

Academic Misconduct Policy

2023/24



Contents

Academic Misconduct	3
Common Forms of Academic Misconduct	4
The Procedure for Handling Cases of Academic Misconduct	4
The Academic Misconduct Investigation	4
Minor Cases	5
Major Cases	6
Severe Cases	6
Appeals	7
Retrospective Penalties	7
Reviews	8
Office of the Independent Adjudicator	8
Reporting and Records Retention	8
Appendix 1: Detailed List of Offences	9
Appendix 2: Penalties for Academic Misconduct	10

Version	2.0
Owner	Assessment Management
Author	Assessment Management
Approved date	21 June 2023
Approved by	Academic Board
Last reviewed	June 2023
Date for review	June 2024
Changes in last review	<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Changes made to the definition of major/minor cases to include levels 5 and 6.■ The available penalties reduced to three.

Academic Misconduct Policy



Academic Misconduct

1.1 Academic misconduct occurs when a student does not follow good academic practice in an assessment¹, thereby gaining unfair advantage and undermining academic standards. It is a fundamental principle that students are assessed fairly and on equal terms. Any attempt by a student to gain unfair advantage in the completion of an assessment or to assist someone else to gain unfair advantage, is considered to be academic misconduct.

1.2 The University takes academic misconduct very seriously and has mechanisms to identify when it may have taken place. Where academic misconduct is suspected, it will be investigated in all cases. The investigation may determine that there is no case to answer, or if poor academic practice can be addressed through further training. Where a case is proven, penalties will be applied in line with those laid out in Appendix 2. In the most serious cases, the penalty can be failure of the programme.

The type and nature of other forms of academic misconduct must be taken into consideration when deciding on the penalty for the behaviour identified. Where an act of misconduct is such that it places other students or staff at significant risk or it risks the reputation of the University, any other appropriate penalty including failure of the programme may be considered. In such cases an Assessment Disciplinary Panel will hear the case and will recommend the penalty.

1.3 The Academic Misconduct Policy applies to all registered students including postgraduate researchers. This includes students studying on programmes at partner institutions, except where it has been contractually agreed that the partner's procedures will apply.

1.4 All disciplinary aspects of this Policy apply solely to academic misconduct that has taken place within

summative assessment i.e. assessment that counts towards academic credit, level progression and final awards. Summative assessment includes (but is not limited to) formal examinations, group work, essays, projects and dissertations.

Where students on undergraduate or taught postgraduate programmes proceed to collect data without getting ethical approval, they will be dealt with under the academic misconduct policy as a major case. Taught students can be dealt with under the Procedure for Investigating Allegations of Research Misconduct where misconduct in research is sufficiently severe. Assessment Management will liaise with Research and Knowledge Exchange in these situations.

1.5 For postgraduate research (PGR) students, the policy applies to all summative and credit-bearing PGR assessments including the thesis. All other work submitted by PGR students, which may include milestone reports, annual reviews and draft thesis chapters, is subject to the University policies on research ethics and governance.

1.6 When academic misconduct is identified within formative assessment (which takes place in-year as part of the learning process and does not count towards academic credit) it will not be taken forward to a formal misconduct investigation. It will instead, be addressed through academic feedback and may lead to more developmental engagement to ensure that the student is able to maintain academic integrity at summative assessments.

1.7 Where a PSRB has particular procedures and penalties for academic misconduct, Manchester Metropolitan University policy, procedures and penalties will take precedence. The only exceptions to this are when variance has been approved by one of the University's committees, for example Academic Board. In these cases, the PSRB procedures and penalties should be communicated clearly to students and fully documented in the Programme Specification.

