

Procedure for Suspected Student Malpractice in Examinations, Coursework and Assessment

QUA 11S

Issue	Date of 1st Issue	Last Reviewed	Date of Next Review	Responsibility of
09	Jan 2011	Sept 2025	Aug 2027	Quality

This document can also be produced in alternative formats upon request.

Contents

1. Purpose	3
2. Scope	3
3. Coursework and Controlled Assessments.....	3
4. Examinations	4
5. Examples of Student Malpractice	4
6. Communication and Records regarding Suspected and Proven Malpractice	6
7. Procedure for Dealing with Suspected Malpractice where:	7
- Student is submitting work as final draft, or	7
- Student 'Declaration of Authenticity' is signed, or.....	7
- Malpractice is suspected during an Exam	7
8. Procedure for Dealing with Suspected Student Malpractice where:	8
- Student Declaration of Authenticity is not signed.....	8
9. Student Appeals against Allegations or Penalties	9
10. Quality Assurance	9
11. Links to other Documents	10
Appendix 1 JCQ Sanctions and Penalties Applied Against Candidates	11
Appendix 1a JCQ Offences and Penalties (Non university coursework)	13
Appendix 1b JCQ Offences and Penalties (Non university examinations).....	14
Appendix 2a Amber Offences and Penalties (Plagiarism in HE Coursework)	15
Tariff Points	15
Appendix 2b Amber Offences and Penalties (Plagiarism in HE Coursework)	16
Appendix 2c Offences and Penalties (HE Academic Misconduct: not plagiarism).....	17

Student Suspected Malpractice

1. Purpose

The aim of this document is to explain the College position relating to all forms of student malpractice that may occur in relation to assessment e.g. coursework, controlled assessments and examinations. The document aims to ensure a consistent approach to the identification of student suspected malpractice and explain how this must be handled across the College.

The information in this document has been developed in consultation with the Joint Council for Qualifications document [JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures](#). The JCQ has produced this document on behalf of all the major Awarding Organisations. This document states that *'failure by the College to notify, investigate and report to an Awarding Organisation all allegations of malpractice or suspected malpractice constitutes malpractice in itself'* (JCQ, p.4.)

The JCQ definition of 'candidate malpractice' means, malpractice by a candidate *'in connection with any examination or assessment, including the preparation and authentication of any controlled assessments, coursework or non-examination assessments, the presentation of any practical work, the compilation of portfolios of assessment evidence and the writing of any examination paper'* (JCQ, p.5.) i.e. any achievement which is measured and which contributes to the award of a qualification.

2. Scope

This document relates to all students (also referred to as candidates) taking assessments across the College.

As a Partner College of the Ulster University, College students who undertake Ulster University validated Higher Education programmes will be subject to the sanctions and penalties for deliberate malpractice as stipulated by the University. Please access <https://www.ulster.ac.uk/student/exams/cheating-and-plagiarism> to view the University's 'Academic Misconduct Policy'.

For students enrolled on Open University programmes, please refer to section F1.18 and F1.19 of the [OU Handbook for Validated Awards](#).

3. Coursework and Controlled Assessments

When a student submits coursework for assessment, it should be the student's own work. Students should use their own ideas and express them in their own words. This is essential for students in developing their understanding of the subject matter and will enable students to

perform better in other assessments and examinations.

However, students are encouraged to show the results of their research by quoting recognised sources to support their ideas. If students include material taken from another source, they **must** clearly identify it and acknowledge the source, using referencing and citation.

When coursework is completed and is being submitted to a lecturer for marking and grading, it **must** be accompanied by an authenticity form or declaration signed by the student. Signing the authenticity form, or making the declaration, is confirmation that the work is the student's own and does not contain unreferenced material copied from any other sources.

4. Examinations

The work submitted at the end of an examination must be entirely the student's own work, and must be produced in accordance with the instructions and rules for that examination.

If a student seeks to gain an unfair advantage that would mean the student obtains a better result than the student would otherwise have achieved, the student is guilty of malpractice i.e. cheating.

