

ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT POLICY

Introduction

1. The University of Suffolk has a duty to maintain academic standards by ensuring the integrity of all aspects of the assessment process and is concerned to ensure that the regulations and policies governing the assessment of courses and programmes at the University are fully and fairly implemented. To this end, the University will take action against any student who contravenes these regulations and policies, whether inadvertently or through negligence or deliberate intent, and who, by so doing, could gain unfair advantage over other students. Any such contravention constitutes academic misconduct.

Scope

2. This policy applies to all students enrolled on undergraduate and taught postgraduate courses at the University of Suffolk and the partner colleges in the University of Suffolk Learning Network. It covers any academic misconduct in any form of assessment including written examinations, assessed coursework (in whatever form the coursework might take) and oral/practical assessments.

3. There is no time limit beyond which academic misconduct will not be investigated. Suspected academic misconduct, whether discovered before or after graduation, will be investigated and dealt with in accordance with this policy. Where academic misconduct is proven after work has been formally assessed, this may lead to the withdrawal of credit previously ratified by an Assessment Board or withdrawal of a conferred award.

4. In addition to consideration under this policy, all proven offences of academic misconduct by students on courses leading to professional registration will be referred to the relevant Fitness to Practise Group for further consideration under the Fitness to Practise Procedure.

5. Depending on the nature of the offence, students may also be subject to additional action under the Student Discipline Procedure.

Principles

6. The University expects that all work submitted for assessment by students is the student's own work, without falsification of any kind. Students are expected to offer their own analysis and presentation of information gleaned from research, even when group exercises are carried out. Insofar as students rely on sources, they should reference these in accordance with the appropriate convention in their discipline.

7. It is the responsibility of the student to familiarise themselves with the rules governing assessment including conduct in examinations and the correct academic conventions for referencing and acknowledging the work of others.

8. Allegations of academic misconduct will be treated in the strictest confidence. No student will be recorded, or referred to, as having committed an academic misconduct offence until the full process (as detailed in paragraphs 35 to 66) has been completed and the allegation proven.

Definitions of Academic Misconduct

9. Academic misconduct typically falls under one of the following headings:

- Plagiarism
- Collusion
- Fabrication
- Cheating
- Failure to have ethical approval

Plagiarism

10. Plagiarism is defined as the presentation of another person's work or ideas as the student's own, without proper acknowledgement. This could be in direct copy or close paraphrase.

11. In the context of the policy, another person's work or ideas includes text, images (graphics, illustrations or photographs), designs, computer code, diagrams, data and formulae or any other representation of ideas (written, visual or oral) in print, electronic or other media, and may be from any published or unpublished source including books, journals, newspapers, the internet, course handouts or another student's work.

12. Plagiarism can occur in examinations and/or coursework assessment which may take a variety of forms including, but not limited to, essays, reports, presentations, dissertations and projects.

13. The reproduction of a student's own previously submitted work, without acknowledgement, is regarded as self-plagiarism and will be treated in the same way as any other form of plagiarism.

Collusion

14. Collusion is the unauthorised co-operation between at least two people, normally with the intent to deceive. It can take the following forms:

- a. the conspiring by two or more students to produce a piece of work together with the intention that at least one passes it off as his/her own work
- b. the submission by a student of the work of another student in circumstances where the former has willingly lent the latter the work, and where it should be evident to the student lending the work that by so doing an advantage could be gained by the other student. In this case both students are guilty of collusion
- c. the unauthorised co-operation between a student and another person in the preparation and production of work which is presented as the student's own work
- d. the commissioning and submission of work as the student's own where the student has paid or solicited another person to produce the work on the student's behalf

15. Various forms of collaborative assessment undertaken in accordance with published requirements evidently do not fall under the heading of collusion.

Fabrication

16. Fabrication is the invention, alteration or falsification of data and evidence that contributes towards assessment. This includes data such as: the origin and results of questionnaires; research data; certificated or portfolio evidence in claims for the recognition of prior learning; and entries and signatures in records of assessment of practice in the workplace.

17. Where a student enrolled on a course leading to professional registration is alleged to have committed an offence of fabrication, the student may instead or additionally be subject to action under the Fitness to Practise Procedure.

18. Allegations of fabrication of research data may instead or additionally be considered under the Research Misconduct Policy.

