

ACADEMIC CONDUCT AND PRACTICE HANDBOOK

Chapter 4 – Procedures at Department, Faculty and University Level

1. **Procedures at Faculty Level for Dealing with Suspected Poor Academic Practice, Academic Misconduct and Severe Academic Misconduct**

- 1.1 Should the marker, Module Convenor or other member of a marking team of an assessment suspect or identify evidence of a possible conduct offence in a student's assignment, they **should** stop marking and should report any concerns about a piece of academic work to the named contact within their Faculty (or delegated School) responsible for academic conduct (normally this would be the Department Academic Conduct Officer (ACO)). In doing so they may wish to also inform the module convenor if they are not them.
- 1.2 The Department ACO will consider the assignment and check the work to ascertain whether there is an issue of academic offence. They may also consult with the Senior Academic Conduct Officer (SACO) and Professional Services (PS) staff as required.
- 1.3 The Department ACO, as a trained member of staff, will then form an academic judgment about the suspicions raised with them. They may determine that there is no evidence of an offence in the work and that no concerns need be pursued, in which case they should refer the case back to the marker or Module Convenor who will resume marking under the normal marking process; or the Department ACO may find there is evidence of a suspected offence and determine that the work needs to be considered further, in which case the Department ACO must make a formal referral of the work to their SACO, and the relevant PS team.
- 1.4 In cases where evidence of a suspected offence is found, the SACO for the Faculty (or delegated School) concerned shall be responsible for the matter in the first instance.

- 1.5 Under the guidance of the SACO the relevant PS team will retrieve all previous summative assessments deemed to be relevant to the case in question, and the Department ACO should re-check these for academic offences. Normally this would include all summative work for the current academic year, but it may also include any or all work that counts towards the Student's degree from Stage Two and onwards. This would apply particularly in cases of final year students or in cases of suspected severe academic misconduct. Any assessments in which possible offences are identified can then be subject to investigation under the formal process and will form part of the ongoing case.
- 1.6 The SACO will then consider the case and either agree with the recommendation of the Department ACO or make their own recommendations. The SACO will make the final decision in the event that there is not a consensus on how to proceed. They will then direct the case to be dealt with in one of the following ways, at which point the student will be sent a 'Meeting Request Letter' informing them that an investigation is underway, the nature of the suspected offence(s) and which of the following procedures will apply:
- a. That the Student is requested to attend an Academic Honesty workshop.
 - b. That the case is to be heard at Department Level for suspected Poor Academic Practice.
 - c. That the case is to be heard at Faculty Level for suspected Academic Misconduct and/or Poor Academic Practice.
 - d. That the concerns raised are sufficiently serious to refer the case directly to the University Cases Team in accordance with the procedures for suspected Severe Academic Misconduct:
 - In cases where the Faculty (or delegated School) believes that Severe Academic Misconduct may have occurred in the student's piece of work, the Faculty (or delegated School) can hold a Faculty Level meeting to gather further information and evidence for the referral of the case to the University; or
 - Alternatively, where it is clear that the alleged offence is sufficiently severe and evidenced, the Faculty (or delegated School) can refer the case directly to the University Cases Office in accordance with the procedures for Severe Academic Misconduct. Examples of circumstances in which Department ACOs may be

required to apply additional consideration to these steps of the process are outlined in **Appendices B and C**.

2. Cases where the SACO determines that the Poor Academic Practice should be seen at an Academic Honesty Workshop

2.1 This concludes the investigation and the Student's work can be returned for marking and feedback release as soon as possible within the department (note, this is no longer subject to the three-week marking turnaround).

2.2 The offer of an Academic Honesty Workshop, in place of an individual meeting, allows the Department ACO (or other suitable academic) to address the student's approaches to writing, or the way they have undertaken referencing, where it is concerning but not sufficiently bad to warrant a formal conduct hearing. It recognises that such practices, if unaddressed, may lead to further instances of poor academic practice, which may in turn lead to further allegations of an academic offence. This workshop is therefore corrective and educational in nature and acts as an alternative to penalties as a way of resolving the issues.