5. Examples of Student Malpractice

Students **must** be made aware of what constitutes malpractice. Examples of student malpractice include, but are not limited to:

Plagiarism:

- 5.1. plagiarism i.e. a student taking or copying material or information from a source (e.g. a book, website etc.) and claiming that it is their own without acknowledging the source of the information;
- 5.2. auto plagiarism - where a student represents their own previous work without being properly referenced;
- 5.3. self-plagiarism i.e. the reuse of significant, identical or nearly identical portions of a student's own work without acknowledging that they are doing this or citing the original work;
- 5.4. covert use of artificial intelligence (AI) where AI generative tools are deployed for assessment purposes without authorisation and/or appropriate acknowledgement;
- 5.5. contract cheating where a student engages with a third part to complete a piece of assessment on their behalf;
- 5.6. copying where a student actively copies the work of another student during an exam or assessment but presents the work as their own;
- 5.7. allowing work to be copied by another student;
- 5.8. a student submitting someone else's work as their own;
- 5.9. a student allowing others to do all, or any part of coursework on the student's behalf;

- 5.10. a student giving a lot of help to another student so they can produce their work;
- 5.11. personation where someone assumes the identity of a student with the intention of completing work on behalf of a student;
- 5.12. collusion i.e. students working together beyond what is permitted (where working together is allowed, students will be informed by their lecturer);

Academic Misconduct:

- 5.13. a student deliberately destroying the work of another student;
- 5.14. theft of another student's work;
- 5.15. theft of work stored electronically belonging to another student; e.g. USB pens, electronic drives, or gaining unlawful access to another student's work;
- 5.16. making a false declaration of authenticity in relation to the authorship of coursework, or the contents of a portfolio;
- 5.17. not obeying the instructions or advice of an invigilator, supervisor, or the awarding organisation in relation to the examination or coursework rules and regulations;
- 5.18. disruptive behaviour in the examination room or during an assessment session;
- 5.19. possessing confidential material in advance of the examination;
- 5.20. exchanging, obtaining, receiving or passing on information in an examination by written, verbal or non-verbal communication;
- 5.21. bringing (into the examination room) notes in the wrong format (where notes are permitted in examinations) or incorrectly annotated texts (in open book examinations);
- 5.22. bringing (into the examination room/ assessment situation or controlled assessment) unauthorised material, e.g. notes, study guides, calculators, dictionaries (when prohibited) or mobile phones;
- 5.23. including or writing, offensive or obscene material in examination scripts, coursework or an assessment;
- 5.24. altering or fabricating results, including certificates;
- 5.25. impersonating or pretending to be someone else in order to produce coursework or sit an examination.

The appendices in this document outline the penalties an awarding organisation may impose for proven cases of malpractice. These are taken from:

- for non-university programmes - JCQ Guidance <https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/>;
- for HE programmes including Open University qualifications - the Amber Tariff guidance for HE qualifications <https://www.plagiarism.org/paper/plagiarism-reference-tariff>

Please Note: If a student requires Education Support he/she may receive additional help and guidance with coursework and/or when sitting examinations. As long as the College has organised this for the student, the student will not be doing anything that is wrong.

6. Communication and Records regarding Suspected and Proven Malpractice

- 6.1. Students must be given appropriate guidance regarding reference and citation at the start of the programme by their Lecturer.
- 6.2. Students must be provided with information by their Lecturer as to what constitutes malpractice (see Section 5 of this document).
- 6.3. Students **must** be made aware of the consequences and impact malpractice may have on their learning. (see Appendix 1 of this document).
- 6.4. Students must be kept informed (preferably in writing) of any allegation made against them, and know what evidence there is to support that allegation.
- 6.5. Students must have an opportunity to submit a written statement regarding the allegation of malpractice.
- 6.6. A student may be asked to attend an interview regarding an allegation or proven case of malpractice. A student cannot ask someone else to represent them.
- 6.7. If a student is called to interview, they may choose to be accompanied. The person accompanying the student must be a member of the College, and must not be related to the student.
- 6.8. If a student is called to interview, it is the student's responsibility to make sure he/she and any accompanying person make arrangements to attend.
- 6.9. If a student is unable to attend an interview on the date scheduled, the College will try to accommodate an alternative date.
- 6.10. Students must have the opportunity to consider their response to allegations of malpractice (if required).
- 6.11. Students must have an opportunity to seek advice (as necessary) and to provide a supplementary statement (if required).
- 6.12. Students must be informed of the applicable appeals procedure, should a decision be made against them.
- 6.13. Students found guilty of malpractice, must be informed of the possibility that information relating to a serious case of malpractice may be shared with other awarding bodies, the regulators and other appropriate authorities.
- 6.14. Students found guilty of malpractice must be made aware that a permanent record will be kept of the impact of any sanctions or penalties on a student's results. For this reason, the College **must not** withdraw candidates after malpractice has been identified, even if they have not completed the assessments in question.

