

**SCHOOL OF ARTS,
LANGUAGES AND CULTURES**

**ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE:
GUIDELINES AND PROTOCOLS**

**December 2019
Version 2.0**

<http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=35621>

Summary of Amendments in Version 2.0

Sections	Amendment
Various	<p>University policy and guidance web link changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regulation XVII (Conduct and Discipline of Students) • Academic Malpractice Procedure • Procedure for Summary Disciplinary Panels • Procedure for the University Disciplinary Panel • Guidance on Applying Student Discipline Penalties • Guidance to students on plagiarism and other forms of academic malpractice
2.1 – 2.3	<p>Rewording to academic malpractice definitions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plagiarism • Collusion • Fabrication or falsification of results, figures or data
2.4 – 2.5	<p>Additional definitions for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-plagiarism • Possession of unauthorised material in an examination • Contract cheating
4.	<p>Addition of procedural guidance for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possession of unauthorised material in an examination • Contract cheating
Various	<p>Terminology changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Academic Malpractice Hearings” are now referred to as: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. School-based Summary Disciplinary Panels (School-based SDPs). ii. Faculty-based Summary Disciplinary Panels (Faculty-based SDPs). iii. University Disciplinary Panels (UDPs). • ‘School Malpractice Officer’ is now referred to as “Authorised University Officer (AUO)”. – Dr Aashish Velkar.
5.	<p>The reference to UG levels has now changed in line with the FHEQ:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Year 1 and 2 students are now referred to as levels 4 and 5 • Year 3 students are now referred to as level 6
5.	<p>The location for handling cases of academic malpractice has changed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference to ‘subsequent offences’ as a catch-all has been removed; ‘first offence’, ‘second offence’, ‘third offence (or further)’ now used. • There are now varying locations for cases to be heard for: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. First offence ii. Second offence iii. Third offence (or further) • Misconduct in research by a student at any level of study is now heard by the Head of Research Governance, Ethics and Integrity providing it meets criteria set out in Section 2.2 of this document. • The Authorised University Officer now have the power to refer cases directly to University Disciplinary Panel should they decide the student has committed significant academic malpractice, irrespective of number of previous offences. • Clarity given if multiple students are involved in a single offence.

6.	<p>Process to follow when Academic Malpractice is Discovered or Suspected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity given on marking up Turnitin report and sources
7. & 8.	<p>Process for Dealing with Academic Malpractice and Poor Practice at UG and PGT Level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terminology changes as indicated above. • Reference to FHEQ levels replace years of study.
10.	<p>Procedure for Summary Disciplinary Panels (“SDP”) replaces ‘Convening a School Hearing’:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An SDP should be arranged within 20 working days of the referral being made and convene within 30 working days. • SDPs can now only accept statements if received at least 2 working days before the hearing. • Students are now entitled to ‘reasonable adjustments’ to the disciplinary process should they be DASS registered. Any such requests will be considered by the SDP Chair and/or Secretary, in consultation with the DASS as required. • Students must now inform the Secretary of their proposed Supporter at least two working days before the date of the hearing. • Students are now entitled to call upon a witness <i>and</i> question witnesses upon whose evidence the case against them is based. This is at the SDP Chair’s discretion as to whether a witness is required for the SDP to conduct its business. • The SDP Chair now has the power to adjourn the hearing to a future date, where they consider it is impractical for the hearing to go ahead as scheduled.
11.	<p>New available penalties for SDPs:</p> <p>(a) A reprimand and warning about future behaviour;</p> <p>(b) A requirement upon the student to apologise for the misconduct to those who may have been affected by it. (New)</p> <p>(c) A requirement for the student to undertake appropriate training related to the misconduct. (New)</p> <p>(d) For any penalty available to be deferred and only imposed should any future breach of the Regulation occur. (New)</p> <p>(e) The examining authority will be informed the mark for the piece of work or assessment should be reduced to a specified mark.</p> <p>(f) A recorded mark of zero for the examination paper or other assessed work in which unfair practice occurred. Should a re-assessment/resubmission opportunity be available this will, if passed, be capped at the lowest compensatable pass mark.</p> <p>(g) A recorded mark of zero for the course unit(s) in which the unfair practice occurred. Should a re-assessment/resubmission opportunity be available it will, if passed, be capped at the lowest compensatable pass mark.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rationales for each penalty are provided. • Guidelines to help Panels determine an appropriate penalty are provided. • If found guilty, despite the penalty given, all students will be required to attend a session with the SALC Writing Tutor.

Separate doc.	Academic Malpractice Summary Guidance for Staff – Document <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SALC-produced summary guidance document that staff may find easier to use when referring cases.
14.2.1	Malpractice Referral Form updated to support Panel decisions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion of ‘Section G – Academic Malpractice Training’ for Secretary to complete. • Inclusion of ‘Section H – Consequences of Penalties’ for Secretary to complete.
14.1.1 – 14.1.3	Letter templates to students updated to reflect regulation changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notification of referral to Faculty-based SDP/UDP • Invitation to School-based Summary Disciplinary Panel • Outcome of School-based Summary Disciplinary Panel
14.1.2	Academic Appeals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students now have 10 working days to submit an appeal once they receive their SDP outcome letter (down from 15 working days).

Contents

Summary of Amendments in Version 2.0	2
1. Academic Integrity.....	1
2. Defining Academic Malpractice	1
2.1 Academic malpractice.....	1
2.2 Plagiarism.....	2
2.3 Fabrication or falsification of results, figures or data	2
2.5 Contract cheating	2
2.6 Misconduct in research.....	3
3. Distinguishing between Academic Malpractice and Poor Practice	4
3.1 Instances of poor academic practice can include the following:	4
3.2 Instances of academic malpractice (including plagiarism) can include the following: ...	4
4. Detection.....	5
4.1 General.....	5
4.2 Possession of unauthorised material in an examination.....	6
4.3 Contract cheating	6
5. Location for Handling Cases of Academic Malpractice and Poor Practice	8
6. Process to follow when Academic Malpractice is Discovered or Suspected	10
7. Process for Dealing with Academic Malpractice and Poor Practice at UG Level	11
7.1 If poor academic practice is discovered at any UG Level.	11
7.2 If academic malpractice is discovered or suspected at UG levels 4, 5 and CPD (first offence)	11
7.3 If academic malpractice is suspected at UG levels 4, 5 and CPD (second offence) ...	12
7.4 If academic malpractice is suspected at UG levels 4, 5 and CPD (third or further offence)	12
7.5 If academic malpractice is discovered or suspected at UG level 6 and above (first offence)	13
7.6 If academic malpractice is discovered at Levels 6 (second offence)	13
8. Process for Dealing with Academic Malpractice and Poor Practice at PGT Level.....	15

8.1 If poor academic practice is discovered at PGT level.....	15
8.2 If academic malpractice (including plagiarism) is discovered or suspected and it is a first offence in the PGT taught element of the programme	15
8.3 If academic malpractice (including plagiarism) is discovered or suspected and it is a second offence in the PGT taught element of the programme	16
8.4 If academic malpractice (including plagiarism) is discovered or suspected and it is a third (or further) offence in the PGT taught element of the programme	16
8.5 If academic malpractice (including plagiarism) is discovered or suspected and it is a first offence in the PGT dissertation element of the programme.....	17
8.6 If academic malpractice (including plagiarism) is discovered or suspected and it is a second or subsequent offence in the PGT dissertation element of the programme.....	17
9. Disclosure of Mitigating Circumstances	18
10. Procedure for Summary Disciplinary Panels (“SDP”)	20
10.1 General.....	20
11. at the School-based SDP Hearing.....	20
12. After the SDP:	24
13. Summary Disciplinary Panel hearing Schedule	24
14. Appendices	25
14.1. Communications to Students	25
14.1.1 Letter of notification to student of referral to Faculty-based SDP or UDP	25
14.1.2 Letter of invitation to School-based Summary Disciplinary Panel Hearing.....	27
14.1.3 Letter setting out the outcome of the School-based Summary Disciplinary Panel Hearing.....	30
14.2. Forms and templates	34
14.2.1 School-based Summary Disciplinary Panel Referral Form.....	34

1. Academic Integrity

Academic Integrity means honesty and responsibility in scholarship. Assessments exist to help students learn; grades exist to show how fully this goal is attained. Therefore all work and all grades should result from the student's own understanding and effort. Academic integrity involves values such as avoidance of cheating or plagiarism; maintenance of academic standards; honesty and rigor in research and academic publishing.

It is the responsibility of the University and its constituent parts to ensure that all students understand the academic requirements expected of them. As a minimum students should be made aware of academic integrity and academic malpractice through handbooks and online resources. In particular this Procedure should be available to students. These responsibilities should be balanced against those of the students who must clearly indicate any lack of understanding concerning academic malpractice and must engage with the resources made available on this subject.

It is good practice for academic integrity to be highlighted to students throughout their programme and for students to be given the opportunity to think critically, to reflect, construct and revise arguments and to proof-read.