2.2.1 The workshop may be facilitated by the Department ACO or another suitable academic, such as the Module Convenor.

2.2.2 A record of this learning intervention will be kept by the Faculty Cases Team. It is not likely that a workshop would be offered as an outcome to an investigation of a second academic offence.

2.2.3 The Academic Honesty Workshops should cover why the students have been called to the workshop in general terms then talk through how to reference according to Department conventions and how to avoid poor practice in the future, thus moving the emphasis away from punishment towards prevention and education.

2.2.4 Students who fail to attend or engage with their scheduled mandatory workshop will not be invited to a further workshop. It will be deemed as a learning opportunity even if a Student fails to attend, and this will be taken into consideration if the Student commits further offences.

3. Cases where the SACO determines that the Poor Academic Practice should be seen at a Department Level Meeting:

3.1 Where the SACO refers a case of Poor Academic Practice to a Department Level Meeting then the Academic Conduct Officer will be supported by the relevant Professional Services team to take the following steps:

3.1.1 The Student should be invited to meet with a Department ACO to discuss the alleged Poor Academic Practice; this is to ensure that the student is aware of why their academic practice is not meeting the department's requirements.

3.1.2 The Department ACO must not be a member of academic staff responsible for marking, moderating or supervising assignments on the modules to which the allegations refer.

3.1.3 The Department ACO should meet with the student along with an administrator who will take notes of the meeting. The Department ACO will discuss the alleged offence and, if in attendance, will offer the student the opportunity to ask for further clarifications.

3.1.4 After the discussion, the Department ACO will make a judgement on the case. They may apply a penalty from the Tariff of Penalties or may find the student not guilty of the offence. If the Department ACO wishes to apply a penalty, then they may apply up to and including penalty B from the Tariff of Penalties in Section 7 below.

3.1.5 Exceptionally, where additional evidence is identified within the meeting, which leads the Department ACO to consider that none of the penalties available to them in Section 7 below are appropriate then they may refer the case to a Faculty Level Meeting as per Section 4 below. The Department ACO will provide a report to the SACO explaining why they were unable to reach a decision, a copy of which will be provided to the student prior to the Faculty Level Meeting. The Department ACO shall not sit on the Faculty Level Panel but may be called as a witness. The Faculty (or delegated School) shall write to the student to indicate that the Department ACO has referred the case to a Faculty Level Meeting.

3.1.6 The student should be notified of the Department ACOs judgement and the outcome of the meeting within ten working days of the meeting. A copy of the notes of the meeting will be included with this notification.

3.1.7 Students are entitled to appeal the decision of the Department ACO as per Chapter 6 of this Handbook with the exception of a decision to refer the case to a Faculty Level Meeting (see h. below).

3.1.8 The student cannot appeal the Department ACO's decision to refer them to a Faculty Level Meeting, as they will be entitled to appeal the decision of the subsequent Faculty Level Panel.

4. Cases where the SACO determines that the Poor Academic Practice and / or Academic Misconduct should be seen at a Faculty Level Meeting:

4.1 When the SACO determines that a case should be heard at a Faculty Level meeting, they will be supported by the relevant PS team to take the following steps:

4.1.1 The Student should be invited to meet with a Panel of staff, to discuss the alleged offences in their work.

4.1.2 The Panel will consist of three members, at least two of whom will be academic members of staff. It should be chaired by the SACO and will include either other Department ACOs, or academics from within the Department concerned, or the Senior Education Partner (SEP) (or nominee).

4.1.3 The Panel must nominate a secretary (who may also be a Panel member) who will be responsible for taking notes of the meeting.

4.1.4 The staff on a Faculty Level Panel must not include those who are responsible for marking, moderating or supervising the assignment to which the allegation refers.

4.1.5 The Panel will discuss the alleged offence and, if in attendance, will offer the student the opportunity to ask for further clarifications.