7. Procedure for Dealing with Suspected Malpractice where:

- Student is submitting work as final draft, or
- Student 'Declaration of Authenticity' **is** signed, or
- Malpractice is suspected during an Exam

Please check individual awarding organisation guidance before proceeding as they may have additional guidance that must be applied.

- 7.1. The Lecturer/Invigilator should immediately complete the 'Student Suspected Malpractice – College Record Form' and send this to quality@nrc.ac.uk.
- 7.2. Quality will alert the Head of Centre and request that they inform the awarding organisation within 48 hours if required.
- 7.3. Within 1 working day of receipt of the 'Student Suspected Malpractice – College Record Form', Quality will record the incident and notify:
- the Examination and Regulatory Manager
 - the Curriculum Area Manager;
 - the Head of Department;
 - the Head of Teaching and Learning Excellence and
 - the Vice Principal for Teaching and Learning.
- 7.4. Within 2 working days of receipt of the 'Student Suspected Malpractice – College Record Form', the Curriculum Area Manager must notify the student of:
- o the allegation made against them;
 - o the evidence to support that allegation;
 - o the student's opportunity to respond to the allegation;
 - o the penalties that may be applied if found guilty (refer to Appendices);
 - o the right to appeal any decision made against them.
- 7.5. Immediately after meeting the student as at 7.3 above, the Curriculum Area Manager must forward the 'Student Suspected Malpractice – College Record Form' to the Head of Department and Head of Teaching and Learning Excellence.
- 7.6. Within 2 working days of receipt of the 'Student Suspected Malpractice – College Record Form', the Head of Department and Head of Teaching and Learning Excellence will review the form and forward to the Head of Centre.
- 7.7. Within 2 working days of receipt of the 'Student Suspected Malpractice – College Record Form', the Head of Centre will complete and submit the JCQ/M1 form to the Awarding Organisation, or in the case of Ulster University, the Faculty Partnership Manager.
- 7.8. College staff will follow the advice and guidance provided by the Awarding Organisation.

Note: Failure by the College to notify an awarding organisation all allegations of malpractice or suspected malpractice constitutes malpractice in itself.

8. Procedure for Dealing with Suspected Student Malpractice where:
- Student Declaration of Authenticity **is not** signed

Please check individual awarding organisation guidance before proceeding as they may have additional guidance that must be applied.

Malpractice by a candidate in a controlled assessment, coursework or non-examination assessment component **discovered prior to the candidate signing the declaration of authentication** may not need to be reported to an awarding organisation, but must be dealt with as below:

8.1. 1st Offence

- i. Immediately, the Lecturer completes the 'Student Suspected Malpractice – College Record Form' and forwards to the Course Co-ordinator.
- ii. Within 5 working days of the suspected offence, the Lecturer speaks to the student indicating:
 - a. where suspected malpractice has taken place;
 - b. reinforcing malpractice guidance; and
 - c. explaining good practice in producing written work.
- iii. If actual malpractice has occurred, Lecturer marks / grades work ignoring the parts where there has been plagiarism and malpractice.
- iv. Penalty for 1st Offence of actual malpractice: Student Disciplinary Procedure invoked - Stage 1 - Oral Warning Applied.