The University can minimise the opportunity for academic malpractice by:

- Providing the information contained within this Procedure.
- Varying assessment tasks, topics and questions from year to year.
- Using forms of assessment that require demonstration of the understanding of knowledge rather than straightforward repetition of such knowledge.
- Providing feedback in accordance with the Policy on Feedback to Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught Students (<http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=6518>), or for Postgraduate Research Students, the PGR Code of Practice (<https://www.staffnet.manchester.ac.uk/rbe/rdrd/code/>).
- Passing work through Turnitin (the University's plagiarism detection software).
- Providing clear information on the expectations of work, assessment criteria and the assessment process.
- Giving students the opportunity to engage with academic supervision where this is available for their level of study and assessment.

Study skills support should be available to students in their academic School. Support also exists within other areas of the University, such as through the Library's My Learning Essentials (<http://www.library.manchester.ac.uk/using-the-library/students/training-and-skills-support/my-learning-essentials/>).

2. Defining Academic Malpractice

Academic malpractice, which includes plagiarism, is regarded as a serious offence by the University and School. The University provides students with the following definitions:

2.1 Academic malpractice is any activity – intentional or otherwise - that is likely to undermine the integrity essential to scholarship and research. It includes plagiarism, collusion, fabrication or falsification of results, and anything else that could result in unearned or undeserved credit for those committing it. Academic malpractice can result from a deliberate act of cheating or

may be committed unintentionally. Whether intended or not, all incidents of academic malpractice will be treated seriously by the University.

2.2 Plagiarism is the presentation, intentionally or unwittingly, of the ideas, work or words of other people without proper, clear and unambiguous acknowledgement. It includes the copying of the work of any other person, including another student. Plagiarism may include the close paraphrasing, or minimal adaptation of another person's words, illustrations, computer code, graph, diagrams etc. Sources can be any available material, such as websites, articles, books and lecture slides.

- **Self-plagiarism** is the submission, in whole or in part, of a student's own work, where that work has been submitted for a different assessment, either at the University or at a different institution. Students who use a previous piece of work or publication in a future piece of work should ensure that they properly reference themselves and the extent of such use should not be excessive.
- **Collusion** is when a student or students permit or condone another student or students, to share a piece of work subject to assessment in order to gain a mark or grade to which they are not entitled. Students who allow another student to copy their work are also committing collusion and both the copier and the provider of the work are liable to be penalised.

The University does however allow collaboration where students work in groups as part of their programme of research or in the preparation of projects and similar assessments. The expectations and marking of the work should be made clear by the person setting the work and students should ensure that they are able to identify their contribution to the piece of work in group submissions. If malpractice appears in a group piece of work, then the group will normally be expected to take collective responsibility for the work and be seen as part of the same disciplinary hearing, unless individual members are able to (i) identify who contributed the element containing malpractice and/or (ii) distinguish their contribution to that of the other members of the group.

2.3 Fabrication or falsification of results, figures or data is the presentation or inclusion in a piece of work, by individual students or groups of students, of figures or any data (quantitative or qualitative) which have been made up or altered and which have no basis in verifiable sources; this may or may not involve other instances of academic malpractice.

2.4 Possession of unauthorised material in an examination is when a student intentionally or unwittingly possesses unauthorised material in an examination. The material need not be used during the examination or pertinent to an examination for this definition to be met.

2.5 Contract cheating is the commissioning of a piece of work by a third party, beyond basic proofreading (<https://www.staffnet.manchester.ac.uk/tlso/policy-guidance/teaching-and-learning/learning/proofreading/>). This may be where a student engages an essay mill to request that the essay mill produces a piece of assessed work for the student. This may also include the use of crowdsourcing, where a student obtains content from, or allows editing by, others and fails to acknowledge the contribution.

2.6 Misconduct in research

For the purposes of student discipline, research misconduct is defined by the same types of research misconduct as listed under the Code of Practice for Investigating Concerns about the Conduct of Research (<https://www.staffnet.manchester.ac.uk/rbe/ethics-integrity/research-misconduct/research-misconduct/>) ("**Code of Practice**"). Similarly, what is considered to be poor practice in research will also mirror the definitions under the Code of Practice.

Some types of academic malpractice may constitute types of research misconduct and vice versa. Where there is such an overlap, the disciplinary process will usually focus on considering the dominant allegation(s) against the student.

Research misconduct can be committed by a student at any level of study, as part of work that is being, or has been, conducted or produced for the purposes of assessment or publication. Where a concern regarding the conduct of research arises about a current student, this would normally be dealt with through the disciplinary process, rather than the Code of Practice.

If the alleged conduct affects a published piece of research work or a supervisor is implicated in a complaint about research misconduct then the Code of Practice would usually take precedence in the first instance for the purposes of investigating the allegation being made. Allegations that might meet either of these criteria should be referred to the Head of Research Governance, Ethics and Integrity as per the Code of Practice. At the conclusion of an investigation under the Code of Practice disciplinary action may be recommended.

It is the responsibility of academic staff in all subject areas and divisions to inform students about these offences and educate them about how to avoid them. Students at all levels should be provided with guidance and advice about the use of academic and referencing conventions, so that they understand what is expected of them when researching and writing assignments, whether individually or in groups. Without such guidance and advice, students who are suspected of academic malpractice can legitimately claim that they were ignorant of, or did not understand, the preferred conventions, making it difficult for tutors to hold them accountable and impose appropriate penalties.

All cases should be dealt with in accordance with the principles of natural justice, which impose a duty on the University to act fairly. In practice, this means that the student should have full information of the case against them; be given adequate warning of a hearing, so that he or she has time to prepare; both sides should hear each other's case in its entirety; and clear reasons be given for decisions reached. Those who adjudicate at hearings must be unbiased and decisions taken must be demonstrably reasonable and not irrational.

The following documents are also relevant in this context, and staff should bear these in mind when confronted with a case of alleged academic malpractice:

(a) Guidance to students on plagiarism and other forms of academic malpractice
<http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=2870>

(b) Plagiarism and other forms of academic malpractice: Guidance for Teaching Staff
<http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=2869>

(c) Regulation XVII (Conduct and Discipline of Students)
<http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=6530>

(d) Academic Malpractice: Procedure for the Handling of Cases ('Academic Malpractice Procedure')

<http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=639>

3. Distinguishing between Academic Malpractice and Poor Practice

It is important that teaching staff use their professional judgement to distinguish between instances of academic malpractice (including plagiarism) and cases of poor academic practice. This is an important first step in the process, the outcome of which will determine the process to be followed thereafter. Cases of alleged academic malpractice are mostly dealt with at School or Faculty level upon referral from a member of teaching staff, with potentially serious consequences for the student. Cases of poor academic practice are better handled at subject or programme level, where markers can use the marking criteria to penalise poor practice. In the case of first-time offences at UG Levels 4 and 5, markers and course unit directors should carefully consider whether it would be more productive (and beneficial for the student) to deal with cases of minor malpractice, including cases that are on the borderline between poor practice and malpractice, under the heading

3.1 Instances of poor academic practice can include the following:

Poor academic practice involves poor citation practice where there is evidence that the student did not apply the appropriate rules of academic writing and/or where the extent of copied material does not meet the level of significance such that it can be considered academic malpractice. Poor academic practice will not instigate disciplinary proceedings but can be taken account of through the marking process. The work in question may include limited:

- Material or copied text expressing ideas or concepts taken from the work of others in the student's own words but without appropriate citation.
- Material or copied text which is referenced in the bibliography but is not properly cited.
- Material or copied text that has been subjected to minor linguistic changes with or without citation.
- Collusion between students as evidenced by structure, source or copied text; this includes cases where the written work is original throughout.
- Pieces of work which are largely constructed of the work and words of others.

Instances of poor academic practice usually stem from a misunderstanding or ignorance of academic conventions, inadequate preparation, or sloppiness in presentation. These kinds of cases, particularly if they involve UG Level 4 students, do not normally need to be referred to the Authorised University Officer. Instead, the marker should explain to the student in their feedback why the work falls below the standards required, remind them about the preferred academic conventions and strongly urge them to arrange to meet with the marker or their academic advisor to discuss the outcomes further. The poor practice itself should be penalised through the assessment criteria, which explicitly mention the requirement to adhere to the preferred academic and referencing conventions (footnotes, bibliography, etc.).

3.2 Instances of academic malpractice (including plagiarism) can include the following:

- Referencing whose inadequacy vitiates the integrity of the work.
- A bibliography that omits texts drawn on in the main body of the work (compounding the failure to cite them in the main text and/or references).
- More than isolated examples of the omission of quotation marks from quotes.

- Close paraphrasing of phrases or sentences of someone else’s material without direct and immediate acknowledgement (anything more than isolated examples where the source is reference properly elsewhere).
- Extensive misuse of secondary quotations.
- Copying the work of another student, copying from a previous submission by the same student (self-plagiarism) or submitting material from ‘essay banks’ or similar sources.

4. Detection¹

4.1 General

Disciplinary action for academic malpractice can usually only be taken where a student has submitted summative assessment containing malpractice. Disciplinary action cannot usually be taken prior to submission. If an academic member of staff notices malpractice in work prior to it being submitted, it is reasonable to expect that the member of staff would warn the student of the consequences of committing malpractice.

Most essay or text-based assignments are submitted through Turnitin. This software allows the comparison of the work submitted for assessment, with other pieces of work or publications stored on Turnitin’s database. Turnitin detects whether there is any similarity in the work to the other sources and produces a report showing where the similarity exists, the amount of similarity and a reference to the source. Turnitin alone does not confirm the presence of malpractice; an academic judgement must be made to reach this conclusion.