Cheating

19. This includes any behaviour which the student would reasonably know would interfere with the fair operation of the assessment process and could gain unfair advantage, such as:

- any transgression of the Institution's examination room rules, as set out in the Preparation and Conduct of Examinations Policy;
- obtaining or seeking to obtain access to examination papers prior to an examination;

- behaviour in a manner likely to prejudice the chances of another student in an assessment;
- offering a bribe or inducement to invigilators, examiners or other persons connected with the assessments;
- being party to an arrangement whereby a person other than the student would fraudulently represent him/her at an assessment;
- submitting a fraudulent claim for extenuating circumstances.

Failure to have ethical approval

20. This includes students embarking on research activities which require ethical approval without that approval being formally granted. It is the student's responsibility to apply for ethical approval and to seek clarification on whether ethical approval is required if unsure.

Definition of Poor Academic Practice

21. The term "poor academic practice" is used in the context of this policy to cover instances where the work submitted for assessment includes evidence that the student has attempted to acknowledge another person's work but has not correctly or consistently done so in accordance with the appropriate academic convention of their discipline. A first instance of poor academic practice should not normally lead to a formal allegation of academic misconduct, particularly if it occurs in the first semester of the student's course. However, the course team should ensure that the student is provided with appropriate feedback and guidance to avoid such practice in future assessments and to develop their academic writing skills.

PROCESS FOR DEALING WITH SUSPECTED CASES OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

22. All suspicions of academic misconduct must be reported to the Course Leader for consideration before any allegation of academic misconduct is put to the student. Where the suspected academic misconduct is discovered by the Course Leader (for example in work submitted for a module he/she teaches), he/she should discuss their suspicions with the Head of Department (or equivalent in the partner colleges) or the Office for Student Appeals, Complaints and Conduct (OSACC).

23. It is the responsibility of the person raising the suspicions to clearly set out the nature of their suspicions and provide supporting evidence showing how and where the suspected academic misconduct has taken place.

24. Where a marker suspects academic misconduct, he/she will, if appropriate, note on the student's work the nature of the alleged offence and report their concerns to the Course Leader.

25. Where an invigilator suspects a student of infringing examination room rules or any other requirements relating to the conduct of the examination, he/she shall take the appropriate action as detailed in the Preparation and Conduct of Examinations Policy. A report of the incident should be provided to the Exams Office, who will inform the Course Leader.

26. Any suspected academic misconduct should be reported to the Course Leader as soon as possible after initial discovery, and normally no later than ten working days after the relevant submission or examination date to allow time for consideration by the Course Leader before the normal release of feedback to students.

Consideration by the Course Leader

27. Upon receipt of any reports of suspected academic misconduct, the Course Leader will consider the evidence provided and decide how to proceed. Training and guidelines for the consideration of suspected academic misconduct will be provided to all Course Leaders. It is important for Course Leaders to be aware that in some instances, particularly in the early stages of a course, it might not always be appropriate to proceed to a formal allegation. In particular the Course Leader should satisfy him or herself that the student has been given appropriate advice on attributing sources and the production of bibliographies prior to assessment.

28. Having reviewed the evidence, the Course Leader will decide that either:

- no offence has been committed;
- there is insufficient evidence of an offence;
- there is poor academic practice; or
- there is sufficient evidence that an offence may have been committed.

29. If the Course Leader decides that no offence has been committed, he/she shall request the marker to consider the work on its academic merits and mark it in accordance with the assessment criteria. No further action will be taken with the student.

30. If the Course Leader decides that there is insufficient evidence of an offence, he/she shall request the marker to consider the work on its academic merits and mark it in accordance with the assessment criteria. He/she may also recommend that the student is made aware of the concerns and offered further support and guidance to avoid any similar concerns about their

academic practice in future. This advice, along with details of where to go for further support, should be given to the student with the feedback on their assessment.

31. If the Course Leader decides that there is poor academic practice, for first instances he/she shall request the marker to consider the work on its academic merits and mark it in accordance with the assessment criteria. In such cases, the student should be issued with a warning about their academic practice and advised to attend an appropriate Learning Services workshop and/or to complete the online academic skills course. The warning should be issued by the Head of Department verbally and/or in writing. If this is a second or subsequent instance, the Course Leader may decide to proceed to a formal allegation.

