ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT POLICY FOR UNDERGRADUATE AND TAUGHT POSTGRADUATE COURSES

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Sheffield Hallam University believes strongly in the importance of academic integrity and supports the development of good academic practice. As such it takes breaches of academic conduct very seriously and all allegations of academic misconduct will be investigated according to this policy. These are applied with full regard to the principles of equity and fairness.

1.2 Academic misconduct is committed when a student does not follow published assessment protocols or tries to gain an unfair advantage by breaking, or not following, the academic regulations concerning any part of the assessment process. This procedure applies to all students on taught courses engaged in any University assessment activity whether on or off site including collaborative programmes.

1.3 In addition to these procedures, students on professional courses may also be subject to supplementary Professional Statutory or Regulatory body regulations and procedures. These procedures will be specified in individual course documentation.

1.4 Staff undertaking research and students undertaking research degrees should refer to the University Research Ethics Policies and Procedures.

2. PRINCIPLES

- The quality and standards of the University's awards are undermined by academic misconduct
- Policy and procedures for dealing with academic misconduct will be fair, transparent and consistently applied
- If academic misconduct is alleged there must be sufficient evidence to substantiate the allegations on the balance of probability
- Investigating and dealing with academic misconduct also involves academic judgements
- The University reserves the right to use any reasonable and fair means of identifying academic misconduct
- The investigation and consideration of all forms of academic misconduct, and the consequences arising therein, are not to be considered within the Assessment Board structure but by a separate panel
- Decisions made under the University's Faculty Academic Conduct Panel procedure may not be changed by Assessment Boards
- Information should be recorded to facilitate monitoring and review of the procedures
- The length of time in which academic misconduct information is kept on individual student files should be determined by the severity of the offence(s).
3. DIFFERENT FORMS OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

3.1 Plagiarism: this is where someone tries to pass off another's work, thoughts or ideas as their own, whether deliberately or unintentionally, without appropriate acknowledgement. Plagiarism can take a number of forms, including:

- **complete plagiarism**: the substantial and unauthorised use of the work or ideas of another person without acknowledgement of the source, including copying the work of another student, eg writing, computer programmes, designs, experiment results, music or copying of text directly from a website without acknowledgement.

- **partial plagiarism**: the inclusion of several sentences or more from another person’s work which has not been referenced in accordance with Sheffield Hallam University conventions on academic referencing and citation; the summarising of another person’s work by simply changing a few words or altering the order of presentation, without acknowledgement. This may be intentional with the aim being to deceive the marker, or unintentional as a result, for example, of poor study skills.

- **self plagiarism or duplication**: copying work that was originally completed and submitted by the student and resubmitted for another purpose, without acknowledgement of this, unless resubmission is allowed.

- **collusion**: this is where a student *undertakes work with others, without acknowledgement, e.g.
  - submits as entirely his/her own work, work done in collaboration with another person, with the intention to gain an unfair advantage, or
  - colludes with another student to complete work which is intended to be submitted as that other student's own unaided work or
  - knowingly permits another student to copy all or part of his/her own work and to submit it as that student's own unaided work

If collusion is suspected and if after investigation it cannot be established which individual(s) is/are responsible, all students involved will be deemed responsible, provided there is sufficient evidence to substantiate the allegations on the balance of probability.

* see information on [http://www.learnhigher.ac.uk/working-with-others/](http://www.learnhigher.ac.uk/working-with-others/) confirms the acceptable conventions of group working.

3.2 Falsifying data: this is where a student presents data in laboratory reports, projects, dissertations, etc based on experimental/ experiential work which the student claims to have carried out but which he/she has invented or obtained by unfair means.

3.3 Impersonation: this is the assumption by one person of the identity of another person with the intent to deceive or to gain unfair advantage.

3.4 Irregular behaviour relating to examinations: examples of academic misconduct in examinations are:

- obtaining an advance copy of an ‘unseen’ written examination paper
- taking any unauthorised material or equipment into the examination room
- communicating or trying to communicate in any way with another student during an examination
- reading or trying to read other candidates’ examination scripts
- copying or trying to copy from other candidates’ examination scripts
• using any electronically stored information in an examination unless permitted in the module regulations
• receiving information in an examination by electronic means, such as from a mobile phone.