It is expected that examiners of assignments will:

- Review any Turnitin report to help determine whether academic malpractice may have occurred.
- In cases of poor academic practice, mark the piece of work in the usual way taking account of the poor academic practice and provide feedback to the student.

In cases of suspected academic malpractice:

- Acquire the original source material where possible and indicate what sections of the material have been taken by the student, cross referring to the material’s location in the student’s work.
- Include a brief statement in the Malpractice Referral letter, explaining why they consider there to be malpractice in the student’s work.
- Continue to mark the work where possible as if the work does not contain academic malpractice. The mark should be withheld from the student pending any disciplinary action. It is acknowledged that marking can prove difficult in some cases especially when there is substantial academic malpractice. If examiners feel unable to mark the work then they should indicate the reasons why in their report.
- Send the information above to an officer in the School (“**School Officer**”). This will usually be an Authorised University Officer (“**AUO**”) (as defined in the Regulation)⁴, or nominee thereof e.g. Academic Malpractice Officer, Programme Director, Director of Teaching and Learning etc:

¹ This links to the Assessment sections of the Procedure for Summary Disciplinary Panels and the Procedure for the University Disciplinary Panel.

Authorised University Officer: Aashish Velkar, Associate Director for Assessment
(aashish.velkar@manchester.ac.uk)

Administrative Support: Joel Loutfi, Teaching and Learning Assessment Coordinator
(joel.loutfi@manchester.ac.uk)

4.2 Possession of unauthorised material in an examination

Students are informed prior to the start of examinations that they should not have any unauthorised materials on their person. This might include any electronic device, revision notes or anything else which could give them an unfair advantage in the examination compared to their fellow students. The material need not be pertinent to the examination for it to be unauthorised.

Some material may be permitted for an examination but this will have been confirmed to the student in advance of the examination.

Invigilators monitor the conditions of an examination, including the detection of unauthorised material. Where unauthorised material is detected, the preliminary details of this should be recorded, including the type and content of the material, the time it was found, the examination title and start time etc. Often students are asked to leave the examination at the point unauthorised material is detected whilst the above details are obtained and the material is confiscated, but they may later be allowed to return to complete the examination in the time remaining.

The student will then be asked to attend a post-examination interview with a member of staff at the Student Services Centre within the Division of Student Admissions and Administration (if the examination was arranged centrally) or their academic School (if the examination was arranged locally). At the interview additional information will be sought from the student.

If it is agreed that an offence has likely been committed then the case will be referred on for appropriate disciplinary action.

4.3 Contract cheating

If there is a reasonable suspicion that a student may have commissioned a piece of work from a third party, but there is no direct evidence of this, then in agreement with the School Officer a viva voce can be arranged to give the student the opportunity to demonstrate that they:

- Produced the work;
- Undertook the reading and research themselves;
- Undertook the preparatory work themselves;
- Understand what they have written.
- If a viva voce is held, the following principles shall be met:
- If a viva voce is to be conducted it should not normally take place more than 30 days after the assessment feedback deadline.

The student should be given at least five working days' notice of the requirement to attend the viva voce. An explanation of what a viva voce is, the purpose of it and the potential outcomes should be outlined in the invitation. It should be made clear that the viva voce is arranged due to the detection of potential academic malpractice and it is to allow the student

an opportunity to demonstrate that the work is their own; it will not contribute to any additional mark obtained for the piece of work.

Two members of academic staff (at least one of whom must be a subject specialist) must conduct the viva voce; this will normally be the School Officer and the examiner of the assessment.

The student may be accompanied by a person of their choice for support only (normally a fellow student, member of staff or Students' Union representative). Any individual accompanying the student should under no circumstances participate in the viva voce.

Reasonable adjustments must be made to ensure that candidates with additional support needs are not disadvantaged for reasons relating to a long-term medical condition, sensory impairment, specific learning difficulty and /or disability.

The viva voce will not normally exceed 30 minutes.

In exceptional circumstances the viva voce can be conducted via video link.

Intensive questions are expected. The questions asked should provide the student with the opportunity to demonstrate that the work is their own.

An accurate record of the viva voce should be taken; this record may be used to form the evidence base for any future disciplinary hearing. It may be necessary for an administrative member of staff to be present at the viva voce to make the record. The student is entitled to have a copy of the record.

The viva voce can have one of two outcomes:

The staff conducting the viva voce will confirm that they accept that the student wrote the work in question; no further action will be taken. The work should then be marked on its own merit, if it has not already been marked.

If the staff conducting the viva voce still remain doubtful of the authorship of the work in question, or the student admits that it is not their work, then the case should be referred for disciplinary action. Any future disciplinary panel should not include, as a member of the panel, the examiner or the same School Officer. The viva voce, in itself, will not result in a penalty being applied; a penalty can only be applied by a disciplinary panel.

5. Location for Handling Cases of Academic Malpractice and Poor Practice

The [Academic Malpractice Procedure](#) states that cases of alleged malpractice are to be handled as follows:

Dealt with by	Case types
School-based Summary Disciplinary Panel (School-based SDP ²)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UG programmes levels 4, 5 and CPD – first offence • PGT programmes taught element – first offence
Faculty-based Summary Disciplinary Panel (Faculty-based SDP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UG programmes levels 4, 5 and CPD – second offences • UG level 6 and above – first offence • PGT programmes taught element – second offence • PGT dissertation element – first offence • PGR taught element – first offence
Student Services Centre-based Summary Disciplinary Panel (SDP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All UG or PGT programmes – first and second offences of possessing unauthorised material in centrally administered examinations, based on the divisions outlined in this table.
University Disciplinary Panel (UDP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UG programmes levels 4, 5 and CPD – third (or further) offences • UG programmes level 6 and above – second (or further) offences • PGT programmes taught element – third (or further) offences • PGT programmes dissertation element – any subsequent offence • PGR taught element – subsequent offence • PGR progression assessment, thesis or viva – first offence • Any student – a significant offence
Head of Research Governance, Ethics and Integrity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Misconduct in research by a student at any level of study if the criteria under section 2.6 has been met.

Cases of poor academic practice should be dealt with at subject area level. See Section 6 below for further guidance.

Where it is alleged that a student has committed significant academic malpractice they will normally be referred to the UDP. In addition to the table under paragraph 5.2, the following may be of consideration in deciding whether a case is significant:

² In cases concerning the University College for Interdisciplinary Learning (“UCIL”), as students studying with UCIL will be from a range of academic Schools, it is deemed that UCIL can operate in the same way as a School for the purpose of detecting and handling cases of academic malpractice in the assessments it oversees.

- The suspected amount of malpractice is a particularly high proportion of the assessment.
- The assessment containing suspected malpractice is high credit bearing and/or important to a student's award or progression.
- It is suspected that multiple assessments in a single assessment period contain academic malpractice.
- The penalty applied in any previous case. If a student has already had the maximum penalty applied for a first offence at summary level, then a second offence may attract a penalty that is open only to the UDP.
- The penalties open to summary level do not reflect the severity of the offence i.e. it is considered that the student's overall degree award should be reduced e.g. from an Honours degree to a Diploma.
- Where there is prima facie evidence of substantial efforts to commit malpractice and avoid detection.
- Where there is prima facie evidence of malpractice extending to already assessed work i.e. malpractice that was previously undetected.

If an offence relates to multiple students, but for one or more students it is a second offence, then all students should be treated at the same level as the second offence. Having, or not having, a previous offence on file can be taken into account in the application of a penalty.

As per the Procedure for Summary Disciplinary Panels, it is recommended that for SDPs considering first-offence allegations of academic malpractice, they comprise at least two persons, with the Chair being a Senior Lecturer (or above) or an academic with equivalent experience. Where an allegation relates to a second offence, given the penalty applied might be higher and the consequences more severe, it is recommended that the panel is extended to three persons.

Examples:

1. A student has a first offence of academic malpractice on file for plagiarism from their first year. This was dealt with by a School-based SDP. A second offence arises, but this relates to unauthorised material in a second year examination; this is dealt with by a Student Services Centre-based SDP.
2. A student has a first offence on file relating to unauthorised material that was dealt with by an Student Services Centre-based SDP. A second offence of academic malpractice (plagiarism) arises and so this is dealt with by a Faculty-based SDP.
3. A Postgraduate Taught student is believed to have committed substantial plagiarism in a high credit bearing piece of work (dissertation). Although it is a first offence, the malpractice is considered to be significant and so is referred to the UDP.
4. Three level 5 Undergraduate students are believed to have colluded in a piece of work. One of the students has a previous offence of malpractice on file. The Faculty-based SDP differentiate the penalties applied, with the student who had a first offence on file, receiving a higher penalty.

Related procedures:

- Procedure for Summary Disciplinary Panels (<http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=42773>)
- Procedure for the University Disciplinary Panel (<http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=42774>)

6. Process to follow when Academic Malpractice is Discovered or Suspected³

In all cases where a marker (particularly one who is inexperienced or a Teaching Assistant) suspects that academic malpractice has been committed or that work has been plagiarised, they should discuss the case with the Course Unit Director and/or UG Assessment Coordinator/PGT Director before taking any further action.