32. If the Course Leader decides that there is sufficient evidence that an offence may have been committed, he/she shall proceed to a formal allegation.

33. To proceed to a formal allegation, the Course Leader should:

a. complete the *Allegation of Academic Misconduct* form with the following information:

- the student's name, ID number, level of study and course/programme/route details;
- module details, including information about the weighting of the component of assessment;
- the formal allegation to be put to the student;
- a summary of the alleged offence.

b. collate the relevant supporting evidence, with the assistance of the Course Administrator.

This may include:

- a report of the incident, where relevant;
- the invigilator's report, where relevant;
- a copy, or the original of, unauthorised material used in an examination;
- a copy of the original script marked with the allegedly plagiarised passages or passages where there is suspected collusion;
- a copy of source material marked with passages which have allegedly been plagiarised or where there is suspected collusion;
- a copy of the plagiarism detection software report, where relevant;
- a copy of the instructions given to the student regarding the component of assessment and a copy of the referencing instructions given to the student where relevant;
- a copy of any relevant material that has allegedly been fabricated (for example: the record of practice or work-based evidence; research data; and certificated or portfolio evidence in claims for recognition of prior learning);

- any other evidence to support the allegation.

34. The completed *Allegation of Academic Misconduct* form and supporting documentation should be submitted to OSACC for the formal allegation to be put to the student.

Formal Allegation

35. Upon receipt of the *Allegation of Academic Misconduct* form and supporting documentation from the Course Leader, OSACC shall write to the student concerned to:

- a. put the allegation as defined by the Course Leader;
- b. request a written statement in response to the allegation and submission of any evidence he/she deems appropriate;
- c. request confirmation of whether the student also wishes to attend an investigative meeting of the Academic Misconduct Panel to respond in person;
- d. request a reply within ten working days of the date on which the letter is sent;
- e. enclose a copy of this policy;
- f. enclose copies of any evidence or reports.

36. The letter from OSACC to the student shall be copied to the relevant Chair of the Assessment Board, Course Leader and Course Administrator. Where possible, every effort should be made to resolve the matter before the meeting of the Assessment Board. However, where it remains unresolved, the Assessment Board will record a deferred decision (DD) on the electronic student record.

37. If no written reply to the allegation is received from the student within ten working days of the date on which the letter is sent, this is deemed to be acceptance of the allegation. In such cases, OSACC will refer the case to the Academic Misconduct Panel for consideration (see paragraphs 41 to 53 below).

38. If the student replies accepting the allegation and does not wish to also respond in person, OSACC will refer the case to the Academic Misconduct Panel for consideration (see paragraphs 41 to 53 below).

39. If the student replies denying the allegation, or if he/she asks to also respond in person, OSACC shall invite the student to attend an investigative meeting of the Academic Misconduct

Panel (see paragraphs 41 to 50 and 54 to 64 below). The student should be given at least five working days' notice of the meeting.

40. While the allegation remains unresolved, the student shall have the right to continue on the course or commence the next part or stage of the course (where permitted within the relevant assessment regulations) unless the alleged offence is deemed by the Academic Registrar to jeopardise the welfare of the subject (whether patient, pupil or client) and/or contravene any relevant professional code of conduct and/or is incompatible with behaviour required by the profession. In these circumstances, the Academic Registrar shall make a report to the relevant Head of Department (or equivalent) to determine whether action under the Fitness to Practise Procedure should proceed concurrently.

Academic Misconduct Panel

41. The Academic Misconduct Panel (the Panel) shall comprise:

- Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Chair)
- At least two members of academic staff (to be drawn from a pool of trained academics with representation from all departments and all partner colleges)

Membership of the Panel may be varied to ensure that the academic staff members are not considering any allegations concerning their own modules, but have the necessary understanding of the discipline to inform discussions. The Head of Quality Enhancement may deputise for the Deputy Vice-Chancellor as Chair when required. A representative from OSACC will be in attendance to record the Panel's decision and justification for that decision.

42. The Panel will be convened at regular intervals to consider all formal allegations of academic misconduct. This will ensure consistency of approach across the range of courses offered within the University of Suffolk and the University of Suffolk Learning Network. The Panel has the authority to determine:

- a. that no offence has been committed, or there is insufficient evidence of an offence, in which case the allegation will be removed from the student's record; or
- b. that an offence has been committed and recommend the penalty to be imposed, as set out in the Academic Misconduct Penalties table in Appendix A.