3.5 **Dishonest practice:** this covers any form of dishonest practice not specifically identified by the above definitions and includes, but is not limited to:

• actual or attempted bribery
• making false declarations to deceive staff and/or to receive special consideration
• procuring another person's work or intentionally buying work from a website or other source
• submitting work which has been completed, altered, translated or corrected by another person, as if it was the student's own work.

Dishonest practice also relates to the use of foreign language material. This is where the student submits work as their own but which has already been published in another language. The work will have been translated into English by the student themselves or by another person. This applies to direct verbatim copying of translated material, copying and re-arranging material, as well as taking the ideas and findings of the material without attribution. In other words, the exact same criteria apply to translation material as to that already written in English.

3.6 **Breaches of Confidentiality and/or Unethical practice in coursework submitted for assessment:** this is where a student does not follow confidentiality and/or anonymity protocols and includes:

• direct naming of an individual or organisation where local protocols prohibit this
• inclusion of documentation that links to privileged information
• provision of information that could lead to the identification of a service user or organisation e.g. dates of birth, hospital record numbers, addresses or reference to unusual circumstances which could lead to identification of individuals or organisations.

3.7 **Additional points relating to group work:** if academic misconduct is suspected in group work and if it cannot be established which individual(s) is/are responsible, the whole group will be deemed responsible, provided that there is sufficient evidence to substantiate the allegations on the balance of probability.

4. **RAISING SUSPICIONS OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT**

4.1 Suspicions that academic misconduct has occurred will normally be raised by the member(s) of staff marking the student's work, by an internal moderator or by an external examiner. The general exception to this is where academic misconduct occurs in an examination and where it might be raised by an invigilator (see section 7).

4.2 It is the responsibility of those raising the suspicions to set out clearly the nature of their suspicions together with clear examples from the student's work showing how and where the academic misconduct has taken place.

4.3 The suspicions should be documented on a standard proforma (Academic Misconduct Allegation Proforma) and passed to the Course/Programme Leader, or equivalent. On the basis of the information provided, the Course/Programme Leader will decide whether there is a case to answer.
4.4 In raising suspicions and considering whether there is a case to answer, particular notice should be taken of the written guidance on the nature of evidence and use of Turnitin (Annex 1) and the Breach of Confidentiality guidelines (Annex 2).

4.5 If it is decided the student has no case to answer then no further action will be taken and no record kept on the student's file. There is no need to inform the student.

4.6 If it is decided there is a case to answer then the next steps are determined by the nature of the allegation and whether the student has committed similar offences previously:

4.7 Allegations can be considered at one or both of two separate stages: stage 1 is for minor offences and stage 2 for major offences. The table below provides a definition of these stages and which students they apply to.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1 - Minor offences</th>
<th>Stage 2 - Major offences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To be considered by the Course/Programme Leader or equivalent role</td>
<td>To be considered by a Faculty Academic Conduct Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctions 1 to 4 apply</td>
<td>Full range of sanctions apply</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- normally first offence for students at levels 3, 4 and 5, and *direct entrants to undergraduate study who are new to the university
- first offence for students at levels 4 and 5, and *direct entrants to undergraduate study, which is first considered at stage 1 but deemed to warrant a heavier sanction due to the seriousness/extent of the misconduct
- any offence committed in an examination
- any repeat offence
- any offence where there is a deliberate attempt to deceive

4.8 Additionally, a student who believes a penalty awarded at Stage 1 is too severe can request the decision is reviewed at Stage 2 (see section 6).

5. **ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT PROCEDURE STAGE 1: Meeting between the Course/Programme Leader, or equivalent role, and student(s)**

*Meetings held at Stage 1 of the Academic Misconduct Procedure will be convened and conducted in accordance with the general principles for meetings set out in the Operational Guidance for Academic Conduct Panels.*

5.1 Having decided there is a case to answer, the Course/Programme Leader will invite the student to a meeting in order to explain the exact nature of the allegation, to allow the student to give an explanation of events and attempt to establish a detailed account of what happened. The member of staff who raised the initial suspicions will attend the meeting and provide all relevant material relating to the case.