¹ Further information on Academic Integrity can be found at <https://www.mmu.ac.uk/student-life/course/assessments/academic-integrity>

Common Forms of Academic Misconduct

2.1 Plagiarism

There is no minimum threshold for plagiarism. The penalties for plagiarism relate to the context and impact on the academic submission of the plagiarised element(s). Consideration will be given to the impact that the plagiarised content has on the overall mark that the submission would have obtained had the plagiarism not been identified. This is a matter of academic judgement. Software such as Turnitin, or other packages to identify academic similarity reports, are indicative tools. A high or low similarity score does not result automatically in either action or inaction.

2.2 Collusion

Undisclosed collaboration of two or more people on an assignment or task, which is supposed to be completed individually. Academic judgement will be required to determine whether collusion has taken place and by which parties. Software such as Turnitin, or other packages to identify academic similarity reports, are indicative tools. A high or low similarity score does not result automatically in either action or inaction.

2.3 Self-plagiarism

Self-plagiarism is submission by the student of work or large elements of work that has been submitted previously for academic credit whether at this institution or another.

Students wishing to include content that has been marked previously as part of another submission must cite and reference their previous work.

There is no minimum threshold for self-plagiarism. The penalties for self-plagiarism relate to the context and impact on the academic submission of the plagiarised element(s). Consideration will be given to the impact that the plagiarised content has on the overall mark that the submission would have obtained had the plagiarism not been identified. This is a matter of academic judgement. Software such as Turnitin, or other packages to identify academic similarity reports, are indicative tools. A high or low similarity score does not result automatically in either action or inaction.

2.4 Contract Cheating

Contract cheating happens when a third party completes work for a student who then submits it to an education provider as their own. It can refer to situations such as friends or family members completing assignments for students in whole or in part, and does not always involve a financial relationship. It also includes work produced using generative artificial intelligence (AI) and passed off as students' own.

Detailed definitions of Academic Misconduct offences are shown in Appendix 1.



The Procedure for Handling Cases of Academic Misconduct

The Academic Misconduct Investigation

The investigation process is the same for both minor and major cases of academic misconduct. The academic misconduct investigation meeting should take place before it is reported to Assessment Management. Severe cases, such as suspected contract cheating, are managed by Assessment Management and covered in Section 6 of this policy.

3.1 Where a potential case of academic misconduct has been identified, the student will be invited to attend an academic misconduct investigation meeting. Where a submission has been made to a unit that has anonymous marking enabled, the identity of the student may be obtained by Assessment Management for the purposes of arranging a meeting.

3.2 The person conducting the meeting is known as the Investigating Officer. This will be a Head of Department or their nominated representative. In some cases it may be appropriate to allocate the investigation to someone from outside the department.

For postgraduate research students the Investigating Officer will be the Departmental Research Degrees Coordinator or other appropriate academic with a PGR leadership role.

3.3 Assessment Management will provide guidance to academic staff for the meeting and reporting process.

3.4 The student will be provided with seven days' notice of the meeting. The student may bring a representative to the meeting, normally an advisor from the Student Union Advice Centre. Legal representation at the Investigation stage is not normally permitted. Students may seek wellbeing support at any time during this process from the University's Counselling, Mental Health and Wellbeing team.

