemed as a collaborative project by all parties sharing work with other students will be regarded as plagiarism on the part of both the recipient and the originator.

Failure to observe these rules may result in an allegation of cheating. You should therefore consult your personal tutor or course director if you are in any doubt about what is permissible. Recourse to the services of 'ghost-writing' agencies or essay mills (for example in the preparation of essays or reports) is strictly forbidden, as is the use of AI tools (see 2.2.7) and students who make use of the services of such agencies render themselves liable for an academic penalty. Professional editorial services, which offer 'correction or improvement of English', should not be used. Students should be aware that work may be submitted to JISC or other available electronic tools for detection.

You are reminded that you may not present substantially the same material in any two pieces of work submitted for assessment, regardless of the form of assessment. For instance, you may not repeat substantially the same material in a formal written examination or in a dissertation if it has already formed part of an essay submitted for assessment. This does not prevent you referring to the same texts; examples or case studies as appropriate, provided you do not merely duplicate the same material.

I acknowledge that I have read the above and I understand that any form of plagiarism is an infringement of University Regulations and that all sources must be correctly acknowledged and referenced. I understand that all course work and essays will be entirely my own work.

---

## **4 Academic Misconduct Procedures**

---

### **4.1 Presumption of Innocence**

- 4.1.1 In any proceedings to consider an allegation of academic misconduct, the person against whom allegations have been made shall be presumed to be innocent until the contrary is established by consideration of the available evidence, on the balance of probabilities.
- 4.1.2 If the Examiners are in the process of considering possible academic misconduct and the case has not been concluded before the Board of Examiners meets, the result(s) of the student concerned cannot be considered by the Board. The results of that student will be considered by the Chair of the Board of Examiners in consultation with internal or external examiners, as appropriate, once the investigation into academic misconduct is concluded.

## **4.2 Electronic copies of work**

- 4.2.1 If work is not submitted electronically and plagiarism is suspected, students must supply an electronic copy of the work in question so that it may be subjected to electronic plagiarism detection testing. Students are therefore required to keep an electronic copy of their work, until after they receive their results.

## **4.3 Description of the Process**

- 4.3.1 The process for consideration of allegations of academic misconduct should follow the steps set out below:

### **4.4 Step One – Identification of possible academic misconduct**

- 4.4.1 If, in the judgment of the marker, a student has committed an act of academic misconduct that meets the College definition, the work and analytic notes that identify specific concerns should be referred to a nominated senior academic.
- 4.4.2 These concerns must be cited, e.g. from 'Turnitin' or identified source material (issues of style, or impressionistic judgements are not acceptable evidence to justify formal referral).
- 4.4.3 Markers should not return coursework, give feedback or discuss the investigation with the student, while the investigation is taking place. The marker will appear as a witness at any Hearing and students could argue that the case is pre-judged, based on any discussion with the marker.
- 4.4.4 Students must be formally notified in writing at the appropriate points in the process and as soon as it is possible to do so.

### **4.5 Step Two – Initial nominated senior academic consideration**

- 4.5.1 The nominated senior academic, will consider the evidence and reach one of the following initial decisions:
- that in their view there is no case to answer, and the allegation will be dismissed without the need to notify the student, or
  - that academic misconduct of a minor or technical nature has occurred, or
  - that further investigation is appropriate, and a hearing should be convened, or
  - that further information is required from the student before an initial decision can be reached



4.5.2 Where an allegation is dismissed, there is no need to notify the student as no action is necessary. Other than to report such allegations in accordance with the College's published procedure, no other record should be retained.

#### **4.6 Step Three – Nominated Senior Academic of Additional Student Evidence**

4.6.1 Where the nominated senior academic determines that further information is needed from the student before an initial decision can be reached, the nominated senior academic should write to the student setting out the allegation against the related work and detail the additional information requested. The student will have seven days to provide a response. The nominated senior academic will consider the information provided by the student and can reach a decision to dismiss the allegation, that a minor or technical offence has occurred (in which case the steps set out at 4.6.2 – 4.6.6 should be followed). Where no response is provided by the student, and as no decision can be reached the nominated senior academic should initiate step three of this procedure.

4.6.2 Where it is determined that academic misconduct of a minor or technical nature has occurred, the nominated senior academic will write to the student, using the template letter provided by the College setting out the allegation relating to the work submitted. The student will be advised to contact the FIDI Student Representative Council for advice. Students should be made aware that a viva voce or written examination may be arranged to establish the original source of any work submitted. Students should respond to the allegation and submit any extenuating circumstances to be taken into account if a penalty is imposed.