8.2. 2nd Offence

- i. Immediately, the Lecturer completes the 'Student Suspected Malpractice – College Record Form' and forwards to the Course Co-ordinator.
- ii. Within 5 working days of the suspected offence:
 - a. student is interviewed by Lecturer and Course Co-ordinator [as in 1st Offence]; and
 - b. student is asked to re-submit work at an agreed date.
- iii. Penalty for 2nd Offence of actual malpractice: Student Disciplinary Procedure invoked - Stage 2 - 1st Written Warning Applied.

8.3. 3rd Offence

- i. Immediately, the Lecturer completes the 'Student Suspected Malpractice – College Record Form' and forwards to the Course Co-ordinator and Curriculum Area Manager.
- ii. Within 5 working days of the suspected offence:
 - a. student is interviewed by Course Co-ordinator and Curriculum Area Manager.
 - b. student is asked to re-submit work at an agreed date.
- iii. Penalty for 3rd Offence of actual malpractice: Student Disciplinary Procedure invoked - Stage 3 - 2nd Written Warning Applied.

8.4. 4th Offence

- i. Immediately, the Lecturer completes the 'Student Suspected Malpractice – College Record Form' and forwards to quality@nrc.ac.uk who. Quality will alert Course Co-ordinator, Curriculum Area Manager, Head of Department and Head of Teaching and Learning Excellence
- ii. Within 5 working days of suspected offence, student is interviewed by Curriculum Area Manager and Head of Department.
- iii. Penalty for 4th Offence of actual malpractice: Student Disciplinary Procedure invoked - Stage 4 - Student will be suspended from College.
- iv. The student will be offered the opportunity to withdraw completely from the course or offered the opportunity to retake the year in full where malpractice has been identified. Retaking the year will be subject to College offering of the course and the availability of places. In some circumstances this may not be possible.

9. Student Appeals against Allegations or Penalties

- 9.1. A student may appeal:
 - i. an allegation of suspected malpractice; or
 - ii. the penalty imposed on them for proven cases of malpractice.
- 9.2. If a student wishes to appeal, he/she should contact the Principal, as Head of Centre. The appeal should provide clear information as to why the student is appealing the allegation or penalty.
- 9.3. If a penalty has been imposed by an Awarding Organisation, the Principal, as Head of Centre, will make the decision as to whether the appeal should be progressed.

10. Quality Assurance

- 10.1. Comments and complaints regarding this document will be handled through the College's comments and complaints mechanisms. If you have a comment or complaint, or require further information regarding the process, please e-mail quality.improvement@nrc.ac.uk.
- 10.2. The following processes must be followed to monitor and review this document:
 - i. It will be monitored on an ongoing basis and subject to a full review at least every two years.
 - ii. It may also be updated if changes or improvements in processes or procedures are identified.
 - iii. In monitoring and reviewing the document, the following will be taken into consideration:
 - feedback regarding the content and format of the document;
 - uptake and usage;
 - comments or complaints regarding the document;
 - Equality information and monitoring data.

11. Links to other Documents

11.1. Internal Documents:

- [Malpractice – Guidance for Staff on Suspected Student Malpractice](#)
- [Malpractice- Procedure for Staff Malpractice](#)
- [Complaints Policy](#)

11.2. External Documents

- Joint Council for Qualifications (JCQ) Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures 2022-2023 – accessible at <https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/>
- Academic Misconduct Benchmarking Research Project (AMBeR Tariff) – accessible at <https://www.plagiarism.org/paper/plagiarism-reference-tariff>

Appendix 1 JCQ Sanctions and Penalties Applied Against Candidates

Under JCQ guidance, **an Awarding Organisation** will determine the application of a sanction or penalty according to the evidence presented, the nature and circumstances of the malpractice, and the type of qualification involved. The penalties below may be applied individually or in combination.

1 Warning

The candidate is issued with a warning that if he/she commits malpractice within a set period of time, further specified sanctions will be applied.

2 Loss of all marks for a section

The candidate loses all the marks gained for a discrete section of the work. A section may be part of a component, or a single piece of non-examination assessment if this consists of several items.