- 3.5** The student will be provided with the material that will be considered at the meeting and will be provided with at least seven days to consider the information presented.
- 3.6** The student will be expected to attend the meeting. If the student does not attend, and does not attempt to make alternative arrangements, the meeting can take place in the student's absence. Where the student has advised that they are unable to attend, one further appointment will be made. If the student is unable to attend for a second time, the investigation meeting can proceed in the student's absence.
- 3.7** The purpose is to establish:
- whether academic misconduct has been proven or not proven
 - if proven, what type(s) of academic misconduct has occurred
 - if proven, whether the academic misconduct is minor or major.
- 3.8** All cases will be considered on the basis of evidence. The standard of proof at any stage of the investigation is that the University is satisfied that, on the evidence available, the student's responsibility for the academic misconduct is more likely than not.
- 3.9** At the meeting, the Investigating Officer will present the full facts of the case to the student, explain the potential penalties and make it clear that if proven the offence will be retained on the student's formal record. The student will be given the opportunity to present their case and to provide any supporting evidence or information that they may wish to submit which, in their view, may have led to the alleged misconduct occurring.
- NB:** Students should note that consideration of mitigation is rare and is unlikely to result in a lesser penalty.
- 3.10** The student can be advised verbally at the end of the meeting of the Investigating Officer's conclusion as to whether academic misconduct has been proven or not proven.
- 3.11** If the Investigating Officer concludes that academic misconduct has been proven, any imposition of penalties will be communicated after the meeting has concluded and will not normally be given verbally at the meeting. Where it is determined that penalties are to be imposed, the following will be taken into consideration:
- a student's prior record of academic misconduct including developmental engagement following academic misconduct
 - the student's level of study.
- NB:** If multiple cases are identified in the same assessment period they will be dealt with as one and will not count as a "history" of academic misconduct. However, the overall proportion of misconduct identified within each assessment will be taken into account when calculating the final penalty.

Minor Cases

- 4.1** Minor cases will be dealt with in a supportive, developmental way.
- 4.2** The procedure for investigating academic misconduct will follow that set out in Section 3.
- 4.3** Minor cases are restricted to a first offence of poor academic practice where the academic misconduct does not constitute a significant proportion of the submission or does not substantially influence the grade that the student may otherwise have received had the poor practice not been identified.
- Taught postgraduate students with recent experience (in the past four years) of Higher Education must be considered under the major and severe categories.
- 4.3.1** An offence by a postgraduate research student can only be classed as minor if:
- it does not have a material impact on the outcome that would have been given
 - it is a first offence
 - the student is in the first 12 months (or part-time equivalent) of their period of registered study, and prior to enrolling on their degree programme, had been out of Higher Education for four years or more
 - it does not occur within the thesis submission.
- 4.4** Where a case is considered by the Investigating Officer to rest within the minor category, developmental activity can take place at the earliest opportunity, without requiring prior confirmation from Assessment Management. This does not preclude the possibility of an imposition of other potentially serious penalties by Assessment Management. This would arise where, for example, the team were in possession of other information that is material to the case, but not known to the Investigating Officer at the time of the Investigation meeting.
- 4.5** At the meeting, the student and the Investigating Officer will discuss the poor practice. The exact nature of the developmental engagement is a matter of academic judgement, but it is expected to involve advice on how to resolve the specific issues identified, broader guidance on good practice, and signposting of further information and resources. Information on how to ensure academic integrity can be found at: <https://www.mmu.ac.uk/student-life/teaching-and-learning/assessments/academicintegrity/>
- 4.6** There will be no cap applied to the student's assessment and the assessment will go forward as marked. However, the case will be noted on the student's academic record. The student will be provided with the summary of the case outcome in writing along with information on how to appeal, and on what grounds.

Major Cases

- 5.1** Major Cases include any of the offences listed in Appendix 1 which do not fall into the minor or severe category. This includes, but is not limited to, self-plagiarism, collusion, plagiarism, exam cheating, and falsification of data. Contract cheating will always fall under the severe category and is addressed in section 6 below.
- 5.2** The procedure for investigating major academic misconduct will follow that set out in Section 3 above.
- 5.3** Penalties are determined and administered centrally by Assessment Management, based on the information provided following the Investigation Meeting. When considering the level of penalty, the team will access the student's academic record to determine whether the student has had a prior record of academic misconduct (including Minor Cases, as above) and to check on their level of study. Assessment Management will combine this with information from the Investigating Officer about the type of academic misconduct, its severity, and the proportion of assessment affected to determine the penalty.
- 5.4** As far as possible, the assessment should be given a mark that reflects the standard of the piece of work as presented irrespective of whether misconduct is subsequently proven. Where the extent of the academic misconduct means that it is impossible to give the work a mark, a 0 may be given. Penalties for proven cases are then applied by Assessment Management depending on the outcome of the meeting.
- 5.5** Assessment Management will inform the student of the penalty. The student will also be provided with the summary of the case outcome, including details of the penalty, if applicable. The student will be provided with information on how to appeal, and on what grounds.
- 5.6** The penalty decision will be communicated to the relevant Assessment Board, for incorporation in the student's overall results.
- NB:** Penalties and marks will be considered by the Assessment Board who will decide on the need to re-sit. Re-sits will be awarded in line with the University's main Assessment Regulations.