4.6.3 The response should be completed and returned by the student within 7 days. If the student does not respond by the deadline and does not provide an acceptable reason for the delay, the nominated senior academic, will proceed with the investigation. Any decisions made will not be invalidated by a student's failure to respond.

4.6.4 The nominated senior academic should consider the written response from the student and determine whether the information contained within it means that the allegation can now be dismissed. Where this is the case, the nominated senior academic will confirm this to the student.

4.6.5 Where the information provided by the student means that an allegation cannot be dismissed, or where a student does not respond to provide any information, the nominated senior academic will move to apply the appropriate penalty relevant to the student's level of study or invite the student to attend a hearing

4.6.6 Where a penalty outcome is determined, the student should be notified (using the template provided by the College). The student should then sign the form to confirm they understand the decision and either:

- accept the penalty and meet the terms of their continued study, or
- request a review of the decision which requires a Hearing to be convened by the a nominated senior academic.

## **4.7 Step Four – Hearing**

4.7.1 Where the nominated senior academic determines that further investigation is appropriate on the basis of the evidence received, or where a student refuses to accept the penalty for a minor or technical offence, or has not provided further information when requested for an initial decision to be reached, the nominated senior academic should inform the student that they will be invited to attend a hearing.

4.7.2 The nominated senior academic should convene a Hearing Panel as soon as possible.

4.7.3 The Panel must be comprised of:

- A nominated senior academic
- An academic member of staff not previously consulted in the alleged case of academic misconduct
- A note taker provided by the Registrar.

4.7.4 The nominated senior academic should inform the student in writing of the invitation (using the template provided by the College) to attend the hearing. The student must receive 7 days' notice of the Hearing;

4.7.5 The student must be advised that they may bring a supporter, a friend or Student Council Representative, to the Hearing (see 1.1.3).

4.7.6 The student must confirm attendance, if they do not attend (see 1.1.3) and do not provide an acceptable reason, the Hearing will proceed in their absence. It will not be invalidated by their failure to attend.

4.7.7 The Hearing Panel should hear the witness testimony, consider the written evidence and decide whether:

4.7.8 There is no case to answer

4.7.9 The allegations are therefore dismissed and the student is informed in writing.

- 4.7.10 Academic misconduct has occurred and an appropriate penalty should be applied
- 4.7.11 The Hearing Panel should decide on the appropriate penalty from the list of tariffs set out below, with reference to the application guidelines relating to the student's level of study.
- 4.7.12 These requirements should be notified to the student in writing on the Assessment Hearing Outcome and Response template provided by the College. The student should sign the form to confirm that they understand the decision and if appropriate will meet the terms of their continued study.
- 4.7.13 Records of investigations of academic misconduct will be maintained by the College and where a penalty is applied, this will be noted in the student's record in accordance with the College's requirements.

#### **4.8 Step 5 – Challenge/Appeal**

- 4.8.1 A student has the right to challenge a finding of assessment misconduct, or a penalty imposed by the Chair of a Board of Examiners following a Hearing on one or more of the following three grounds:

##### **4.8.2 Procedural Irregularity**

- 4.8.2.1 that the proceedings of the Hearing conducted by the Chair of the Board of Examiners were not carried out in accordance with the process set out in the Policy and Procedures;

##### **4.8.3 Fresh Evidence**

- 4.8.3.1 that relevant fresh evidence can be presented which could not reasonably have been made available to the Hearing conducted by the Chair of the Board of Examiners; NB: Extenuating circumstances e.g. (Medical) are not normally considered as grounds for a challenge;

##### **4.8.4 Prejudice or Bias**

- 4.8.4.1 that there is evidence of prejudice or bias on the part of the person conducting the hearing.
- 4.8.5 If a student wishes to challenge the penalty imposed, they must submit a challenge in writing to the member of the staff appointed by the Chief Operating Officer to assess cases of this kind, within fourteen days of notification of the decision of the Chair of the Board of Examiners.
- 4.8.6 Students must set out the grounds for their challenge with supporting evidence and, where the challenge is based on the presentation of fresh evidence, the student should forward it or a summary of it, with the challenge.