4.1.6 After the discussion, the Panel will deliberate and make a judgement on the case.

4.1.7 The Panel should then determine whether an offence has taken place. The Faculty Level Panel should determine the exact offence the student has committed and whether this constitutes either poor academic practice or academic misconduct. When deliberating the offence Faculty Level Panels should give regard to the level of advantage which would have been gained by the student if the act or failure to act had not been detected. If during the course of the meeting, additional evidence of an offence not listed in the 'Meeting Request Letter' is identified, this will be taken into consideration by the Panel and the investigation may need to be extended. If this requires a postponement or rescheduling of the meeting the Student will be

notified in writing. Alternatively, the Panel may decide to refer the case, including evidence of the additional offence to the University Cases Office.

- 4.1.8 They may apply a penalty from the Tariff of Penalties set out in Section 7 or may find the student not guilty of the offence. Should the Panel conclude that there has been a case of either Poor Academic Practice or Academic Misconduct, then they should impose a penalty from the Tariff of Penalties set out in Section 7. They may impose up to and including Tariff D. Where a penalty clearly impacts on progression or the ability of the student to pass the module, the Faculty Level Panel should give a clear reason for imposition of the penalty.
- 4.1.9 The student should be notified of the Panel's judgement and the outcome of the meeting within ten working days of the meeting. A copy of the notes of the meeting will be included with this notification.
- 4.1.10 Students are entitled to appeal the decision of the Faculty Level Panel as per Chapter 6 of this Handbook with the exception of a decision to refer the case to the University Cases Office.
- 4.1.11 If the Faculty Level Panel considers that none of the penalties available to them in the Tariff of Penalties set out in Section 7 are appropriate, then they may refer the case to the University Cases Office so that the case can be considered under the University stage of the procedure. The Faculty (or delegated School) shall write to the student to indicate this.
- 4.1.12 The student cannot appeal the Faculty Level Panel's decision to refer them to the University Cases Office as they are entitled to appeal the decision of the subsequent University Committee of Academic Enquiry.

5. Arrangements for Department and Faculty level meetings

- 5.1 The Meeting Request Letter should be sent at least **five working days** prior to the meeting.
- 5.2 All relevant documentation should be made available to the student **five working days** prior to the meeting.
- 5.3 If the Faculty (or delegated School) appointed an Investigating Officer, then their report should be made available to the Student as part of the relevant documentation sent to the student five working days in advance of the meeting. The Panel may call the

Investigating Officer to present their findings but must notify the Student of their intention to call a witness at least one working day before the meeting.

- 5.4 A witness is a person who can testify their knowledge of a matter that is under investigation. A witness would not be called to provide a character reference, nor would they be able to act as the Student's supporter, as described in Chapter 2 of this Handbook, within the meeting. A witness can be called by the Panel or Committee or by the Student. If the Student intends to have a witness present, they must notify the relevant team at least one working day prior to the meeting.
- 5.6 The student may be accompanied by a supporter, as described in Chapter 2 of this Handbook, but will be asked and expected to respond to questions themselves in the meeting. If the Student wishes for a supporter to attend the meeting with them, they will need to arrange this themselves and ensure that the meeting information is forwarded on to their supporter. The student must state whether they will be bringing a supporter with them (and if so, who the supporter is) and must notify the relevant team at least one working day prior to the meeting.
- 5.7 Should a student not attend their meeting this will not affect the attendance of others at the meeting such, with the exception of the Student's supporter; and/or any witness who has been called by the Student. Neither the supporter nor a witness called by the Student may attend in the Student's absence. If a student is not in attendance consideration of the case will take place in their absence and the outcome will be communicated to them as normal.
- 5.8 Should a student fail to join a meeting **within the first 10 minutes** of the start time for the meeting provided in the Meeting Request Letter, the student will be deemed to have not attended the meeting and consideration of the case will take place in their absence and the outcome will be communicated to them as normal.
- 5.9 Students have the right to submit a defence and/or details of any mitigating circumstances they believe to be relevant. This may be in writing or in person but is not a requirement. However, Students cannot prevent any hearing from taking place through non-submission of a defence or non-attendance at a meeting, providing reasonable steps have been taken to give the student the opportunity to attend or to submit a statement. The student must provide the Faculty (or delegated School) with their written

statement and any evidence that they wish to have taken into consideration by the Panel at least one whole working day ahead of the meeting along with confirmation of whether or not they will be attending.