43. The decision of the Panel as to whether an offence has been committed is final and will be reported to the student and relevant Assessment Board. The Assessment Board will consider the penalty recommended by the Panel and inform the student of the penalty imposed and the impact of that penalty on their studies and/or award.

44. In determining whether an offence has been committed, the judgement will be made on the balance of probability.

45. In determining the recommended penalty, the Panel will take into account:

- a. the severity of the offence;
- b. the intent;
- c. whether it is a first or subsequent offence;
- d. the academic stage of the student;
- e. any mitigation;
- f. the proportionality of the penalty to the offence.

A guide to the standard penalty to be imposed for first offences is provided in Appendix B.

46. The University does not normally accept a student's medical or personal circumstances as an excuse or reason for academic misconduct. However, where the Panel deems that the evidenced circumstances have severely impaired the student's capacity for rational judgement, the Panel may take account of the circumstances in determining the recommended penalty for the offence.

47. The Panel shall normally recommend the standard penalties suggested for first offences. However, the Panel may vary the penalty in such circumstances where the suggested penalty is deemed to be too lenient or too harsh to ensure that the outcome is not disproportionate to the offence. In all cases, the penalty should normally exceed that which would follow if the student had merely been referred in the assessment.

48. The penalty recommended for second or third offences will normally be one penalty point higher than the standard penalty for the offence or one point higher than the penalty previously imposed, whichever is higher. Any student with three sequential offences will automatically receive a minimum of penalty 6 and be required to withdraw.

49. In the context of this policy, sequential offences are offences that do not occur in the same assessment period (be that mid-semester or end of semester). Where a student has two or more allegations in the same assessment period, these will be considered concurrently (where possible) and the penalty imposed for all pieces of work will be the same.

50. Where a student receives a penalty resulting in the recording of a component mark as 0% refer infringement (RI) or fail infringement (FI) at any attempt, no component of that module can subsequently be considered for in-module compensation (meaning all components marks

must be at or above the pass mark defined in the relevant assessment regulations in order for the module to be passed) and the module itself cannot be condoned.

Standard meeting of the Academic Misconduct Panel

51. The consideration of accepted allegations of academic misconduct where the student does not wish to also respond in person need not involve a physical meeting of members of the Panel if alternative methods of discussion and mutual deliberation are available.

52. The documentation for accepted allegations will be distributed to the Panel for consideration within five working days of receipt of the student's written acceptance or once the ten working day deadline has passed in cases where no response has been received.

53. The Panel's decision and recommended penalty will be based on the documentary evidence provided.

Investigative meeting of the Academic Misconduct Panel

54. Where a student denies the allegation, or wishes to respond to the allegation in person, an investigative meeting of the Panel will be arranged. This will normally take place no later than twenty working days after the date of the letter putting the formal allegation to the student.

55. OSACC will inform the student, in writing, of the date, time and venue of the investigative meeting. The meeting will normally take place at the Ipswich campus or the partner college where the student concerned is enrolled.

56. The student may be accompanied at the meeting by a friend. A friend is defined as a member of staff of the University of Suffolk or one of the partner colleges, or a registered student of the University, or a member of staff or sabbatical officer of the Students' Union. The role of the friend is to act as an observer, give moral support and to assist the student to make their case. In addition, where reasonable adjustments are required, a student may be accompanied by a supporter eg. a sign language communicator or a notetaker, and a student with difficulty in understanding English may be accompanied by an interpreter.

57. If the student does not appear at the meeting, the Panel may proceed with the consideration of the allegation in the student's absence provided the Panel is satisfied that the student has received proper and timely notification of the meeting.

58. The Chair of the Panel shall explain that the purpose of the meeting is to establish whether an offence of academic misconduct has been committed. He/she will put the allegation to the student and make available for scrutiny any relevant documentary evidence, including any statements by staff or students, sources of allegedly plagiarised passages and/or passages where collusion is suspected, annotated coursework or scripts, and falsified documents.

59. The student will make a statement in response to the allegation, following which the members of the Panel have the right to put any questions to the student.