If their suspicions are confirmed, markers should compile, in a timely manner, the following documents and send them to the Course Unit Director (if not you) and the UG Assessment Coordinator/PGT Director:

- I. A marked up copy of the student's Turnitin originality report. (See [Guidance for Staff on Interpreting Turnitin Originality Reports](#))

The first marker must adhere to the following procedures when marking up/annotating coursework:

- underline the plagiarised passages in the essay in pen;
- annotate the written work so it is clear whether the material has been copied word for word or lightly reworded (you may wish to use the abbreviations '**WFW**' and '**LW**');
- identify the main sources from which the student has copied and underline the plagiarised passages, inserting cross references to the piece of assessed work (e.g. "**Source 1, Page 2, WFW**").

The work **must not** be formally marked at this stage. The first marker should record a pre-penalty mark on the SALC Academic Malpractice Referral form, indicating that this is the notional mark that the piece of work would receive if there was no plagiarism present. If the marker considers that it is not possible to mark the work due to the nature or extent of the malpractice, this fact should be noted instead of a mark being recorded on the Referral form.

A mark of 0 should be noted on GradeMark and the feedback must include the information that the piece of work has been referred to the Authorised University Officer to review the suspected case of malpractice.

- II. A scan or photocopy of the marked-up source text that has been plagiarised by the student, based on the academic judgement of the marker.
- III. A completed SALC School-based Summary Disciplinary Panel form (see Appendix 3 below).

NB: The UG Assessment Coordinator/PGT Director is ultimately responsible for referring all of the above paperwork to the Teaching and Learning Assessment Coordinator for processing.

The AUO (Authorised University Office; See Section 4.) responsible for assessing the allegation should gather any information that may be relevant. In particular, they should enquire as to whether a student has any previous offences for academic malpractice. This information is usually retained in the student's School record. This will assist the AUO in

³ Any reference to a named member of staff within this document should also be read as a reference to an equivalent role/title and/or delegated nominee.

determining whether a case can be heard by a Summary Disciplinary Panel (“SDP”) a, or if the case should be referred to the University Disciplinary Panel (“UDP”).

The detection of academic malpractice will not normally lead to the review of a student’s previous assessments, unless there is a reasonable suspicion that they may contain malpractice. If this is the case, prior to a disciplinary hearing, the AUO may review previous pieces assessments, but this will not normally extend to assessments outside the student’s current level of study.

7. Process for Dealing with Academic Malpractice and Poor Practice at UG Level

7.1 If poor academic practice is discovered at any UG Level.

The marker should explain in their written feedback why the work falls below the standards required, remind the student about the expected academic conventions and require the student to make an appointment with the marker to discuss the outcomes further. The poor practice itself should be penalised through the assessment criteria, which explicitly mention the need to adhere to the preferred academic and referencing conventions (footnotes, bibliography, etc.).

7.2 If academic malpractice is discovered or suspected at UG levels 4, 5 and CPD (first offence)

- 1) The work must be marked up/annotated (see guidance in Section 4 above) by the first marker and sent to the subject area Assessment Coordinator to confirm that the case needs to be handled at a formal malpractice hearing. The work should not be formally marked at this stage, but the first marker should record a pre-penalty mark on the Academic Malpractice Referral form. A mark of 0 should be noted on GradeMark.
- 2) The Assessment Coordinator sends the annotated work and referral form to the T&L Assessment Coordinator for consideration by the Authorised University Officer who decides where the case should be handled.

Information about whether the offence is a first, second, third or further should be provided by the School T&L Assessment Coordinator to the Authorised University Officer.

If the decision of the Authorised University Officer is that a School-based SDP hearing must be convened:

- 3) The T&L Assessment Coordinator invites the student in writing to attend a **School-based Summary Disciplinary Panel** hearing with a subject area Assessment Coordinator, a Chair and the School T&L Assessment Coordinator.⁴ The marked-up work must be sent to the student along with the meeting invitation, as must a link to the [Academic Malpractice Procedure](#). The student must be given at least 5 working days’ advance notice of the hearing. Wherever possible, meetings should not be scheduled during formal examination periods. The invitation must include:
 - a) details of the alleged breach(s) of misconduct;
 - b) details of the time, date and place of the hearing;

⁴ The first marker (or person who made the allegation of malpractice) must not be a member of a disciplinary panel, but they may be involved to the extent that they can give evidence to the panel

- c) details of their right to be accompanied to the hearing;
 - d) details of their right to call witnesses, to question those or other witnesses and to submit documentary evidence and/or a statement for consideration;
 - e) copies of, or access to, the documentation which may be referred to during the hearing; and
 - f) a copy of, or access to, this procedure.
- 4) The T&L Assessment Coordinator provides hard copies of the papers for all Panel members.

7.3 If academic malpractice is suspected at UG levels 4, 5 and CPD (second offence)

If the suspected case is a student's second offence, it **must** be referred to **Faculty-based Summary Disciplinary Panel**, regardless of the extent of the malpractice.

- 1) The work must be marked up/annotated (see guidance in Section 4 above) by the first marker and sent to the subject area Assessment Coordinator to confirm that the case needs to be handled at a formal malpractice hearing. The work should not be formally marked at this stage, but the first marker should record a pre-penalty mark on the Academic Malpractice Referral form. A mark of 0 should be noted on GradeMark.
- 2) The Assessment Coordinator sends the annotated work and referral form to the T&L Assessment Coordinator for consideration by the Authorised University Officer who decides where the case should be handled.

Information about whether the offence is a first, second, third or further should be provided by the School T&L Assessment Coordinator to the Authorised University Officer.

If the decision of the Authorised University Officer is that a formal Faculty hearing must be convened:

- 3) The T&L Assessment Coordinator informs the student that the case will be handled by a Faculty-based SDP.
- 4) Academic referring the case writes a short statement for the Faculty referral.

7.4 If academic malpractice is suspected at UG levels 4, 5 and CPD (third or further offence)

If the suspected case is a student's third or further offence, it **must** be referred to the **University Disciplinary Panel**, regardless of the extent of the malpractice. The subject area Assessment Coordinator is the first person to whom the work should be referred.

- 1) The work must be marked up/annotated (see guidance in Section 4 above) by the first marker and sent to the subject area Assessment Coordinator to confirm that the case needs to be handled at a formal malpractice hearing. The work should not be formally marked at this stage, but the first marker should record a pre-penalty mark on the Academic Malpractice Referral form. A mark of 0 should be noted on GradeMark.
- 2) The Assessment Coordinator sends the annotated work and referral form to the T&L Assessment Coordinator for consideration by the Authorised University Officer who formally decides where the case should be handled.

Information about whether the offence is a first, second, third or further should be provided by the School T&L Assessment Coordinator to the Authorised University Officer.

If the decision of the Authorised University Officer is that a formal University hearing must be convened:

- 3) The T&L Assessment Coordinator informs the student that the case will be handled at a University Disciplinary Panel hearing.
- 4) Academic referring the case writes a short statement for the University referral.

7.5 If academic malpractice is discovered or suspected at UG level 6 and above (first offence)

Even if the suspected case is a student's first offence, it **must** be referred to **Faculty-based Summary Disciplinary Panel**, regardless of the extent of the malpractice. The subject area Assessment Coordinator is the first person to whom the work should be referred.

- 1) The work must be marked up/annotated (see guidance in Section 4 above) by the first marker and sent to the subject area Assessment Coordinator to confirm that the case needs to be handled at a formal malpractice hearing. The work should not be formally marked at this stage, but the first marker should record a pre-penalty mark on the Academic Malpractice Referral form. A mark of 0 should be noted on GradeMark.
- 2) The Assessment Coordinator sends the annotated work and referral form to the T&L Assessment Coordinator for consideration by the Authorised University Officer who decides where the case should be handled.

Information about whether the offence is a first, second, third or further should be provided by the School T&L Assessment Coordinator to the Authorised University Officer.

If the decision of the Authorised University Officer is that a formal Faculty hearing must be convened:

- 3) The T&L Assessment Coordinator informs the student that the case will be handled at a Faculty-based SDP.
- 4) Academic referring the case writes a short statement for the Faculty referral.

7.6 If academic malpractice is discovered at Levels 6 (second offence)

If the suspected case is a student's second offence, it **must** be referred to the **University Disciplinary Panel**, regardless of the extent of the malpractice. The subject area Assessment Coordinator is the first person to whom the work should be referred.

- 5) The work must be marked up/annotated (see guidance in Section 4 above) by the first marker and sent to the subject area Assessment Coordinator to confirm that the case needs to be handled at a formal malpractice hearing. The work should not be formally marked at this stage, but the first marker should record a pre-penalty mark on the Academic Malpractice Referral form. A mark of 0 should be noted on GradeMark.
- 6) The Assessment Coordinator sends the annotated work and referral form to the T&L Assessment Coordinator for consideration by the Authorised University Officer who decides where the case should be handled.

Information about whether the offence is a first, second, third or further should be provided by the School T&L Assessment Coordinator to the Authorised University Officer.

If the decision of the Authorised University Officer is that a formal University hearing must be convened:

- 7) The T&L Assessment Coordinator informs the student that the case will be handled at a University Disciplinary Panel.
- 8) Academic referring the case writes a short statement for the University referral.
- 9) Panel members are expected to ensure familiarity with case documentation before the Panel hearing.