- 4.8.7 The member of staff appointed by the Chief Operating Officer will consider whether the challenge presents valid grounds. A challenge which does not present valid grounds will be dismissed and a completion of procedures letter will be issued by the appropriate office of the central administration.
- 4.8.8 If, in the opinion of the member of staff appointed, the challenge does present valid grounds, a Challenge Hearing shall be convened (see 1.1.3).
- 4.8.9 A Pro-Warden appointed by the Warden shall hear the challenge together with up to two members of academic staff who have not previously been involved with the case and who are not from the same Department as the student.
- 4.8.10 The Chair of the Board of Examiners concerned shall be responsible for providing a Pro-Warden appointed by the Warden with a factual statement of the case together with relevant documentation, as appropriate.
- 4.8.11 A member of staff appointed by the Chief Operating Officer will act as secretary for the Hearing.
- 4.8.12 The procedure for the Hearing will be sent to the student in advance.
- 4.8.13 The student who has submitted the challenge will be given at least ten days' notice of the date of the Hearing.
- 4.8.14 The student may be accompanied (see 1.1.3) at any such Hearing by a member of staff or a student of the College. The name, address and description of this person shall be submitted in writing to the member of the staff appointed by the Registrar / Secretary not less than two days before the date appointed for the Hearing.
- 4.8.15 The member of the staff appointed will provide the appellant, at least five days before the date of the Hearing, with a copy of the statement referred to above.
- 4.8.16 The student may make an oral statement in support of their challenge at the Hearing.
- 4.8.17 The student may, at the discretion of a Pro-Warden appointed by the Warden, call witnesses to attend the Hearing if this is necessary to support the contention that fresh evidence exists which was not available to the Chair of the Board of Examiners.
- 4.8.18 A Pro-Warden appointed by the Warden shall normally request a written statement from the Chair of the Board of Examiners whose decision is the subject of the challenge, and the Chair of the relevant Board of Examiners shall normally be given an opportunity to appear at the Hearing.

- 4.8.19 The Hearing shall decide whether or not the challenge is to be upheld, and if upheld, the action to be taken. If the challenge is not upheld the panel shall confirm the penalty imposed by the Chair of the Board of Examiners.
- 4.8.20 The decision of the Hearing shall be the final decision of the College.
- 

## **5 Definitions of Level of Offence**

---

### **5.1 Minor or Technical Offences**

- 5.1.1 Poor referencing
- 5.1.2 Incorrect (or an absence of) attribution for copied work inserted in an assignment
- 5.1.3 Paraphrasing without adequate attribution

### **5.2 Moderate Offences**

- 5.2.1 Ideas or concepts which appear to originate from the student but are in fact the work of others, not fully referenced, cited or otherwise acknowledged as required;
- 5.2.2 Work that is inappropriately paraphrased or directly quoted without speech marks and is not referenced;
- 5.2.3 Identical or closely related work and ideas to another assignment previously submitted by the student;
- 5.2.4 Minor infringement of the examination venue rules (as set out in the conduct of examination rules);
- 5.2.5 Minor breach of ethical and professional standards appropriate to the discipline.

### **5.3 Severe Offences**

- 5.3.1 Plagiarism extending to a substantial proportion of the work;
- 5.3.2 Falsifying some data or evidence;
- 5.3.3 Failure to obtain ethical approval, where there is an unambiguous requirement to do so, or to follow professional standards appropriate to the discipline;
- 5.3.4 Cheating in an examination;
- 5.3.5 Taking notes relevant to the examination in to the examination halls\*;

- 5.3.6 Using an electronic device to access data or calculations in an examination\*.
- 5.3.7 \*Unless use of text, notes or electronic devices is permitted in the examination and recorded within the examination paper rubric.

## **5.4 Very Severe Offences**

- 5.4.1 Commissioning work from someone else;
- 5.4.2 Copying the work of another student;
- 5.4.3 Collusion with other students to produce a piece of work as if it was an individual student's own work;
- 5.4.4 Falsifying the majority of data or evidence;
- 5.4.5 Impersonation of a student in an examination;
- 5.4.6 Major breach of ethical and professional standards appropriate to the discipline.

---

## **6 Tariff of Penalties**

---

### **6.1 Penalties applicable when academic misconduct is found to have occurred**

- 6.1.1 Issue a written formal warning, that may be considered in the event of any subsequent offences;
- 6.1.2 Require the student to read and sign the Academic Misconduct Statement and study the online good academic practice tutorial available on FIDI's Moodle.
- 6.1.3 Require the student to resubmit the work within 3-5 days, appropriately referenced without any additional changes to the substance of the submission. If a student fails to submit the amended coursework by the set deadline, it will be considered as non-completion of the module and a mark of zero will be awarded;
- 6.1.4 Subtract ten percentage marks from the final mark for the module overall;
- 6.1.5 Award a mark of zero for the element of the module (the retake is penalised);
- 6.1.6 Award a mark of zero for all elements of the module (the retake is penalised);
- 6.1.7 Award the minimum pass mark for the module;