- 5.10 If a student provides details of mitigating circumstances, they believe to be relevant to the case (either in writing or in person), these will be taken into consideration by the panel. However, these circumstances would not normally be relevant to deciding whether a student is guilty of an offence but will be taken into consideration when determining the appropriate penalty to be applied if the student is found to have committed an offence.
- 5.11 If a student provides evidence indicating that an offence other than those listed in the Meeting Request Letter has been committed (either in writing or in person), this will be taken into consideration by the Panel, and the investigation may need to be extended. If this requires a postponement or rescheduling of the meeting the Student will be notified in writing.
- 5.12 Meetings will only be rescheduled in the event of the Student providing evidence of exceptional circumstances preventing them from engaging with the procedure. Such circumstances might include hospitalisation.
- 5.12 All meetings will be conducted in English (with the exception of meetings in which a foreign language assessment is being discussed where it may be appropriate for sections of the meeting to involve discussion in the assessed language).
- 5.13 Use of software to formulate answers to the panel's questions is not permitted during the meeting.
- 5.14 Providing the Student attends the meeting within the first 10 minutes of the start time for the meeting stated in the Meeting Request Letter, the Student shall be entitled to be present for the duration of the meeting. However, they are not entitled to be present for the Panel's deliberations and therefore the Chair may ask the Student and their supporter to withdraw, whilst reaching a decision.
- 5.15 The Panel shall base their decision on the documentary evidence provided in advance of the meeting, any written statement provided by the student, the student's responses to the panel's questions, and any witness testimony that had been provided during the meeting. In cases that involve more than one student, such as those where collusion is

being investigated or where group work is being considered, the panel may also consider the testimony of other students.

- 5.16 Normally, the decision of the Panel and outcome of the case will not be given verbally on the day of the meeting but will be communicated in writing within 10 working days of the meeting.
- 5.17 The use of electronic audio recording equipment will not normally be allowed and would only be permitted at the discretion of the Chair.

6. Arrangements for University Committees of Academic Enquiry

- 6.1 In cases referred to the University Cases Office after consideration at Faculty level under the Faculty (or delegated School) must also submit a report to the University Cases Office. At the same time the student must be informed of the fact that they are being reported to the University Cases Office. If the student is suspected of plagiarism or collusion, then the report should clearly indicate (by cross-referencing) what sections of text have been plagiarised and from what source.
- 6.2 A University Committee of Academic Enquiry will be convened as soon as possible following receipt of the Faculty (or delegated School) report. The Committee shall comprise a Dean as Chair, who shall not be of the same Department of the Student, and two members drawn from nominated Department ACOs, who shall not be of the same Faculty (or delegated School) as the student.
- 6.3 Exceptionally (in cases where it has been determined that the scale of offence does not warrant a Committee hearing), on receiving a report from a Faculty (or delegated School), the Divisional Director of Education and Academic Services (or nominee) may, in consultation with the Dean for Taught Students, direct the Faculty (or delegated School) to deal with the suspected case as set out in Section 5 above of these procedures.
- 6.4 Where a student's conduct is to be considered by a University Committee of Academic Enquiry, the University Cases Office shall inform the student in writing of the Committee's meeting which they are invited to attend. Not less than five working days ahead of that meeting, the University Cases Office shall provide the student with a copy of the report from the Faculty (or delegated School), along with any other supporting evidence and a copy of these procedures. The student may make a written statement to the Committee, supply any evidence that they wish to have taken into consideration by the Committee,

and may also call witnesses of their own, the details of which must be provided to the University Cases Office not later than one whole working day ahead of the Committee's meeting.