3 Loss of all marks for a component

The candidate loses all the marks gained for a component. A component is more often a feature of a linear qualification than a unitised qualification, and so this penalty can be regarded as an alternative to penalty 4. Some units also have components, in which case a level of penalty between numbers 2 and 4 is possible.

4 Loss of all marks for a unit

The candidate loses all the marks gained for a unit. This penalty can only be applied to qualifications which are unitised. For linear qualifications, the option is penalty 3. This penalty usually allows the candidate to aggregate or request certification in that series, albeit with a reduced mark or grade.

5 Disqualification from a unit

The candidate is disqualified from the unit. This penalty is only available if the qualification is unitised. For linear qualifications the option is penalty 7.

The effect of this penalty is to prevent the candidate aggregating or requesting certification in that series, if the candidate has applied for it.

6 Disqualification from all units in one or more qualifications

If circumstances justify, penalty 5 may be applied to other units taken during the same examination or assessment series. (Units which have been banked in previous examination series are retained.) This penalty is only available if the qualification is unitised. For linear qualifications the option is penalty 8.

7 Disqualification from a whole qualification

The candidate is disqualified from the whole qualification taken in that series or academic year. This penalty can be applied to unitised qualifications only if the candidate has requested aggregation. Any units banked in a previous examination series are retained, but the units taken in the present series and the aggregation opportunity are lost. If a candidate has not requested aggregation the option is penalty 6. It may also be used with linear qualifications.

8 Disqualification from all qualifications taken in that series

If circumstances justify, penalty 7 may be applied to other qualifications. This penalty can be applied to unitised qualifications only if the candidate has requested aggregation. Any units banked in a previous examination series are retained, but the units taken in the present series and the aggregation opportunity are lost. If a candidate has not requested aggregation the option is penalty 6. It may also be used with linear qualifications.

9 Candidate debarral

The candidate is barred from entering for one or more examinations for a set period of time. This penalty is applied in conjunction with any of the other penalties above, (other than penalty 1 warning) if the circumstances warrant it.

Appendix 1a JCQ Offences and Penalties (Non university coursework)

Standard Penalties (as taken from JCQ Suspected Malpractice)

1. warning;
2. loss of marks gained for a section;
3. loss of all marks gained for a component;
4. loss of all marks gained for a unit;
5. disqualification from the unit;
6. disqualification from all units in one or more qualifications taken in series;
7. disqualification from the whole qualification;
8. disqualification from all qualifications taken in that series;
9. barred from entering for examinations in a set period of time.

Offences relating to the content of candidates' work			
Type of offence	Warning (Penalty 1)	Loss of marks (Aggregation still permitted) (Penalties 2-4)	Loss of aggregation or certification opportunity (Penalties 5-9)
The inclusion of inappropriate, offensive or obscene material in scripts, controlled assessments, coursework, non-examination assessments or portfolios	isolated words or drawings, mildly offensive, inappropriate approaches or responses	Frequent mild obscenities or drawings; isolated strong obscenity; isolated mild obscenities or mildly offensive comments aimed at the examiner or member of staff	Offensive comments or obscenities aimed at a member of staff, examiner or religious group; homophobic, transphobic, racist or sexist remarks or lewd drawings
Collusion: working collaboratively with other candidates beyond what is permitted	collaborative work is apparent in a few areas, but possibly due to teacher advice; candidate unaware of the regulations	collaborative work begins to affect the examiner's ability to award a fair mark to an individual candidate	candidates' work reflects extensive similarities and identical passages; due to a deliberate attempt to share work
Plagiarism: unacknowledged copying from or reproduction of published sources (including the internet); incomplete referencing	minor amount of plagiarism/poor referencing in places	plagiarism from published work listed in the bibliography or referenced; or minor amount of plagiarism from a source not listed in the bibliography or referenced	plagiarism from published work not listed in the bibliography or referenced; or plagiarised text consists of the substance of the work submitted and the source is listed in the bibliography or referenced
Making a false declaration of authenticity		sections of work done by others, but most still the work of the candidate	most or all of the work is not that of the candidate
Copying from another candidate or allowing work to be copied (including the misuse of technology)	lending work not knowing it would be copied	permitting examination script/work to be copied; showing other candidates answers	copying from another candidate's script, controlled assessment, the coursework, non-examination assessment; borrowing work to copy

Awarding organisations reserve the right to apply sanctions and penalties flexibly, outside of the defined ranges, if particular mitigating or aggravating circumstances are found to exist.