5.2 Following the meeting and after any further investigation deemed to be appropriate, the Course/Programme Leader can reach one of the following decisions:
• that academic misconduct has not occurred. If so, no further action will be taken and no record of the allegation kept on file. The student will be informed that this is the case.
• that academic conduct has occurred and that an appropriate penalty is within the remit of Stage 1 (see Annex 3 for sanctions). The Course/Programme Leader will report the proposed decision on a standard Stage 1 Academic Conduct Panel proforma to the Chair of the Faculty Academic Conduct Panel. The Chair of the ACP will either approve the decision or a joint decision will be made after discussion. The final decision will be recorded on the proforma and the decision will be communicated in writing to the student by the Course/Programme Leader. A copy of the letter and proforma will be kept on the student's file.
• that the allegations are more serious than initially believed and should be considered therefore at Stage 2.

5.3 The student has the right to ask for the decision to be reviewed by the Faculty Academic Conduct Panel if the student believes the penalty is too severe. **The student must give reasons why they believe the penalty is too severe and make the request to the Academic Conduct Panel within 10 working days of receiving notification of the decision. In such cases, Stage 2 of the process will be invoked.**

6. **ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT PROCEDURE STAGE 2: Consideration by a Faculty Academic Conduct Panel**

*Meetings held at Stage 2 of the Academic Misconduct Procedure will be convened and conducted in accordance with the general principles for meetings set out in the Operational Guidance for Academic Conduct Panels*

6.1 Each Faculty will establish a Faculty Academic Conduct Panel (ACP) ensuring a membership which demonstrates objectivity of the process. The Faculty Academic Board will set a quorum. The constitution will typically comprise: Chair (normally the Faculty Head of Quality or equivalent), up to four experienced Course Leader/Programme Leaders or equivalent, a senior administrator and a secretary. A Deputy Chair should be appointed from the members of the Panel. The Deputy Chair may chair the meeting if the Chair is unavailable. No one will be a member of the ACP if they participated at an earlier stage of the investigation or if they are a Course Leader/Programme Leader, or have a personal interest in the student.

6.2 The ACP will consider the evidence and make a decision based on the balance of probability as to whether or not academic misconduct has occurred.

6.3 If the Panel considers that academic misconduct has not occurred, no further action will be taken and no record of the allegation will be kept on file. The student will be informed that this is the case.

6.4 If the Panel considers that academic misconduct has occurred then using the criteria set out in section 8 it will set a penalty and notify the student in writing.

7. **PROCEDURES FOR SUSPECTED ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT DURING EXAMINATIONS**

7.1 If an invigilator or member of academic or other staff suspects a student is academic misconduct during an examination:

• the invigilator will annotate the student’s script after informing the student of his/her suspicions
• the invigilator will confiscate any relevant evidence (for example, any unauthorised material) and give the student a receipt
• the student will be allowed to continue with the examination
• if the student persists in academic misconduct, he/she will be expelled from the room. If this is necessary, the invigilator will ensure that the minimum amount of inconvenience and disturbance is caused to other students.

7.2 Following the examination, the invigilator will submit a report to Registry Services. The report will be accompanied by the relevant evidence and countersigned with comments by the chief invigilator or a co-invigilator. The incident will also be noted on the standard Invigilator Report Form. Copies of these will be sent to the relevant faculty.

7.3 Stage 2 of the process will then be followed as outlined in paragraphs 6.1 to 6.4.

8. CRITERIA USED FOR CONFIRMING THE SEVERITY OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

8.1 The Faculty ACP will consider all the material presented with the regard to the case and will assess the seriousness of the academic misconduct taking into account the following criteria along with any other relevant factors or information:

i. **the level of the student**: acts occurring at levels 5 and 6 of undergraduate work and at postgraduate level will normally be considered to be more serious than those occurring at level 4 of undergraduate work.

ii. **the previous learning background of the student**: for example, academic experiences from overseas or the extent to which the student is familiar with current UK and Sheffield Hallam academic conventions and expectations, although this would only occur for the time needed for tutors to deal with the issue through briefing and training.