- 6.5 The student is entitled to attend the Committee meeting for its duration (except when the Committee has retired to consider its decision). Should a student decide not to exercise their right of attendance, the hearing will proceed in the student's absence. Should the student subsequently, **within five working days**, present sufficiently exceptional mitigating circumstances explaining their absence to the Chair's satisfaction, the Committee may be reconvened to reconsider the case with the student in attendance. The student will be given five working days' notice of the Committee being reconvened. The student may be accompanied by a supporter (see definition of the role of 'supporter' in Chapter 2). The use of electronic audio recording equipment will not normally be allowed and is at the discretion of the Chair. The student may direct questions to the Faculty (or delegated School) representative (and any witnesses called) directly in an appropriate manner. Proxies or substitutes for the student will not be permitted.
- 6.6 The Faculty (or delegated School) will be invited to send a Representative to attend for the duration of the meeting (except when the student is addressing the Committee) to present the case to the Committee. The Faculty (or delegated School) Representative shall have the right to call other witnesses to appear before the Committee. The University Cases Office shall be notified of these witnesses no later than one whole working day ahead of the Committee meeting. The Faculty (or delegated School) Representative may also call the student as a witness and may then, at the Chair's discretion, direct questions to the student directly, in an appropriate manner.
- 6.7 The student should be given the opportunity to address the Committee in the absence of the Faculty (or delegated School) representative. The Committee may recall the Faculty (or delegated School) Representative following the student's statement, should the need arise. Following this the Committee shall retire to consider their decision.
- 6.8 If the Committee determines that an offence has taken place, it shall inform the student and the Faculty (or delegated School) in writing of its decision and of the penalty to be imposed. This may, in the first instance, be a summary of the Committee's deliberations. This will be communicated within five working days of the meeting, with the full report and formal outcome letter following in due course. A record of the Committee's decision

will be kept both on the University's central records and by the relevant Faculty (or delegated School).

- 6.9 The Committee of Academic Enquiry can impose any penalty from the Tariff of Penalties range A to G, as set out in Section 7 below. If the allegation of academic misconduct is proven, one of the penalties from the tariff of penalties contained in section 12.19 shall be applied. For all penalties, a record must be entered on the student's file by Student Records.

7. Tariff of Penalties

- 7.1 The description of offences is not intended to be an exhaustive list of each specific offence to which that tariff can be applied but is considered to be an illustrative summary of particular offences for which the University considered the tariff to be appropriate. ACOs, Faculty Academic Conduct Panels and University Committees of Academic Enquiry are encouraged to consider the case before them, and how characteristics within their case match up to the description of the offence column, to reach the appropriate penalty. If the allegation is proven, one of the penalties set out in section the table below will be applied. The Panel should consider the impact of the penalty and ensure that the outcome is not disproportionate to the offence committed. Panels should also take into account any mitigating factors that have been presented and record in the notes of the meeting how consideration for these mitigating factors has influenced the penalty being applied. Where two penalty options are given the Officer, Panel or Committee has the discretion to select the most appropriate penalty. Academic Conduct Officers may impose up to and including Tariff B, Faculty Panels may impose up to and including Tariff D, Review Panels and University Committees of Academic Enquiry may impose any tariff.
- 7.2 Where a Penalty B or C is awarded the Officer, Panel or Committee should give consideration to whether the piece of work has sufficient potential for the Student to be able to demonstrate the Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) of the assessment. Where the Panel does not consider it possible that the Student can successfully demonstrate they would be meeting the ILOS of the assessment, as the poor academic practice is too extensive, then they may mandate a new question.