Severe Cases

- 6.1** The main type of severe case is contract cheating. Contract cheating happens when a third party completes work for a student who then submits it to an education provider as their own. It can refer to situations such as friends or family members completing assignments for students in whole or in part, and does not always involve a financial relationship. It also includes work produced using generative artificial intelligence (AI) and passed off

as students' own. Other types of severe cases could include, but are not limited to, large-group collusion and cheating, major disruption of an examination and large-scale falsification of data. The default penalty for a severe offence is normally failure of the programme.

- 6.2** The procedure for severe cases can be instigated at an early stage where, for example, contract cheating is discovered or suspected, or if there has been major disruption of an examination. There is no need to await the completion of local investigations before instigating the procedure for severe cases.

6.3 The Role of Assessment Management

In all cases where severe academic misconduct is suspected, the academic department should make contact with Assessment Management at the earliest opportunity. The Assessment Management Department will manage all procedural elements of the case including communication with relevant parties. In the case of PGR students, Assessment Management will liaise with the Graduate School.

6.4 The Assessment Disciplinary Panel

- 6.4.1** The investigation of the case will include an interview with the student, undertaken by a panel. The Assessment Disciplinary Panel (ADP) will be selected to give the following combination of elements:

- a Chair, who will be suitably senior and have appropriate experience/knowledge of academic misconduct
- academic expertise in the subject (usually local academic staff)
- an elected Sabbatical Officer or other student representative of the Students' Union.

- 6.4.2** The student will be invited to a meeting of the Assessment Disciplinary Panel (ADP). The student will be given a minimum of seven days' notice of the interview. Guidance and representation, normally by the Students' Union Advice Centre, is encouraged.

- 6.4.3** The student will be expected to attend the Assessment Disciplinary Panel meeting. If the student does not attend, and does not attempt to make alternative arrangements, the meeting can take place in the student's absence. Where the student has advised that they are unable to attend, one further appointment will be made. If the student is unable to attend for a second time, the investigation meeting can proceed in the student's absence.

- 6.4.4** At the ADP meeting, the student will be invited to make a statement and present any additional evidence that the student considers to be relevant to the case. The panel will then question the student based on the information supplied by the student in advance of, and during, the Assessment Disciplinary Panel meeting.

6.5 Outcomes

- 6.5.1** The default penalty for a severe case is normally failure of the programme.
- 6.5.2** The Assessment Disciplinary Panel may conclude that an offence has been committed but does not fall into the category of severe or may conclude that no offence has been committed. In these cases, the Assessment

Disciplinary Panel will make a recommendation to Assessment Management regarding the application of any penalty.

6.5.3 The student will be notified in writing following the Panel meeting. This will include details of the penalty, if applicable, and how to appeal and upon what grounds.

6.5.4 The decision will be communicated to the relevant Assessment Board which will make adjustments to the student's results.

Appeals

7.1 A student who is in receipt of a penalty decision from a minor, major or severe case has the right to appeal against the decision. The appeal should be made within 14 days of the date on which the decision outcome is sent. Appeals will be considered by an Appeals Panel.