iii. **intent**: an act which is committed intentionally will be considered more serious than one that is not.

iv. **extent**: an act which involves a substantial degree of academic misconduct will normally be considered more serious than one which involves a lesser degree of academic misconduct (for example the plagiarism of several pages of text, as opposed to a few sentences). An act which is sustained and/or repetitive will normally be considered more serious than an act which is committed on a single occasion.

v. **previous history or record**: repeated acts of academic misconduct will be considered more serious than an initial instance

vi. **whether theft or falsification was involved**: it is more serious to steal someone else’s work without their knowledge or to falsify results than to obtain results from someone else with their agreement but without acknowledgement

vii. **impact on other parties**: an act which has an adverse effect on the standing or well-being of other parties will be considered more serious than an act which affects only the person being investigated for academic misconduct.

9. SANCTIONS

The list of available sanctions is set out in Annex 3. In applying a sanction the ACP will use the criteria specified in section 8 above and take into account the student's current academic profile together with the severity of the academic misconduct offence. Any other relevant information pertinent to the case will also be used. Further to the sanctions listed in Annex 3, the Panel may also find that action should be taken against the student under the University Disciplinary procedures. This may be a standalone outcome or may be applied in conjunction with one or more of the sanctions available.

10. APPEALS
The student has the right to appeal a decision of the ACP within the grounds and timescales set out in the University’s Regulations on Appeals against decisions of Ratification, Extenuating Circumstances and Academic Conduct Panels. Students cannot appeal against the severity of a penalty at Stage 1 if they have not asked for the decision to be reviewed at Stage 2.

11. EXTERNAL EXAMINERS

External Examiners will be fully informed of the University’s procedures for dealing with academic misconduct and are asked to report any suspicions they have, or observations they wish to make, as a result of their activities.

NOTES

Cases of alleged academic misconduct identified after work has been formally assessed and/or after an award has been conferred will be investigated in accordance with the above procedures and may result in a reconsideration of a decision previously taken. This may lead to the withdrawal of an award or the award of credit that has already been conferred.

Cases of alleged academic misconduct by students who have been excluded for debt or who have taken a break in study or have left the University will be investigated in accordance with the above procedures and concluded. This is in order to have an agreed outcome on file should a student re-apply/rejoin a course at the University.

Approved by Academic Board June 2015 (AB 3/15/9)
ANNEX 1

Guidance on the nature of evidence provided to substantiate the allegation of academic misconduct

1 A finding that academic misconduct has occurred is a judgement based on available evidence, the standard of proof being the balance of probability. What this means is that, on the basis of the evidence, it is more likely than not that academic misconduct has occurred. Panels need to be clear, therefore that their judgements are soundly based, given their possible effect on the students’ ability to proceed on the course and on his/her future career.

2 Academic misconduct may be suspected even in the absence of evidence, based perhaps on changes in writing style, or sophistication of argument. Style may improve either within the piece of written work or when compared to other written work produced by the same student. However, mere suspicion of academic misconduct is insufficient. Changes in writing style may provide - at best - circumstantial evidence of academic misconduct, but would not be conclusive.

3 Direct evidence of academic misconduct would include: student X’s acknowledgement that they had cheated; acknowledgement by other students that student X had copied from their work; detection of the original work which has been plagiarised (e.g. by means of a search engine such as Google or a text matching service such as Turnitin).

4 It follows that if academic misconduct is suspected, appropriate academic staff should use academic judgement to scrutinise the coursework submitted and the information in the Turnitin report (if used), to determine whether there is evidence of academic misconduct in a particular piece of coursework. This task should normally be done by the coursework marker, module tutor, or module leader, as they would have appropriate subject expertise and knowledge of the assessment. The task could entail some or all of the following actions:

- identification of which parts of the coursework are original and which match other documents or sources, e.g. by annotating a copy of the coursework;
- consideration and judgement of whether matched text in the coursework has been referenced in the coursework to acknowledge its source in accordance with correct academic practice or not, as this information would be needed if a academic misconduct allegation is pursued or poor academic practice by the student needs attention
- obtaining or locating source documents for the matched text, to provide evidence for consideration by the University to decide whether an allegation should be formally pursued, and used as evidence if that allegation is formally pursued; and for notification to the student as evidence of academic misconduct. E.g. if it appears that the coursework copied text from other sources without acknowledgement, but was submitted as if the student's own work
- consideration and judgement of whether source documents were used in accordance with correct academic practice or not, e.g. significant text matches with source documents comprising other students’ coursework could indicate collusion with other students or copying from other students' work rather than writing original coursework

5 The outcomes from these actions should help to ascertain:

- whether there is not actually evidence to pursue a academic misconduct allegation further; or
- whether additional evidence or information is required to determine whether an allegation should be pursued or not; or
that there is evidence (beyond the Turnitin report) to pursue formal action under stage 1 or stage 2 of the Academic Misconduct Policy.

6 If it appears there is evidence to support a formal allegation, the marker, module tutor or module leader should consider how this should be recorded or otherwise explained or evidenced. This is so that it can be considered by staff responsible for deciding whether or not to pursue stage 1 or stage 2 proceedings (eg Course Leader/Programme Director, or chair/deputy chair of Academic Conduct Panel). If stage 1 or stage 2 proceedings are invoked, the material will contribute to the evidence of academic misconduct.

7 There is no legalistic formula for determining how much evidence will suffice to establish a case of academic misconduct. In law, there are cases which suggest that, depending on the seriousness of the allegation, the 'balance of probability' standard may in fact come close to the standard of proof required in criminal cases - 'beyond reasonable doubt'. However, as to the question of how much evidence (direct and circumstantial) will be required to tip the balance of probabilities, the ACP should have regard, in any given case, to whether any dishonesty (as apposed to deficiencies in research technique) is alleged to be involved – a higher degree of probability would be required in such a case.

Guidance on the use of text-matching service (eg. Turnitin)

The University subscribes to a text matching service (currently Turnitin UK), and, students' coursework may be submitted to the service before marking. A text matching service produces an originality report for each piece of coursework submitted, listing and highlighting matches with other documents, and stating what percentages of the coursework match these sources.

Such a service does not in itself differentiate between properly referenced text and plagiarised text. Rather, it can highlight text that staff should investigate or consider further to establish whether there is evidence of plagiarism. Therefore a Turnitin report on its own is not necessarily evidence of academic misconduct.
Confidentiality Guidelines

Confidentiality refers to ensuring the anonymity of:

1) service users and the privileged information about them, and

2) the workplaces and organisations accessed by students working on placement.

It is essential that confidentiality is maintained at all times, and especially in students' submitted assessed work as stipulated, for example, by the Health Professions Council, the Caldicott Report (1997) and the Helsinki Declaration (2008), although issues of confidentiality apply across subject discipline areas.

Information to Students

- All students will be informed of Confidentiality protocols during induction and it will be included in student handbooks and module information.
- Any breach of confidentiality will be recorded in the student's personal file.
- If a student has any queries about the inclusion of references to a service user or establishment they should seek the advice of their tutor.

Examples of Breaches of Confidentiality

- Inclusion of names in the student's work (either in the main text or the appendices) that allows a service user to be identified
- References to an organisation that could be linked to the student's placement activity that allows the site to be identified and therefore potentially the service user
- Students must be aware that there is the possibility of multiplicity when designing assignments, case studies or theses that may add up to allow identification of a service user or the service provided.

This includes:
- direct naming of an individual or organisation
- inclusion of documentation (original or photocopied) that links to privileged information
- provision of information that could lead to identification of a service user or organisation e.g. dates of birth, hospital record numbers, addresses OR reference to unusual circumstances that can lead to identification of individuals or organisations

Integration into students' assessed work

- If the work requires the naming of an individual, their anonymity must be protected and the names changed to fictitious ones. There must be a statement stating that this is the case on the first page of the document.
- The name of the organisation must also be changed to a fictitious one if the work requires a link to the organisation.

Work that enters the public domain

- There are certain pieces of work that enter the public domain (theses etc) that must follow absolutely these guidelines re confidentiality.
- Students are advised to follow the advice of their supervisors on this matter.