- 7.3 Where a Penalty B or C is awarded for coursework the Officer, Panel or Committee should give consideration to setting an appropriate deadline for the Student and should give guidance on what the student should be revising. Once the work has been resubmitted, a Department ACO should check to ensure that the work now complies with the Department's standards and then send to the marker for marking. If the work has not been remedied to the required standard, then the Department ACO should apply a mark of zero. The decision to apply the mark of zero will be checked and confirmed by the SACO for the Faculty. It is a principle of the University that appeals cannot be made against the academic judgement of a marker, and it is therefore not possible for a student to appeal this decision to apply a mark of zero except in cases where they believe that this judgement was not made fairly or according to the correct University process or where they experienced material circumstances which also prevented them from engaging with the mitigation processes at the point of submission.
- 7.4 Where a Penalty B or C is awarded for coursework and a deadline has been agreed or the resubmission, a student is entitled to apply for an extension on this deadline in line with the procedure for Mitigation as defined in [Chapter 10 - Mitigation](#) of the Assessment, Progression and Awarding: Taught Programmes Handbook. However, the student should not be permitted to apply for a deferral of the resubmission as this would result in a new assessment being set for the student in the next assessment period, and this would provide the student with an advantage.

7.5 **Tariff of Penalties for Coursework and examinations sat in non-invigilated conditions:**

Note: For the tariff of Penalties applying to invigilated exams only please see Chapter 5 of this Handbook.

Tariff	Description of Offence	Penalty to be imposed for offences identified in coursework	Penalty to be imposed for offences identified in non- invigilated examinations (typically sat remotely and submitted online)
A	Misunderstanding of the academic conventions of the department	The Student will be issued a warning letter. This warning	The Student will be issued a warning letter. This warning

		letter will remain on file. May also recommend action such as taking the Module, on Academic Honesty.	letter will remain on file. May also recommend action such as taking the Module, on Academic Honesty.
B	Minor amount of poor academic practice within the piece of work	When submission was the student's first attempt: The student will be formally reprimanded with a mark of zero being recorded for the submission. The student will be asked to resubmit the piece of work with the poor academic practice removed. The penalty does not impose a cap on this resubmission. This will not be considered a referral attempt, nor will it affect the right of referral should the student fail the module. When the submission was the student's referral attempt: The student will be formally reprimanded with a mark of zero being recorded for the submission. The student will be asked to resubmit the piece of work with the poor academic practice removed. The penalty does not impose a cap on this resubmission	When submission was the student's first attempt: The student will be formally reprimanded and a mark of zero will be recorded for the examination in question. The candidate will be permitted a fresh attempt at this assessment in the next appropriate assessment period. The penalty does not impose a cap and the subsequent attempt will not be considered a referral attempt, nor will it affect the right of referral should the student fail the module. When the submission was the student's referral attempt: The student will be formally reprimanded and a mark of zero will be recorded for the examination in question. The candidate will be permitted another attempt at this assessment in the next appropriate assessment period.

		However, the student's module mark should be capped as per the rules for referred assessments.	The penalty does not impose a cap on this resubmission. However, the student's module mark should be capped as per the rules for referred assessments
C	Significant amount of poor academic practice within the piece of work. OR Minor amount of academic misconduct within the piece of work. OR Minor inappropriate manipulation of data or source material to support the piece of work	When submission was the student's first attempt: The student will be formally reprimanded with a mark of zero being recorded for the submission. The student will be asked to resubmit the piece of work with the poor academic practice or academic misconduct removed. The mark will be capped at the pass mark. This will not be considered a referral attempt, nor will it affect the right of referral should the student fail the module. When the submission was the student's referral attempt: The student will be formally reprimanded with a mark of zero being recorded for the submission. The student will be asked to resubmit the	When submission was the student's first attempt: The student will be formally reprimanded and a mark of zero will be recorded for the examination in question. The candidate will be permitted a fresh attempt at this assessment in the next appropriate assessment period, but the mark will be capped at the pass mark. This is to prevent a student from gaining an advantage from committing misconduct. This will not be considered a referral attempt, nor will it affect the right of referral should the student fail the module. When the submission was the student's referral attempt: The student will be formally reprimanded and a