7.2 A student may appeal against an academic misconduct penalty decision, on one or more of the following grounds:

- that there was mitigation for their actions that they did not submit at the investigation or Assessment Disciplinary Panel stages
- that the proceedings of the Investigation or Assessment Disciplinary Panel were not conducted in accordance with the relevant regulations or that some other material irregularity had occurred and that the conduct or irregularity was of such a nature as to cause reasonable doubt as to whether the decision might have been different had it not occurred
- that there is new material evidence that they were not, for valid reasons, able to submit at an earlier stage of the process
- that the penalty imposed was disproportionate, or not permitted under the Policy.

7.3 The core membership of an Appeals Panel will normally consist of:

- A Chair (normally a Senior Officer of the University)
- Two senior academic members of staff with appropriate experience and no prior involvement in the case
- An elected Sabbatical Officer or other student representative of the Students' Union.

Further members may be appointed as appropriate, for example, in considering cases relating to PGR students.

7.4 The Appeals Panel can take the following factors into account:

- facts (including new evidence if made available)
- newly-disclosed mitigating circumstances submitted by, or on behalf of, the student
- a student's prior record of academic misconduct
- a student's level of study.

7.5 The Appeals Panel will normally consider the full written appeal submitted by the student, including any supporting evidence, without the student present.

7.6 There may be occasions where the Appeals Panel considers it important to invite the student to attend a Panel meeting. Should this be the case, the student will be invited to attend with a representative and will be given at least seven days' notice. The case will be considered without the student being present, if they fail to attend.

7.7 Please refer to the **Procedure for Academic Appeals and Review of Assessment-Related Matters** for details of the timescales for the conclusion of cases.

7.8 The Appeals Panel will consider the available evidence. Panel members will use their academic judgement in considering the extent to which the appeal makes a case for an adjustment to the penalty. The Appeals Panel is empowered to recommend to the Assessment Board for the penalty to be amended.

7.9 The Appeals Panel will produce a report of its deliberations and the rationale for its decisions. This will be made available to the student when notifying the student of the Panel's decision and will include information regarding the Review Stage.

Retrospective Penalties

8.1 In circumstances where the University becomes aware of an allegation of academic misconduct against a student after they have been granted an award, retrospective action can be taken. Such cases will always be considered by an Assessment Disciplinary Panel.

8.2 If the ADP decides that misconduct has occurred, they will apply a penalty equivalent to that which would have been applied had the student still been enrolled on the course.



- 8.3** If the effect of the penalty results in failure of the programme, the ADP will recommend that the award is revoked, and no opportunity for further reassessment will be provided. If a lesser penalty is applied, but that penalty includes the removal of credits in which misconduct occurred, the ADP will ask for the award to be revoked and consider whether reassessments should be granted to potentially allow the student to regain the award. Reassessments will normally only be granted where the misconduct is identified within 12 months of the award being made.
- 8.4** Any decision to revoke an award will be made by the University Registrar on behalf of Academic Board.

Reviews

- 9.1** Reviews will take account of all factors i.e. findings, context and mitigation. Reviews will also examine the way in which the investigation was conducted and the extent to which other factors were taken into consideration when allocating penalties and considering appeals.
- 9.2** A student may request a review of an academic misconduct appeal decision, on one or more of the following grounds:
- that there was mitigation for their actions that they did not submit at the investigation or Assessment Disciplinary Panel stages
 - that the proceedings of the Investigation or Assessment Disciplinary Panel were not conducted in accordance with the relevant regulations, or that some other material irregularity had occurred, and that the conduct or irregularity was of such a nature as to cause reasonable doubt as to whether the decision might have been different had it not occurred
 - that there is new material evidence that they were not, for valid reasons, able to submit at an earlier stage of the process
 - that the penalty imposed was disproportionate, or not permitted under the Policy.
- 9.3** For taught students, the review will be undertaken by a senior academic such as a Head of Department or Faculty Director of Education who has had no prior involvement with the case.

For research students, the Review will be undertaken by the Chair of the Research Degrees Committee, or their nominee who has had no prior involvement in the case.