8. Process for Dealing with Academic Malpractice and Poor Practice at PGT Level

8.1 If poor academic practice is discovered at PGT level

The marker should explain in their written feedback why the work falls below the standards required, remind the student about the expected academic conventions and require the student to make an appointment with the marker to discuss the outcomes further. The poor practice itself should be penalised through the assessment criteria, which explicitly mention the need to adhere to the preferred academic and referencing conventions (footnotes, bibliography, etc.).

8.2 If academic malpractice (including plagiarism) is discovered or suspected and it is a first offence⁵ in the PGT taught element of the programme

The case must be referred to a **School-based Summary Disciplinary Panel**. The relevant Masters Programme Director is the first person to whom the work is referred. The following process applies:

- 1) The work must be marked up/annotated (see guidance in Section 4 above) by the first marker and sent to the Programme Director to confirm that the case needs to be handled at a formal malpractice hearing. The work should not be formally marked at this stage, but the first marker should record a pre-penalty mark on the Academic Malpractice Referral form. A mark of 0 should be noted on GradeMark.
- 2) The Programme Director sends the annotated work and referral form to the T&L Assessment Coordinator for consideration by the Authorised University Officer who decides where the case should be handled.

Information about whether the offence is a first, second, third or further should be provided by the School T&L Assessment Coordinator to the Authorised University Officer.

If the decision of the Authorised University Officer is that a School-based SDP hearing must be convened:

- 5) The T&L Assessment Coordinator invites the student in writing to attend a School-based Summary Disciplinary Panel hearing with a Chair, an Academic School Officer and the School T&L Assessment Coordinator.⁶ The marked-up work must be sent to the student along with the meeting invitation, as must a link to the [Academic Malpractice Procedure](#). The student must be given at least 5 working days' advance notice of the hearing. Wherever possible, meetings should not be scheduled during formal examination periods. The invitation must include:
 - a) details of the alleged breach(s) of misconduct;
 - b) details of the time, date and place of the hearing;
 - c) details of their right to be accompanied to the hearing;
 - d) details of their right to call witnesses, to question those or other witnesses and to submit documentary evidence and/or a statement for consideration;

⁵ Information about whether the offence is a first or a second one should be provided by the School T&L Assessment Coordinator.

⁶ The first marker (or person who made the allegation of malpractice) must not be a member of a disciplinary panel, but they may be involved to the extent that they can give evidence to the panel

- e) copies of, or access to, the documentation which may be referred to during the hearing; and
a copy of, or access to, this procedure.
- 3) The T&L Assessment Coordinator provides hard copies of the papers for all Panel members.

8.3 If academic malpractice (including plagiarism) is discovered or suspected and it is a second offence⁷ in the PGT taught element of the programme

The case must be referred to a **Faculty-based Summary Disciplinary Panel**. The relevant Masters Programme Director is the first person to whom the work is referred. The following process applies:

- 1) The work must be marked up/annotated (see guidance in Section 4 above) by the first marker and sent to the Programme Director to confirm that the case needs to be handled at a formal malpractice hearing. The work should not be formally marked at this stage, but the first marker should record a pre-penalty mark on the Academic Malpractice Referral form. A mark of 0 should be noted on GradeMark.
- 2) The Programme Director sends the annotated work and referral form to the T&L Assessment Coordinator for consideration by the Authorised University Officer who decides where the case should be handled.

Information about whether the offence is a first, second, third or further should be provided by the School T&L Assessment Coordinator to the Authorised University Officer.

If the decision of the Authorised University Officer is that a formal Faculty-based Summary Disciplinary Panel hearing must be convened:

- 3) The T&L Assessment Coordinator informs the student that the case will be handled at a Faculty-based Summary Disciplinary Panel malpractice hearing.
- 4) Academic referring the case writes a short statement for the Faculty referral.

8.4 If academic malpractice (including plagiarism) is discovered or suspected and it is a third (or further) offence in the PGT taught element of the programme

The case must be referred to a **University Disciplinary Panel**. The relevant Masters Programme Director is the first person to whom the work is referred. The following process applies:

- 1) The work must be marked up/annotated (see guidance in Section 4 above) by the first marker and sent to the Programme Director to confirm that the case needs to be handled at a formal malpractice hearing. The work should not be formally marked at this stage, but the first marker should record a pre-penalty mark on the Academic Malpractice Referral form. A mark of 0 should be noted on GradeMark.
- 2) The Programme Director sends the annotated work and referral form to the T&L Assessment Coordinator.

⁷ Information about whether the offence is a first or a second one should be provided by the School T&L Assessment Coordinator.

Information about whether the offence is a first, second, third or further should be provided by the School T&L Assessment Coordinator to the Authorised University Officer.

If the decision of the Authorised University Officer is that a formal Faculty-based Summary Disciplinary Panel hearing must be convened:

- 3) The T&L Assessment Coordinator informs the student that the case will be handled at a University Disciplinary Panel.
- 4) Academic referring the case writes a short statement for the Faculty referral.

8.5 If academic malpractice (including plagiarism) is discovered or suspected and it is a first offence in the PGT dissertation element of the programme

The case must be referred to a **Faculty-based Summary Disciplinary Panel**. The relevant Masters Programme Director is the first person to whom the work is referred. The following process applies:

- 4) The work must be marked up/annotated (see guidance in Section 4 above) by the first marker and sent to the Programme Director to confirm that the case needs to be handled at a formal malpractice hearing. The work should not be formally marked at this stage, but the first marker should record a pre-penalty mark on the Academic Malpractice Referral form. A mark of 0 should be noted on GradeMark.
- 5) The Programme Director sends the annotated work and referral form to the T&L Assessment Coordinator.

Information about whether the offence is a first, second, third or further should be provided by the School T&L Assessment Coordinator to the Authorised University Officer.

If the decision of the Authorised University Officer is that a formal Faculty-based Summary Disciplinary Panel hearing must be convened:

- 6) The T&L Assessment Coordinator informs the student that the case will be handled at a Faculty-based Summary Disciplinary Panel.
- 4) Academic referring the case writes a short statement for the Faculty referral.

8.6 If academic malpractice (including plagiarism) is discovered or suspected and it is a second or subsequent offence⁸ in the PGT dissertation element of the programme

The case must be referred to a **University Disciplinary Panel**. The relevant Masters Programme Director is the first person to whom the work is referred. The following process applies:

- 1) The work must be marked up/annotated (see guidance in Section 4 above) by the first marker and sent to the Programme Director to confirm that the case needs to be handled at a formal malpractice hearing. The work should not be formally marked at this stage, but the first marker should record a pre-penalty mark on the Academic Malpractice Referral form. A mark of 0 should be noted on GradeMark.

⁸ Information about whether the offence is a first or a second one should be provided by the School T&L Assessment Coordinator.

- 2) The Programme Director sends the annotated work and referral form to the T&L Assessment Coordinator for consideration by the Authorised University Officer:

Information about whether the offence is a first, second, third or further should be provided by the School T&L Assessment Coordinator to the Authorised University Officer.

If the decision of the Authorised University Officer is that a formal Faculty-based Summary Disciplinary Panel hearing must be convened:

- 3) The T&L Assessment Coordinator informs the student that the case will be handled at a University Disciplinary Panel hearing.
- 4) Academic referring the case writes a short statement for the University referral.

9. Disclosure of Mitigating Circumstances

The University's [Guidance on Applying Student Discipline Penalties](#) contains the following statement:

“Mitigating circumstances in the context of student discipline means factors that may cause a Disciplinary Panel to consider applying a lesser penalty. Mitigating circumstances do not justify an offence.

Mitigating circumstances within student discipline are factors that may have had some bearing on the misconduct. They are not necessarily circumstances that have affected a student's academic performance, such as the meaning of mitigating circumstances described under the Policy on Mitigating Circumstances (<http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=4271>) or the Change of Circumstances for Postgraduate Research Students Policy (<http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=8162>). The examples of mitigating circumstances outlined within the policies above may be considered by a Disciplinary Panel as a mitigating circumstance if the Disciplinary Panel considers them to be relevant.

Mitigating circumstances must be unpreventable and unforeseeable and which had a significant effect on the student concerned.

The onus primarily rests with the student to make known, with supporting evidence, to a Disciplinary Panel any circumstances which they believe may warrant consideration. However Disciplinary Panels can enquire with a student's School about any formal requests for mitigation submitted by the student in the period surrounding the misconduct.

In academic malpractice cases Disciplinary Panels should consider whether the student had an opportunity to disclose any mitigating circumstances to their School and request mitigation before an assessment deadline. If they did have such an opportunity but did not submit a request, then the student must have a credible and compelling explanation for why this was not done. If a request for mitigation has been already been submitted by a student and accepted by a Mitigating Circumstances Panel then the Disciplinary Panel should acknowledge that this was the case.

Examination Boards² must implement Disciplinary Panel decisions. If a student has requested mitigation for an assessment which becomes the subject of a malpractice allegation, then mitigation can only be considered by the Disciplinary Panel in the context of penalty setting; it cannot be considered by the Examination Board for the purposes of that

assessment. This does not, however, prevent Examination Boards from applying mitigation to other unaffected assessments or to the assessment in contention provided that the application of mitigation does not remove the disciplinary penalty. For example, if a School permits a student the opportunity to re-sit a semester's assessments at first attempt, but one of the assessments was penalised for academic malpractice, the penalty to the affected assessment will still need to be applied."