		piece of work with the poor academic practice or academic misconduct removed. The mark for the assessment will be capped at the pass mark. The student's module mark should be capped as per the rules for referred assessments.	mark of zero will be recorded for the examination in question. The candidate will be permitted a fresh attempt at this assessment in the next appropriate assessment period. The mark for the assessment will be capped at the pass mark. This is to prevent a student from gaining an advantage from committing misconduct. The student's module mark should be capped as per the rules for referred assessments.
D	Significant amount of Academic Misconduct detected within the piece. OR Data has been used by the student to support critical parts of their piece of work, and this has not referenced. OR Inappropriate manipulation of data or source material to support the piece of work.	When submission was the student's first attempt: D1 The student will be formally reprimanded. The student will be given a mark of Zero for the piece of work concerned. There will be no right of referral for this piece of work. (This will not affect the Student's right to reassessment of the module where the module is reassessed by way of one 100% examination;	When submission was the student's first attempt: D1 The student will be formally reprimanded. The student will be given a mark of Zero for the piece of work concerned. There will be no right of referral for this piece of work. (This will not affect the Student's right to reassessment of the module where the module is reassessed by way of one 100% examination;

		however, the student will only be able to be awarded the marks equal to the component where no misconduct was detected. i.e. the student has received a mark of zero in 1 essay worth 40% of the module, therefore would be entitled to 60% of the marks from any reassessment of the entire module). Or D2 The module concerned will be given a mark of zero, and the student has a right of referral for the pass mark. When the submission was the student's referral attempt: D1 As above. It is expected that for referred assessments, a D1 penalty would usually be applied. D2 If a D2 penalty is applied to a referred assessment, the student would have no further right of referral in the module. Students would be entitled to marks achieved at their first attempt.	however, the student will only be able to be awarded the marks equal to the component where no misconduct was detected. i.e. the student has received a mark of zero in 1 essay worth 40% of the module, therefore would be entitled to 60% of the marks from any reassessment of the entire module). Or D2 The module concerned will be given a mark of zero, and the student has a right of referral for the pass mark. When the submission was the student's referral attempt: D1 As above. It is expected that for referred assessments, a D1 penalty would usually be applied. D2 If a D2 penalty is applied to a referred assessment, the student would have no further right of referral in the module. Students would be entitled to marks achieved at their first attempt.
E	Severe Academic Misconduct detected within one piece of work,	E1 The module concerned will be	E1 The module concerned will be

	or across several pieces of work. OR The underlying data supporting the piece of work has been fabricated, or the results of experimentation have been falsified.	given a mark of zero with no right of referral. Or E2 Mark of zero for the year concerned with a right of referral, the referral will be capped at the pass mark.	given a mark of zero with no right of referral. Or E2 Mark of zero for the year concerned with a right of referral, the referral will be capped at the pass mark.
F	Severe Academic Misconduct, detected within either one piece of work or within several pieces of work occurring within significant parts of the piece(s), or throughout a dissertation or large-scale research project. OR The underlying data supporting the piece of work has been fabricated, or the results of experimentation have been falsified.	F1 A mark of zero will be recorded for the modules in which the misconduct occurred. The Student will also not be permitted to be awarded for the degree upon which they are registered but may be awarded a lesser award in line with the credits which they have achieved. Or F2 Mark of zero for the year in question with no right of referral. Credits gained from previous years are unaffected and may be counted towards an award from the University.	F1 A mark of zero will be recorded for the modules in which the misconduct occurred. The Student will also not be permitted to be awarded for the degree upon which they are registered but may be awarded a lesser award in line with the credits which they have achieved. Or F2 Mark of zero for the year in question with no right of referral. Credits gained from previous years are unaffected, and may be counted towards an award from the University
G	Severe Academic Misconduct, across several assessments, occurring in critical parts of the pieces of work. OR Widespread amounts of plagiarism or fabrication within a dissertation or large-scale research project. OR Evidence that the entire essay has been purchased and submitted by the student	Expulsion from the University with no credit received.	Expulsion from the University with no credit received.

Note: Students who commit academic offences are subject to the normal programme rules for progression, i.e. where programmes permit, affected modules may be condoned.