- 9.4** A student may request a review of the decision made by the Appeals Panel within 14 days of the outcome of appeal letter being sent. Outcomes will be sent by email.
- 9.5** The review stage will normally be completed within 30 days of the receipt of the request for review.

- 9.6** Student Case Management will compile a full case file for the reviewer including all evidence received at all stages of the case. The reviewer may, at their discretion, request further evidence or investigation. The reviewer may, if they see fit, interview any person who has been involved in the case, in any role, however, there is no requirement for the reviewer to do this if they feel that the documentary evidence is sufficient.
- 9.7** On the basis of this holistic analysis the reviewer will reach a judgement as to whether:
- procedures were followed correctly
 - all evidence was taken into consideration, including mitigation at the appeal stage
 - judgement was applied impartially and consistently
 - the penalty was proportionate to the offence.
- 9.8** The reviewer will then advise on whether the case outcome should stand or whether it should be reconsidered by the Appeals Panel. If the Appeals Panel re-considers the case, it will do so in the absence of attendance by the student.
- 9.9** The reviewer will, with the assistance of Student Case Management, produce a summary of the rationale for their decision.
- 9.10** The student will be informed of the Reviewer's decision and the rationale for it (or the Appeals Panel's decision if the case has been referred back to them). The student will be advised of their right to appeal to the Office for the Independent Adjudicator.

Office of the Independent Adjudicator

- 10.1** At the conclusion of the University's internal processes under this Policy, the student shall be issued with a Completion of Procedures letter, as prescribed by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA). A student who is dissatisfied with the outcome of their case may submit a complaint to the OIA under the rules of its scheme within 12 months of the issue of the Completion of Procedures letter. Information on the process can be obtained directly from the OIA at <http://www.oiahe.org.uk>.

Reporting and Records Retention

- 11.1** Information on investigation outcomes and penalties will be used in an anonymised format as part of the annual report on academic misconduct that is presented to Academic Board.
- 11.2** A record of the penalties applied in relation to academic misconduct will be retained in accordance with the University's Records Retention and Disposal Schedule.

Appendix 1: Detailed List of Offences

Offences relating to assessed work include, but are not limited to:

- unacknowledged incorporation of another person's work
- unacknowledged summarising of another person's work
- unacknowledged and/or unauthorised use of the ideas of another person
- copying the work of another person with or without that person's knowledge or agreement and presenting it as one's own
- the representation of another person's work, without acknowledgement of the source, as one's own
- the submission of collaborative work as entirely a student's own
- the completion of work with another person which is intended to be submitted as a student's own unaided work
- actions which enable another student to access / copy all or part of their own work and to submit it as that student's own unaided work
- the use of third parties and/or websites to attempt to buy assessments or answers to questions set
- gaining access to any unauthorised material relating to an assessment prior to the release date of such information
- the provision of falsified information that has the potential to give a student an unfair advantage.
- proceeding with data collections without ethical approval
- failures to follow accepted procedures or to exercise due care in carrying out responsibilities for avoiding unreasonable risk or harm to:
 - humans
 - animals used in research
 - the environment
 - the proper handling of privileged or private information on individuals collected during research, including failure to seek appropriate consent and breaking of data protection regulations
- submitting all or part of a piece of work for which a student has already received credit
- use of materials created by others and passed off as students' own. This includes all forms of contract cheating, such as the use of material produced by essay mills or the submission of work produced using generative artificial (AI)
NB: This does not apply to third parties such as Studiosity that have been sanctioned by the University to provide guidance and assistance to students in specific assessment situations, or where the generation of content using artificial intelligence (AI) has been expressly authorised as part of the assessment component.
- falsification of data or sources of information that are presented in support of the assessment.