- 6.1.8 Reduce the student's degree class by one class (unless by doing so a pass would be turned into a 'fail');
  - 6.1.9 "Cap" the student's degree class at a certain level;
  - 6.1.10 Suspension from College (an interruption of one academic year);
  - 6.1.11 Award a mark of zero for the module and instruct the Examination Board to consider the student only for an exit award on the basis of credits already achieved. (where the Programme Specification provides for interim awards);
  - 6.1.12 Require the student to withdraw without being awarded a degree or exit award (earned credits, that is credits which have already been ratified by a Board of Examiners, can be recorded).
- 6.2 When determining a penalty for a repeat offence, the prior offence and the level of it should be taken into account when determining the appropriate penalty for the repeat offence. Where it is determined that a student has committed an academic misconduct offence on more than one occasion, it is expected that the penalties will take this into account appropriately.

## 7 Penalties relative to academic level

The following tables provide guidance on the application of penalties relative to the student's level of study.

### 7.1 Undergraduate Penalties

Level of offence being considered	First Offence	Repeated Offence
<p><b>MINOR OR TECHNICAL</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor referencing</li> <li>• Incorrect (or an absence of) attribution for copied work inserted in an assignment</li> <li>• Paraphrasing without adequate attribution</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issue a written formal warning, that may be considered in the event of any subsequent offences;</li> <li>• Require the candidate to read and sign the Academic Misconduct Statement and study the online good academic practice tutorial available on FIDI's Moodle.</li> <li>• Require the candidate to resubmit the work within 3-5 days, appropriately referenced without any additional changes to the substance of the submission. If a student fails to submit the amended coursework by the set deadline, it will be considered as non-completion of the module and a mark of zero will be awarded</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require the student to resubmit the work within 3-5 days, appropriately referenced without any additional changes to the substance of the submission. If a student fails to submit the amended coursework by the set deadline, it will be considered as non-completion of the module and a mark of zero will be awarded.</li> <li>• Award the minimum pass mark for the module;</li> </ul>



Level of offence being considered	First Offence	Repeated Offence
<p><b>MODERATE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ideas or concepts which appear to originate from the student but are in fact the work of others, not fully referenced, cited or otherwise acknowledged as required</li> <li>• Work that is inappropriately paraphrased or directly quoted without speech marks and is not referenced Identical or closely related work and ideas to another assignment previously submitted by the student</li> <li>• Minor infringement of the examination venue rules (as set out in the conduct of examination rules)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require the candidate to resubmit the work within 3-5 days, appropriately referenced without any additional changes to the substance of the submission. If a student fails to submit the amended coursework by the set deadline, it will be considered as non-completion of the module and a mark of zero will be awarded</li> <li>• Subtract ten percentage marks from the final mark for the module overall;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce the degree class by one class (unless by doing so a pass would be turned into a 'fail')</li> </ul>

Level of offence being considered	First Offence	Repeated Offence
<p><b>SEVERE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plagiarism extending to a substantial proportion of the work</li> <li>• Falsifying some data or evidence</li> <li>• Cheating in an examination</li> <li>• Taking notes relevant to the examination in to the examination halls*</li> <li>• Using an electronic device to access data or calculations in an examination*.</li> </ul> <p>*Unless use of text, notes or electronic devices is permitted in the examination and recorded within the examination paper rubric</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require the candidate to resubmit the work within 3-5 days, appropriately referenced without any additional changes to the substance of the submission. If a student fails to submit the amended coursework by the set deadline, it will be considered as non-completion of the module and a mark of zero will be awarded</li> <li>• Award a mark of zero for the element of the module (the retake is penalised);</li> <li>• Award a mark of zero for all elements of the module (the retake is penalised);</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Cap” the student’s degree class at a certain level;</li> <li>• Suspension from College (an interruption of one academic year);</li> </ul>

Level of offence being considered	First Offence	Repeated Offence
<p><b>VERY SEVERE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commissioning work from someone else</li> <li>• Copying the work of another student</li> <li>• Collusion with other students to produce a piece of work as if it was an individual student's own work</li> <li>• Falsifying the majority of data or evidence</li> <li>• Impersonation of a student in an examination</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require the candidate to resubmit the work within 3-5 days, appropriately referenced without any additional changes to the substance of the submission. If a student fails to submit the amended coursework by the set deadline, it will be considered as non-completion of the module and a mark of zero will be awarded.</li> <li>• Award a mark of zero for all elements of the module (the retake is penalised);</li> <li>• Award the minimum pass mark for the module;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suspension from College (an interruption of one academic year);</li> <li>• Award a mark of zero for the module and instruct the Examination Board to consider the student only for an exit award on the basis of credits already achieved (where the Programme Specification provides for interim awards).</li> </ul>