Appendix 1b JCQ Offences and Penalties (Non university examinations)

Standard Penalties (please refer to 'JCQ Suspected Malpractice' document for a full list of scenarios and penalties)

1. warning;
2. loss of marks gained for a section;
3. loss of all marks gained for a component;
4. loss of all marks gained for a unit;
5. disqualification from the unit;
6. disqualification from all units in one or more qualifications taken in series;
7. disqualification from the whole qualification;
8. disqualification from all qualifications taken in that series;
9. barred from entering for examinations in a set period of time.

Type of offence	Warning (Penalty 1)	Loss of marks (Aggregation Still Permitted) (Penalties 2-4)	Loss of aggregation or certification opportunity (Penalties 5-9)
Own blank paper	used for rough work	used for final answers	
Calculators, dictionaries (when prohibited)	not used	used or attempted to use	
Bringing into the examination room notes in the wrong format or prohibited annotations	notes/annotations go beyond what is permitted but do not give an advantage; notes irrelevant to subject	Notes/annotations are relevant and give an unfair advantage	notes/annotations introduced in a deliberate attempt to gain an advantage
Study guides and personal organisers	content irrelevant to subject	content relevant to subject	relevant to subject and evidence of use
Mobile phone or similar electronic devices (including iPod, PM3/4 player, memory sticks, Smartphone, Smartwatch)	not in the candidate's possession but make a noise in the examination room	in the candidate's possession but no evidence of being used by the candidate	In the candidate's possession and evidence of being used by the candidate
A breach of the instructions or advice of an invigilator, supervisor, or the awarding body in relation to the examination rules and regulations	minor non-compliance: e.g. sitting in a non-designated seat; continuing to write for a short period after being told to stop	major non-compliance; e.g. refusing to move to a designated seat; significant amount of writing after being told to stop	related non-compliance
Failing to abide by the conditions of supervision designed to maintain the security and integrity of the examinations	leaving examination early (no loss of integrity); removing script from the examination room, but evidence of the integrity was maintained	removing script from examination room but with no proof that the script is safe; taking home materials	deliberately breaking a timetable clash supervision arrangement; removing script from the examination room and with proof that the script has been tampered with; leaving examination room early so integrity is impaired
Disruptive behaviour in the examination room or assessment session (including use of offensive language)	minor disruption lasting a short time; calling out, causing noise, turning around	repeated or prolonged disruption; unacceptably rude remarks; being removed from the examination room; taking another's possessions	Warnings ignored; provocative or aggravated behaviour; repeated or loud offensive comments; physical assault on staff or property

Appendix 2a Amber Offences and Penalties (Plagiarism in HE Coursework)

Tariff Points

Note:

The Amber Tariff will be used for Open University validated qualifications.

For Ulster University qualifications please refer to <https://www.ulster.ac.uk/student/exams/cheating-and-plagiarism>

History of plagiarism offences

1 st time	100 points
2 nd time	150 points
3 rd time	200 points

Level of programme

Level 4	7 points
Level 5	115 points
Level 6	140 points
Level 7	140 points

Value of assessment

Standard weighting	30 points
Heavy weighting e.g. end of year project/dissertation	60 points

Amount of plagiarism identified

Below 5% AND less than two sentences	80 points
As above but with critical aspects* plagiarised	105 points
Between 5% and 20% OR more than two sentences but not more than two paragraphs	105 points
As above but with critical aspects* plagiarised 130 points Between 20% and 50% OR more than two paragraphs but not more than five paragraphs	130 points
As above but with critical aspects* plagiarised	160 points
Above 50% OR more than five paragraphs	160 points
Submission purchased from essay mill or ghost-writing service	225 points

Additional characteristics

Evidence of deliberate attempt to disguise plagiarism by changing words, sentences or references to avoid detection	40 points
---	-----------

Appendix 2b Amber Offences and Penalties (Plagiarism in HE Coursework)

Note:

The Amber Tariff will be used for Open University validated qualifications.