If a student discloses mitigating circumstances at (or prior to) the Summary Disciplinary Panel hearing, they should be asked (a) if they applied for mitigating circumstances for the work in question and evidenced them in the normal way, following the established procedures; and (b) if their application was accepted.

If the student *has applied* for mitigating circumstances for the work in question, and the application has been accepted, mitigating circumstances may already have been considered and applied. Since double mitigation cannot be claimed, the issue of mitigating circumstances will be of limited relevance to the Panel's deliberations and decision.

If the student *has applied* for mitigating circumstances for the work in question, and the application was accepted but mitigation has not yet been applied (e.g. due to plagiarism being reported, or where an application has not been accepted), then the Malpractice Panel should take account of the Mitigating Circumstances Panel's decision in this regard when determining the penalty.

If the student *has not applied* for mitigating circumstances for the work in question, they may choose to provide evidence with any statement they wish to submit to the Panel. If evidence is provided, the T&L Assessment Coordinator will send a copy to the SSGO no later than 1 day in advance of the malpractice hearing. The SSGO will review the evidence and advise the T&L Assessment Coordinator as to whether the evidence would be accepted as mitigating circumstances, in line with the University's mitigating circumstances policy and procedures. At this stage it will be important for the student to provide a compelling reason as to why they did not apply for mitigating circumstances at the appropriate time, in line with School procedures. The School Malpractice Panel will consider the evidence provided before a decision on any penalty is made. If the student does not provide evidence in advance of the malpractice hearing, and discloses mitigating circumstances during the hearing, the student may be advised that they need to present any previously undisclosed mitigating circumstances as part of an outcome disciplinary appeal to the Teaching and Learning Support Office.

If the student's mitigating circumstances are likely to impact on future assessments, the student should be advised to apply for consideration in the normal way via the Student Support and Guidance Office (SSGO). The SSGO can also offer general support and advice, as well as referral to the Disability Advice and Support Service (DASS), if appropriate.

10. Procedure for Summary Disciplinary Panels (“SDP”)

10.1 General

Sections 6 and 7 of Regulation XVII (Conduct and Discipline of Students) (<http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=6530>) (the “Regulation”) permit certain members of the University (Authorised University Officers (“AUO”) and Summary Disciplinary Panels (“SDPs”) to consider allegations of less-serious misconduct. This procedure sets out the processes which the University will follow in connection with such allegations. Less serious misconduct is explained in more detail in Appendix Two.

11. at the School-based SDP Hearing

- 1) Meeting takes place with
 - UG: the Chair, subject area Assessment Coordinator, and the School T&L Assessment Coordinator (or representative) as Secretary
 - PG: the Chair, relevant Masters Programme Director and the School T&L Assessment Coordinator (or representative) as Secretary
- 2) The Chair will clarify any procedures with Panel members before the student is admitted. Particulars of the case must not be discussed before the student is present.
- 3) Chair introduces the Panel members; anyone accompanying the student (friend/supporter) is also asked to introduce him/herself.
- 4) Chair explains that the secretary will take notes, and these will be summarised in the outcome letter
- 5) Student asked to confirm that they understand why they have been invited to the hearing.
- 6) Chair explains the purpose of the hearing: (i) to consider whether or not the student has committed an act of academic malpractice, and (ii) if the student is in breach of the regulations, to consider the seriousness of the offence and to set an appropriate penalty.
- 7) Chair makes the student aware of the cause for concern regarding their work (i.e explains the allegation), citing relevant evidence (e.g. Turnitin originality report, concerns expressed during the initial marking process, etc.).
- 8) Student asked to confirm that they have received a copy of the marked-up work and that it is theirs.
- 9) Chair asks the student if they understand what academic malpractice (plagiarism) is, and if they have received information about this in course handbooks, seminars/tutorials, etc.
- 10) Chair confirms whether or not student has submitted a written statement to the Panel.
- 11) Panel allows the student the opportunity to state their case and explain the process of writing the piece of work and any relevant circumstances surrounding the writing of the piece of work
- 12) The Panel can ask relevant questions that they may have about the work in question. It may be helpful to ask the student to describe the source materials they used, and

their methods of researching, drafting, composing and proofreading their coursework essays

- 13) If necessary, the Chair should clarify whether or not the student admits to an act of academic malpractice.
- 14) Ask the Panel members if they have any further questions.
- 15) Ask the student if they have anything further to add.
- 16) Student (and anyone accompanying them) to leave the meeting and wait outside whilst the Panel considers the case.
- 17) Panel discusses the textual evidence and the oral evidence given by the student to decide if malpractice has been committed, taking into account whether the student admitted the offence. The Chair should ensure that the Panel takes the following factors into consideration when determining an appropriate penalty:
 - a. The student's level of study: the more advanced and experienced the student, the more serious the offence.
 - b. The proportion of the piece of work that was subject to malpractice: the higher the proportion, the more serious the offence.
 - c. The credit rating of the piece of work: the higher the rating, the more serious the offence.
 - d. The student's previous history: a second offence, occurring after a student has already received a warning or a penalty for academic malpractice, is more serious than a first offence.
 - e. The degree of intention to deceive in the piece of work in question (which might be assessed by, for example, efforts to change wording, poor referencing or lack of referencing of plagiarised material, evidence from earlier drafts) and also in the hearing itself by failure to tell the truth.
- 18) If the offence is admitted or proven, the SDP will apply one or more of the appropriate penalties from the following list:

(a) A reprimand and warning about future behaviour;

The warning serves as a reminder of the University's conduct expectations. A warning may be disclosed and seen as an aggravating factor should a student be found in breach of the Regulation on a future occasion.

(b) A requirement upon the student to apologise for the misconduct to those who may have been affected by it.

This should be imposed where a student's misconduct has affected anyone. The apology will usually take the form of a written statement. The student should be advised in the disciplinary outcome letter that the statement need not be substantial in length but it should:

- i. *Acknowledge the misconduct.*
- ii. *Accept responsibility for the misconduct.*
- iii. *Explain clearly why the misconduct happened.*
- iv. *Express sincere regret for the misconduct.*
- v. *Set out any steps the student will take to learn from the misconduct and avoid it happening again in the future.*

(c) A requirement for the student to undertake appropriate training related to the misconduct.

All students found guilty should be referred to the SALC Writing Tutor and therefore receive this penalty.

(d) For any penalty available to be deferred and only imposed should any future breach of the Regulation occur.

This will allow a Disciplinary Panel to specify a penalty within its remit, but not require it to be immediately applied. However, if a student is found to have breached the Regulation in the future, the penalty will be applied by the subsequent Disciplinary Panel, regardless of whether or not the subsequent offence was of the same nature as the first offence.

Example: *a second year student is found to have committed academic malpractice in an assignment worth 100% of a 20 credit unit. The Disciplinary Panel consider that the student should receive a mark reduction of 20% for the assignment, but that based on the information available to them, the Disciplinary Panel agree that it would be proportionate to defer the mark reduction and for the assignment to receive a mark as per the usual marking process. If a future offence arises, the mark reduction will be applied to the assignment alongside the penalty for the future offence.*

(e) The examining authority will be informed the mark for the piece of work or assessment should be reduced to a specified mark.

Disciplinary Panels are empowered to direct the mark to be awarded to a student for an assessment in which malpractice has been found to exist. The reduction is for the Disciplinary Panel to specify. For example, a Disciplinary Panel may direct that a mark of 62% for a piece of coursework is reduced by 20 percentage points to reflect the amount of plagiarism found in the coursework; the student's mark for the coursework is therefore recorded as 42%.

(f) A recorded mark of zero for the examination paper or other assessed work in which unfair practice occurred. Should a re-assessment/resubmission opportunity be available this will, if passed, be capped at the lowest compensatable pass mark.

A mark of zero in this context only applies to a single examination paper or piece of coursework, although the penalty will apply to a full unit where the unit is only evaluated by the one assessment. This is a common penalty for first offences of academic malpractice. The Disciplinary Panel should consider whether the student has an opportunity for reassessment (or resubmission). If they do, then the student will be able to undertake the reassessment as directed by their academic School. This will allow the student an opportunity to gain the credit for the assessment and obtain the lowest compensatable pass mark e.g. 30%. If a re-assessment opportunity is unavailable (e.g. academic malpractice has occurred in a reassessment or resubmission, or this is denied through the application of penalty 2.8) then the student will lose the credit for the piece of work. For final year undergraduates, re-assessment opportunities do not usually exist. Such students may receive compensation in up to 40 credits in failed assessments. Final year students can therefore receive compensation for assessments in which a penalty is applied. Example One: A student in their third and final year of a law degree (with honours) is found to have plagiarised an element of their coursework (worth 50%) of a 20 credit unit. The student 4 receives a penalty of mark of zero. As a re-assessment opportunity does not exist because the student is in their final year, then the student will receive compensation for the affected assessment.

(g) A recorded mark of zero for the course unit(s) in which the unfair practice occurred. Should a re-assessment/resubmission opportunity be available it will, if passed, be capped at the lowest compensatable pass mark.

A mark of zero in this context applies to the full unit. Even if the malpractice relates only to one component of assessment, the penalty will apply accordingly to all assessments within the unit. See penalty (f) for explanation around re-assessment.