Non-breaches of Confidentiality

There are certain instances during training when naming of individuals and organisations would not constitute a breach of confidentiality. These include:

- staff signatures on students’ official documentation
• acknowledgement of staff who have supported students in their work provided their names only are used and not their designation or place of work
• naming of individuals or organisations where such information has entered the public domain
• where permission has been clearly granted that inclusion of details has been approved.

Illustrative examples include:
• where inclusion is a stated course requirement
• where disclosure of the organisation within which a student works is necessary to the development of a community of learners on a distance learning module
• the inclusion of patient information leaflets which have entered the public domain
• in the writing of research proposals which necessarily identify the locations where the research will be carried out
• in the keeping of project files in which individuals and organisations will be named

Ethics Approval
This should not be included in the assessed work. However where it has been necessary to gain approval, the signature of the supervisor will be required to authenticate that the original has been seen.

The University has a process in place for ethical approval, which is a pre requisite for some NHS projects and in other subject disciplines. Any assessment, whilst stating that ethical approval had been granted, would not include any details.
ANNEX 3

ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT SANCTIONS

The range of sanctions available to the Academic Conduct Panel is as follows:

For Stage 1

1) A warning

The original mark will stand.

2) Resubmit the assessed work for the assessment task affected by academic misconduct (i.e. coursework of the same title and content). The resubmitted work receives a capped mark

A mark of 1% for the assessment task affected by academic misconduct is recorded pending resubmission of the assessed work. When the resubmission has been submitted and marked, its mark replaces the initial 1% mark, but the assessment task is capped at 40%. If the student does not resubmit the work, the mark of 1% remains. The overall module mark is calculated using the weighted aggregate marks from all other assessment tasks in the module, including the capped mark or the 1% if the work has not been resubmitted.

3) Submit a new piece of work for the assessment task affected by academic misconduct. This would normally be a different title (requiring different content). The work receives a capped mark.

A mark of 1% for the assessment task affected by academic misconduct is recorded pending submission/resubmission of the new work. When the work has been submitted and marked, its mark replaces the initial 1% mark, but the assessment task is capped at 40%. If the student does not submit the work, the mark of 1% remains. The overall module mark is calculated using the weighted aggregate marks from all other assessment tasks in the module, including the capped mark or the 1% if the work has not been resubmitted.

4) Submit a new piece of work for the assessment task affected by academic misconduct, for which the Academic Conduct Panel may set either the same or a different title or topic. The work receives a capped mark and the overall module mark is capped at 40%.

A mark of 1% for the assessment task affected by academic misconduct is recorded pending submission/resubmission of the work. When the work has been submitted and marked, its mark replaces the initial 1% mark, but the assessment task and the overall module mark are capped at 40%. If the student does not submit the work, the mark of 1% remains. The overall module mark is calculated using the weighted aggregate marks from all other assessment tasks in the module, including the capped mark or the 1% if the work has not been resubmitted.

Deadlines for submission/resubmission of work in respect of Stage One sanctions would normally be prior to the completion of the semester in which the module falls (i.e. where possible deadlines would be set in-module during the relevant semester).

For Stage 2

Any sanction available at stage 1 (see sanctions 1-4 above)

5) Refer in all assessment tasks in the module concerned

A mark of 1% for ALL the assessment tasks in the module affected by academic misconduct is recorded pending submission and marking of the referred work. If any assessment tasks have not been taken, a mark 0% will be recorded for them. A mark of 1% is recorded for the module and an overall module result is REFER DUE TO MISCONDUCT.

When the referred work has been submitted and marked, the new mark replaces the initial 1% mark. The overall module mark is recalculated using the new mark and the overall mark is capped at 40. If the student does not submit the referred work, the mark of 1% remains and the module result is REFERRED FAIL.

Deadlines for referred work will be in accordance with the University’s Academic Calendar.

6) Fail in the module, with reassessment only allowed after further attendance on a taught programme. This will require retake of the failed module, or substitution for a different module if the failed module
is an elective module. Where the module affected by academic misconduct is substituted, capping the overall module mark will apply.