For Ulster University qualifications please refer to <https://www.ulster.ac.uk/student/exams/cheating-and-plagiarism>

Minor Offences

Minor offences may be characterised as:

- poor academic practice such as inadvertently inaccurate description of methods, data collection and/or analysis,
- poor referencing, unattributed quotations, inappropriate paraphrasing, incorrect or incomplete citations, particularly where there is reason to believe that the student had not yet fully grasped the normal academic conventions in these regards.

Where minor offences are identified, the offence may be dismissed with a warning to the students.

Points Accrued	Category	Penalties (select one)
Less than 280	Minor	A minor offence (see above) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an informal warning reinforced with development activity and additional support for the student
280 – 329		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No further action beyond formal warning • Assignment awarded 0% - resubmission required, with no penalty on mark
330 – 379	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No further action beyond formal warning • Assignment awarded 0% - resubmission required, with no penalty on Mark • Assignment awarded 0% - resubmission required but mark capped or reduced <p>NB. Resubmissions in some programmes e.g. HNDs always require a cap of Pass on Mark</p>
380 – 479		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assignment awarded 0% - resubmission required but mark capped or reduced • Assignment awarded 0% - no opportunity to resubmit
480 – 524		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assignment awarded 0% - no opportunity to resubmit • Module awarded 0% - re-sit required, but mark capped or reduced • Module awarded 0% - no opportunity to re-sit, but credit still awarded
525 – 559	Serious	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Module awarded 0% - re-sit required, but mark capped or reduced • Module awarded 0% - no opportunity to re-sit, but credit still awarded • Module awarded 0% - no opportunity to re-sit, and credit lost • Award classification reduced • Qualification reduced (e.g. Honours -> no Honours) • Expelled from institution but credits retained • Expelled from institution with credits withdrawn
More than 560	Gross	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Module awarded 0% - no opportunity to re-sit the assessment, and credit lost • Award classification reduced • Qualification reduced (e.g. Honours -> no Honours) • Expelled from institution but credits retained

Appendix 2c Offences and Penalties (HE Academic Misconduct: not plagiarism)

Note:

The Amber Tariff will be used for Open University validated qualifications.

For Ulster University qualifications please refer to <https://www.ulster.ac.uk/student/exams/cheating-and-plagiarism>

Cheating

Offence	Penalty
Submitting false claims of previously gained qualifications, research or experience in order to gain credit for prior learning	Moderate
Possessing notes, mobile devices, programmable calculators or other materials that are not permitted in the exam room	Serious
Acquiring detailed knowledge of the content of an exam	Gross
Submitting work for assessment that has already been submitted as all or part of the assessment for another module without prior consent of the course coordinator	Minor
Accessing an electronic communication device which has not been permitted during an exam	Serious
Copying from the examination script of another candidate	Gross
Providing information to another candidate in an exam	Gross

Collusion

Offence	Penalty
The conscious collaboration, without official approval, between two or more students in the preparation and production of work which is ultimately submitted by each in an identical or substantially similar form and/or is represented by each to be the product of his or her individual efforts	Moderate
Unauthorised cooperation between a student and another person in the preparation and production of work which is presented as the student's own	Moderate

Fabrication of evidence

Offence	Penalty
Claiming to have carried out experiments, observations, interviews or any form of research which s/he has not, in fact carried out	Gross
Embellishment of data – when a small amount of data is enhanced or exaggerated in order to emphasise data, which has been obtained by legitimate means	Serious
Fabrication of data – this occurs when a student creates and presents an extensive amount, or significant amount, of data in order to conceal a paucity of legitimate data, or wholly fabricates data in the absence of legitimate data.	Gross

Adapted from guidance written by City of Liverpool College