Penalty **(c)** should be applied to any student found guilty.

A recommendation may be made to the final exam board for which: penalty **(g)** may be imposed 'without loss of credit' in circumstances where it is judged that the penalty would otherwise have a disproportionate consequence.

The Chair should ensure that each penalty is given consideration.

When determining the penalty to be imposed, the Panel will take account of the consequences which the penalty will have for the student's academic progress. An outline of each penalty consequence can be found in Section G of the SDP referral form (Appendix 14.2.1).

- 19)** Student invited back into the meeting. Ask the student (and anyone accompanying them) to return and inform the student of the Panel's decision and any penalty. If the offence has been admitted or proven, the Chair should remind the student that academic malpractice (plagiarism) is taken extremely seriously, and that serious penalties could be applied if the student were to commit further acts of academic malpractice.
- 20)** Chair informs the student that they will receive a formal record of the Panel's decision. This will be in a letter, normally within 5 working days.
- 21)** Chair informs the student that they have the right to appeal against the decision of the Panel, and the details of the grounds permissible and the process will be set out in the letter
- 22)** Student thanked for attending the hearing. Hearing concludes.

12. After the SDP:

- 1) Chair will confirm the outcome of the panel with the T&L Assessment Coordinator.
- 2) T&L Assessment Coordinator will prepare the formal letter (referred to under set 19 above) informing of the student of the hearing outcome. The letter should be in PDF format, date-stamped to when the letter was sent to the student and password protected with the student's ID number. This should happen whether or not the student attended the hearing. The letter must inform the student of their right to appeal and the process to follow should they wish to appeal. The letter will be reviewed by the Chair, and will normally be sent to the student within 5 working days of the hearing. All panel members should be copied into this correspondence with the student.
- 3) Academic Malpractice spreadsheet updated by T&L Assessment Coordinator and minutes (if applicable) of the hearing saved in the appropriate folder within one week of the hearing.
- 4) Relevant administrators, course unit directors and assessment coordinators made aware of grade changes, resubmission deadlines, etc.

Failure to Attend: If the student fails to attend the Summary Disciplinary Panel hearing, for whatever reason, the hearing should go ahead as planned and a decision be made on the evidence available to the Panel. If the student makes a prior request to delay/postpone the hearing, such requests should be facilitated wherever possible.

13. Summary Disciplinary Panel hearing Schedule

When malpractice referrals are submitted in semester 1, the hearing will be held in semester 1 as long as the case is submitted by the third week of November. Where semester 1 cases are submitted after the third week of November, the hearings will take place as soon after the January exam period as possible.

When malpractice cases are submitted in semester 2, a hearing will be arranged as soon as possible (normally within four weeks of the submission of the case, but can be up to six weeks).

When malpractice referrals are submitted during the May/June exam period or shortly after, a hearing will be arranged as soon as possible to stay within term time. If it is not possible to hold the hearing within term time, the student can attend by skype or telephone or the hearing can be delayed until the August assessment period.

14. Appendices

14.1. Communications to Students

14.1.1 Letter of notification to student of referral to Faculty-based SDP or UDP

Subject Line: Notification of suspected academic malpractice



The University of Manchester

School of Arts, Languages and Cultures

Joel Loufi
Teaching and Learning Assessment Coordinator
S3.10, Samuel Alexander Building
School of Arts, Languages and Cultures
University of Manchester
Oxford Road
Manchester M13 9PL

Email: joel.loufi@manchester.ac.uk
Direct Line: 0161 275 3014

Tuesday, 03 December 2019

By email to: xxx

PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL

Dear Name

It has come to light during the marking process that assessed work you submitted for insert course unit code and title appears to contain elements of academic malpractice. As this is your second/third offence at UG/PGT Level 4/5/6/7, under Regulation XVII, you are being referred to the Faculty-based Summary Disciplinary Panel / University Disciplinary Panel.

A colleague from the Faculty-based Summary Disciplinary Panel / University Disciplinary Panel will be in touch soon with details of your hearing.

Your case will be dealt with in accordance with *Regulation XVII - Conduct and Discipline of Students*, a copy of which is enclosed. I also enclose copies of *Guidance to Students on Plagiarism and other forms of Academic Malpractice*, together with the *Academic Malpractice: Procedure for the Handling of Cases* and *The Purpose of the Academic Malpractice Panel*. It is your responsibility to read these documents before the hearing.

Should you require any counselling support following receipt of this invitation, then you may wish to approach the University's Counselling Service: <http://www.counsellingservice.manchester.ac.uk/>.

Yours sincerely,



Joel Louffi
Teaching and Learning Assessment Coordinator

CC.
Assessment Coordinator
Panel members
Course Unit Director
Admin Coordinator

14.1.2 Letter of invitation to School-based Summary Disciplinary Panel Hearing

Subject Line: Letter of invitation to School-based Summary Disciplinary Panel Hearing



The University of Manchester

School of Arts, Languages and Cultures

Joel Loufi
Teaching and Learning Assessment Coordinator
S3.10, Samuel Alexander Building
School of Arts, Languages and Cultures
University of Manchester
Oxford Road
Manchester M13 9PL

Email: joel.loufi@manchester.ac.uk
Direct Line: 0161 275 3014

Tuesday, 03 December 2019

By email to: xxx

PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL

Dear **NAME**

Invitation to School-based Summary Disciplinary Panel (SDP) Hearing

1. Background

It has come to light during the marking process that assessed work you submitted for **insert course unit code and title** appears to contain elements of academic malpractice. [Regulation XVII](#) states that cases of suspected academic malpractice must be heard at a School-based Summary Disciplinary Panel hearing, at which your attendance is requested.

I enclose marked-up copies of the assignment where academic malpractice has been suspected and relevant extracts from the source(s) in question.

Your case will be dealt with in accordance with *Regulation XVII - Conduct and Discipline of Students*, a copy of which is enclosed. I also enclose copies of *Guidance to Students on Plagiarism and other forms of Academic Malpractice*, together with the *Academic Malpractice: Procedure for the Handling of Cases* and *The Purpose of the Academic Malpractice Panel*. It is your responsibility to read these documents before the hearing.

2. Process and arrangements

The matter will be considered on behalf of the Head of School of Arts, Languages and Cultures by a School-based Summary Disciplinary Panel (SDP). The Panel will consist of a Chair, a

subject area Assessment Coordinator and the School Teaching & Learning Assessment Coordinator (or representative).

The hearing will take place at 0.00am/pm (UK time) on insert day and date in insert room number and location (<http://www.manchester.ac.uk/discover/maps/interactive-map/>)

The meeting is compulsory and it is expected that you will attend in person. However, there may be measures we can put in place to allow you to participate in the meeting remotely. A student who does not attend or participate, without good reason, will have the allegation against them considered in their absence.

The SDP can require attendance at the hearing a Case Presenter to outline the allegation. However, it is hoped that as the hearing is at a summary level, and relates to a potentially non-complex issue, the hearing can proceed on the basis of the documentary material already available as this should set out the matter in contention in sufficient detail. If you believe that there is someone you think needs to be present at the hearing or otherwise input sought from (e.g. a witness) beyond the material supplied, please do let me know. Please note that whilst the SDP may give an outline of the case at the meeting, it is not the SDP which is making the allegation.

Whether or not you attend the hearing, you may submit a written statement and supporting documentary evidence to me, the Teaching and Learning Assessment Coordinator, prior to the hearing. Additionally, if you believe that there are witnesses to the matter in question, then you could include with your statement, any supplementary statements you have also collected. Your statement and supporting evidence must reach me no later than 2 working days before the date of the malpractice hearing.

You are entitled to ask a friend, fellow student, member of University staff or an advisor from the Students' Union Advice Service to accompany you at the meeting (Supporter). If someone is attending the hearing with you, please share with them the enclosed copy of the *Guidance for supporters of students attending disciplinary hearings ("Supporter")*. Please note that the person attending with you is not present to state your case; the Panel will want to hear from you in your own words.

If you have any queries about the process, or wish for a reasonable adjustment to the process to be considered due to a disability for which you are registered with the Disability Advisory and Support Service, then please do let me know. Any such requests will be considered by the SDP Chair and/or Secretary, in consultation with the DASS as required.

If the Panel finds that academic malpractice (including plagiarism) has taken place, it may impose one of the following penalties:

- (a) A reprimand and warning about future behaviour;
- (b) A requirement upon the student to apologise for the misconduct to those who may have been affected by it.
- (c) A requirement for the student to undertake appropriate training related to the misconduct.
- (d) For any penalty available to be deferred and only imposed should any future breach of the Regulation occur.
- (e) The examining authority will be informed the mark for the piece of work or assessment should be reduced to a specified mark.

(f) A recorded mark of zero for the examination paper or other assessed work in which unfair practice occurred. Should a re-assessment/resubmission opportunity be available this will, if passed, be capped at the lowest compensatable pass mark.

(g) A recorded mark of zero for the course unit(s) in which the unfair practice occurred. Should a re-assessment/resubmission opportunity be available it will, if passed, be capped at the lowest compensatable pass mark.

When determining the penalty to be imposed, the Panel will take account of the consequences which the penalty will have for your academic progress.

3. Next steps

At least two working days prior to the hearing, you must have e-mailed me to:

- Confirm your attendance and who might be accompanying you.
- Submit any statement (and supporting material) that you wish to be considered.
- Request any reasonable adjustment to the proceedings (applicable for DASS registered students only).