A mark of 1% will be recorded for any assessment task in the failed module which has been taken and has a mark. The module mark is recorded as 1% and the module result is FAIL DUE TO MISCONDUCT.

Notes:
- if the student subsequently passes the module following retake, the overall module result will be capped at 40%;
- if it is not possible for the student to retake the module due to having exhausted all retake opportunities, the fail result stands. No further reassessment or retake in the module is permitted, and the student must leave the course;
- if the module is an elective and the student chooses to substitute, the substitute module will also be capped at 40%.

7) Fail in the module affected, with all other modules taken at that level or during the period concerned* capped at 40%. Reassessment in the failed module will only be allowed after further attendance on a taught programme. This will require retake of the failed module or substitution for a different module if the failed module is an elective. Where the module affected by academic misconduct is substituted, capping the overall module mark will apply.

A mark of 1% will be recorded for any assessment task in the failed module which has been taken and has a mark. The module mark is recorded as 1% and the module result is FAIL DUE TO MISCONDUCT. All other modules taken in the period concerned are capped at 40%.

Notes:
- if the student subsequently passes the module following retake, the overall module result will be capped at 40%;
- if it is not possible for the student to retake the module due to having exhausted all retake opportunities, the fail result stands. No further reassessment or retake in the module is permitted, and the student must leave the course;
- if the module is an elective and the student chooses to substitute, the substitute module will also be capped at 40%.

8) Refer in all modules taken at the level or during the period concerned*.

A mark of 1% for ALL the assessment tasks is recorded pending submission and marking of the referred work. If any assessment tasks have not been taken, a mark 0% will be recorded for them. The overall module result is REFER DUE TO MISCONDUCT.

When the referred work has been submitted and marked, the new mark replaces the initial 1% mark. The overall module mark is recalculated using the new mark and the overall mark is capped at 40. If the student does not submit the referred work, the mark of 1% remains and the module result is REFERRED FAIL.

Deadlines for referred work will be in accordance with the University’s Academic Calendar.

9) Fail in all modules taken at the level or during the period concerned* with reassessment only allowed after further attendance on a taught programme. This will require retake of the failed module or substitution for a different module if the failed module is an elective. Where the module affected by academic misconduct is substituted, capping the overall module mark will apply.

A mark of 1% will be recorded for any assessment task in the failed modules which has been taken and has a mark. The overall module result is FAIL DUE TO MISCONDUCT.

Notes:
- if the student subsequently passes the module following retake, the overall module result will be capped at 40%;
- if it is not possible for the student to retake the module due to having exhausted all retake opportunities, the fail result stands. No further reassessment or retake in the module is permitted, and the student must leave the course;
- if the module is an elective and the student chooses to substitute, the substitute module will also be capped at a maximum 40%

10) Fail in the module concerned, with no reassessment, retake, replacement or substitution of modules allowed in the failed module.

A mark of 1% will be recorded for any assessment task in the failed module which has been taken and has a mark. The overall module result is FAIL DUE TO MISCONDUCT. The student cannot proceed to the next academic year.

11) Fail in all modules taken at the level or during the period concerned*, with no reassessment, retake, replacement or substitution of modules allowed, and no re-entry to the programme of study.

A mark of 1% will be recorded for any assessment task in the failed module which has been taken and has a mark. The overall module result is FAIL DUE TO MISCONDUCT. The student cannot continue on the course.
Action under the University Disciplinary procedures
The Panel may also find that action should be taken against the student under the University Disciplinary procedures. This may be a standalone outcome or may be applied in conjunction with one or more of the sanctions available.

Action where assessment tasks and modules are not numerically assessed
If sanctions apply to modules marked by grade and not numerical marks, the grades should be recorded as, for example, DD (decision deferred), R (referred) or F (fail). For a full list of codes available, please refer to the document named 'Operational Guidance for the Processing and Recording of Academic Misconduct sanctions' which is issued by Assessment, Awards and Regulations in Registry Services.

* The relevant period in which academic misconduct occurred will be defined by the Panel (eg S1, S2, or the whole year; or for postgraduate or non standard other courses the period may depend on the pattern of study)