Offences relating to formal examinations may include, but are not limited to:

- non-compliance with Examination Regulations, which are found in the Undergraduate or Taught Postgraduate Assessment Regulations
- copying or attempting to copy from any other candidate during an examination
- communicating during an examination with any person other than the invigilator(s) or other authorised members of staff unless expressly permitted by the examination and/or Assessment Regulations
- introducing into the examination room or being in possession of any written or printed material(s) or obtaining any electronically stored information unless expressly permitted by the examination and/or assessment regulations
- being in possession of, or obtaining access to, a copy of an examination question paper in advance of the date and time for its authorised release (this covers both 'seen' and 'unseen' papers)
- disruptive behaviour in an examination
- being party to personation, where an individual assumes the identity of another person with intent to deceive, for example, by sitting or attempting to sit an examination or test in the place of the student who should be sitting it
- continuing to write after the end of the examination
- the provision of information that has the potential to give a student an unfair advantage.

Appendix 2: Penalties for Academic Misconduct

Important Notes

Assessment Mitigation and/or repeating units

Students who are subject to academic misconduct penalties but also have an approved deferred assessment for the assessment attempt, will be allowed a further reassessment opportunity in accordance with the Assessment Mitigations Policy, but the assessment will normally be capped in line with the penalties for academic misconduct below.

Eligibility for Reassessment

Penalties and marks will be considered by the Assessment Board who will decide on the eligibility to re-sit. If the offence is committed as part of a resubmission of an assessment, the student will have no further opportunity to resubmit, subject to the conditions of the Assessment Mitigations Policy.

Resubmissions will normally be at the next available opportunity, usually the resit period. However, resubmission may be approved to occur at a later date, for example, where a student has been allowed to repeat (with or without attendance) in the following academic year. All opportunities for timing of resubmissions are subject to approval by the Assessment Board.

Capping

If the student is required to resubmit, any reassessment mark will be capped at the appropriate pass mark for that level.

Penalties

The penalties below should be applied according to the penalty grid, taking into account whether it is the student's first offence, and whether the misconduct represents a significant proportion of the assessment, or substantially influences the grade that the student may otherwise have received had the misconduct not been identified.

Category	A	B	C
Details of Penalty	<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Assignment marked without the identified elements being included for assessment. Exams: No mark change.■ No cap applied.■ Case noted on the student's file. <p>Written outcome/warning. Student to be referred for developmental engagement.</p>	Written warning and mark of 0 for the assessment being undertaken.	Student deemed to have failed the programme.

Indicative Penalty Ranges – Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate Students

A: Offences relating to assessed work (e.g. coursework and essays) other than event based assessments (e.g. time limited examinations)

Level	Type of offence			
	First offence – minor (See 4.3)	First offence – major (see 5.1)	Second offence	Any subsequent offence
3 or 4	A	A	B	C
5 or 6, or 7 at integrated masters (UG)	A	B	B	C
7 (PGT) – out of HE for 4+ years	A	A	B	C
7 (PGT) – not new to HE	B	B	C	C

B: Offences relating to event-based assessments (e.g. time limited examinations)

Exam – first offence, minor	Exam – first offence, major	Exam – any subsequent offence
A	B	C

Indicative Penalty Ranges – Research Students

Minor Offence (see definition in 4.3.1)	Developmental engagement
Major Offence where it is a first offence, and the student has been out of higher education for four years or more prior to enrolment on their current academic year.	The work to be put forward for assessment with the relevant sections removed. Work follows standard submission arrangements for first submission or resubmission as applicable. No additional cap applied.
Major Offence where it is a first offence, and the student has been on a higher education programme within the last four years.	For credit-bearing units on postgraduate research degrees: The element(s) of the unit in which the misconduct occurred to be given a mark of 0/fail and resubmitted in the resit period (or at an appropriate future point), with the mark capped at the pass mark for the unit. For a thesis: The thesis to be referred (failed) at the first assessment and given an outcome of 'revise and resubmit'. The thesis to be revised and resubmitted within the resubmission period and put forward for assessment. Available outcomes limited to the available outcomes for resubmitted theses.