The information disclosed as part of the hearing should remain confidential to those who are a party to it or have a legitimate need-to-know e.g. for the purpose of putting the Regulation into effect. The information should only be disclosed outside of the meeting for the purpose of obtaining advice from a designated supporter and if you decide to pursue any appeal options following the SDP hearing.

Please note that any discussions about the case itself should be directed to a supporter (see above).

Should you require any counselling support following receipt of this invitation, then you may wish to approach the University's Counselling Service: <http://www.counsellingservice.manchester.ac.uk/>.

Yours sincerely,



Joel Loutfi
Teaching and Learning Assessment Coordinator
School of Arts, Languages and Cultures

CC.

Panel members
UG Assessment Coordinator or PGT Director
Course Unit Director
Programme Administrator

14.1.3 Letter setting out the outcome of the School-based Summary Disciplinary Panel Hearing

Subject Line: Outcome of your School-based Summary Disciplinary Panel Hearing



The University of Manchester

School of Arts, Languages and Cultures

Joel Loutfi
Teaching and Learning Assessment Coordinator
S3.10, Samuel Alexander Building
School of Arts, Languages and Cultures
University of Manchester
Oxford Road
Manchester M13 9PL

Email: joel.loutfi@manchester.ac.uk
Direct Line: 0161 275 3014

Name

Date

By email: xxx

PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL

Dear Name

I am writing to inform you of the outcome of the recent School-based Summary Disciplinary Panel hearing, held on **insert date** at **time**. The hearing was established in accordance with *Regulation XVII - Conduct and Discipline of Students* to consider an allegation of academic malpractice in the above course unit.

The Panel comprised of **title and name** (Chair), **title and name** (Assessment Coordinator) and myself in the capacity of Teaching and Learning Assessment Coordinator ("the Panel").

The Panel noted that the assignment was worth **XX%** of this **XX** credit unit. **The Panel noted that you had / had not submitted a personal statement.**

The allegation was that you had **taken material from a number of sources without adequate citation or referencing. Your assignment and marked up copies of the sources in contention were circulated prior to the hearing.** The following sources were circulated:

- Source 1 was a paper by **NAME (date) title**. **Multiple sentences and paragraphs appear to have been taken from this source without attribution; you did / did not cite the source in your bibliography.**

In your statement, you explained that

During our telephone discussion,

During the hearing, you explained that

The Panel's decision

The Panel decided that you were guilty of plagiarism / self-plagiarism / collusion / fabrication / falsification in that you had not **XXXXXXXXXX**.

Example:

"The Panel found that there was clear evidence of malpractice (plagiarism) in the Project, as large sections of Sources 1, 2 and 3 had been reproduced verbatim without any attempt made to reference either within the text of the assignment, or in the bibliography. There was no acknowledgement the sources in contention"

Mitigating Circumstances

Detail any circumstances the student presented at the hearing and whether or not the Panel considered a more lenient penalty was appropriate in light of the circumstances presented. If the circumstances did not warrant a more lenient penalty, explain why

Example

(e.g. "At the hearing you explained how you had to meet a number of deadlines and that you were under time pressure to complete the assignment. The Panel did not consider that a lack of time constituted a mitigating circumstance and did not justify academic malpractice. The Panel did not consider that a more lenient penalty should be applied in light of these circumstances.")

The penalty

State penalty applied here

Explain the factors the Panel took into account when determining the penalty to apply. The factors Panels should consider are:

- The student's level of study and time spent at the University; the more advanced the student, the more aggravated the offence.
- The scale of the offence; the more work or people affected, the more aggravated the offence.
- The student's previous history; a subsequent offence, when a student has already been through a formal disciplinary process in the past, is more serious than a first offence. Note: where a student is known to have committed an offence during a previous programme of study, the later offence will not be viewed as a subsequent one, but the student having been through the disciplinary process before may be an aggravating factor in setting a penalty.
- Whether the student exhibited any intent to deceive, such as in a piece of academic work or in the hearing itself. These are aggravating factors.
- Whether the student has shown any remorse, contrition or insight. These may mitigate any penalty applied.
- Whether the student has been open and transparent e.g. in accepting the allegation.

- Whether there any other mitigating factors of a personal nature that have been established by the student.
- The necessity to protect other members of the University.
- The effect of the penalty on the student's intended progression on their programme.
- Any action that may have been taken which has already penalised the student e.g. a court conviction, eviction from their halls of residence, should be considered in its determination of a penalty.

Impact of the penalty

State here the Panel's intentions in terms of the impact of the penalty on progression / degree awarded / achievement / classification

I have to warn you that any future offence of academic malpractice may result in your case being referred to a Faculty-based Summary Disciplinary Panel or University Disciplinary Panel, which have a wider range of penalties available to them. General study skills advice can be found on the University's website at:

<http://www.studentsupport.manchester.ac.uk/study-support/academic-support/>

Right to Appeal

This now concludes the Summary Disciplinary Panel's consideration of your disciplinary case under Regulation XVII (Conduct and Discipline of Students).

You may appeal (see Regulation XVII, Section 8) against this outcome by submitting a written statement on the form found at:

<http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=37759>

The form should be sent for the attention of the Head of Division of Teaching, Learning and Student Development, either in hard copy to the John Owens Building, University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester, M13 9PL, or electronically to appealsandcomplaints@manchester.ac.uk. A copy of this letter should also be submitted with the appeal.

Please note that appeals can only be made on one or more of the following grounds:

- procedural irregularity in the operation of the disciplinary process of such a nature as to cause reasonable doubt as to whether the decision might have been different had the irregularity not occurred;
- availability of new evidence which could not reasonably have been expected to be presented at an earlier stage;
- the disproportionate nature of the penalty

Appeals must be submitted within 10 working days from the date of this letter, and should include all of the information that you wish to be considered with the appeal.

You may wish to seek guidance on the appeals process from the University of Manchester Students' Union Advice Service: <https://manchesterstudentsunion.com/advice>

Yours sincerely,



Joel Loutfi
Teaching and Learning Assessment Coordinator
School of Arts, Languages and Cultures

CC.
Assessment Coordinator
Panel members
Course Unit Director
Admin Coordinator

14.2. Forms and templates

14.2.1 School-based Summary Disciplinary Panel Referral Form

**FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
SCHOOL OF ARTS, LANGUAGES AND CULTURES
INFORMATION FOR SCHOOL-BASED SUMMARY DISCIPLINARY PANELS**

Please note that this form should be completed for any referral made to your subject area Assessment Coordinator/PGT Director, even if the referral is returned to the marker for penalising through the marking (poor practice)

SECTION A – STUDENT DETAILS	
Surname	
First Name(s)	
University ID Number	
Email Address	

SECTION B – PROGRAMME/COURSE UNIT DETAILS	
Programme	
PGT/UG	
Current Year of Study <i>(i. e. Year 1, 2, 3 etc.)</i>	
Current Level of Study <i>(i.e. Level 4, 5, 6 or 7)</i>	
September 2012 Regulations	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Title of Course Unit	
Course Number	
Credit Rating	
Weighting of Assessment <i>(e.g. Exam 50%, C/w essay 50%)</i> Note: Include all assessed components and their weightings, and highlight the affected component.	

SECTION C – DETAILS OF ALLEGED MALPRACTICE	
Estimated Proportion of Assessment that is subject to Malpractice	
Turnitin Report Included	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

Statement on the nature of the academic malpractice found in the assessed work:

SECTION D – REFERRAL PROCESS TO SCHOOL

Date of submission of work		
Marker who discovered issue	<i>name</i>	<i>date</i>
CUD who confirmed issue and referral to Assessment Coordinator/ PGT Director	<i>name</i>	<i>date</i>
AC/PGT D responsible for SA	<i>name</i>	<i>date</i>
AC/ PGT D confirm malpractice or poor practice	malpractice	poor practice
Date of referral to Authorised University Officer		
Decision of Authorised University Officer	<i>decision</i>	<i>date</i>

SECTION F – ATTACHMENTS

Please check where attached:

- The Student's piece(s) of work cross referenced to Sources
- Cross referenced Source(s)
- Turnitin Report (if not used for the cross-referencing)

Any other relevant information

SECTION G – ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE TRAINING

Please note the details of any Academic Malpractice training/information received by the student:

SECTION H – CONSEQUENCES OF PENALTIES (Admin)

Regulation penalty reference	Penalty Text	Effect of the penalty
(a)	a reprimand and warning about future behaviour	
(b)	A requirement upon the student to apologise for the misconduct to those who may have been affected by it	
(c)	A requirement for the student to undertake appropriate training related to the misconduct.	
(d)	For any penalty to be deferred and only imposed should a future breach of the Regulation occur.	
(e)	The examining authority will be informed the mark for the piece of work or assessment should be reduced.	
(f)	A recorded mark of zero for the examination paper or other assessed work in which unfair practice occurred. Should a re-assessment/resubmission opportunity be available then this will, if passed, be capped	

	at the lowest compensatable pass mark.	
(g)	A recorded mark of zero for the course unit(s) in which unfair practice occurred. Should a re-assessment/resubmission opportunity be available then this will, if passed, be capped at the lowest compensatable pass mark.	