60. At any time during the meeting, the Chair of the Panel may decide to suspend proceedings in order to seek more evidence. The student will be advised of the action that will be taken and the date of the reconvened meeting.

61. If the student admits the offence at the meeting, the Chair of the Panel shall invite the student to sign a written statement to this effect.

62. At the end of the questioning, the student will be asked to leave the meeting for the Panel to deliberate and reach its decision in private.

63. The Panel shall determine its decision based on the written and oral evidence. If the Panel finds that there is no case to answer, the Chair will inform the student accordingly, in writing via OSACC, and all record of the alleged academic misconduct will be removed from the student's record. The Course Leader, Course Administrator and the Chair of the Assessment Board will be informed of the decision and the work will then be marked on its academic merit.

64. If the Panel finds that an offence of academic misconduct has been committed, the Panel will agree a penalty to be recommended to the Assessment Board.

Notification to Student and Assessment Board

65. The decision of the Panel will be communicated to the student and the relevant Assessment Board in writing within five working days of the Panel meeting (or conclusion of the Panel deliberations if a physical meeting is not held).

66. The notification to the student will include the decision and the rationale for the decision. The Assessment Board will also be notified of the recommended penalty.

Action by Assessment Board

67. Following receipt of the Panel's decision, the Assessment Board will meet (where necessary as an extraordinary meeting) to consider the penalty recommended by the Panel and determine the penalty to be imposed and the consequence of that penalty in the context of the student's overall profile, the relevant assessment regulations and any Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body (PSRB) requirements. The Assessment Board do not have the authority to amend the decision of the Panel as to whether or not an offence has been committed. The Chair of the Assessment Board will notify the student, in writing, of the penalty imposed and the appropriate course of action within fifteen working days of the date of the letter informing the student of the Panel's decision. A copy of the letter should be sent to OSACC.

68. Where the student concerned is in employment and where the employer has a material interest in the matter, the Assessment Board will inform the employer of the decision and consequence, in writing, within the same timescale.

69. Where PSRBs are involved, the Chair of the Assessment Board will determine in conjunction with the Academic Registrar whether to inform the relevant body of the decision of the Panel in writing. Such a report should not be made until the period for lodging an appeal has passed or until any appeal is fully considered.

Appeals Procedure

70. Students may appeal against the verdict of academic misconduct and/or the penalty imposed under the provisions of the Academic Appeals Procedure. This procedure is available on MySuffolk and the University of Suffolk website.

Plagiarism Detection Software

71. All work that is submitted electronically will be passed through plagiarism detection software.

Monitoring and Evaluation

72. Cases of academic misconduct will be reported annually to the Equality and Diversity Committee, Quality Committee and Senate. The reports will include equality monitoring data.

APPENDIX A: PENALTIES FOR ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

The following table sets out the standard penalties for proven offences.

Minor offence	Penalty 1	The work submitted will be marked in accordance with the assessment / grading criteria but the component mark will be capped at the pass mark. The student will receive a formal written warning.
	Penalty 2	Refer component (mark of 0%, recorded as refer infringement (RI)) with reassessment opportunity where permissible under the relevant assessment regulations. On reassessment, the component mark will be capped at the pass mark. The student will receive a formal written warning.
Serious offence	Penalty 3	Refer component (mark of 0%, recorded as refer infringement (RI)) with reassessment opportunity where permissible under the relevant assessment regulations. On reassessment, the component and module mark will be capped at the pass mark. The student will receive a formal written warning.
	Penalty 4	Fail component (mark of 0%, recorded as fail infringement (FI)) with opportunity to retake module where permissible under the relevant assessment regulations. On retake, the component and module mark will be capped at the pass mark. The student will receive a formal written warning.
Grave offence	Penalty 5	Fail module (mark of 0% for all components, recorded as fail infringement (FI)) with no opportunity for reassessment or retake. The student can take an alternative module where permissible under the relevant assessment regulations, but the module mark will be capped at the pass mark. If the fail results in termination of studies, any work already submitted for outstanding modules will be ratified by the Assessment Board (with no opportunity for reassessment or retake) and the student considered for an exit award only. The student will receive a formal written warning.
	Penalty 6	Fail module (mark of 0% for all components, recorded as fail infringement (FI)) and the student required to withdraw. The Assessment Board will be instructed to ratify the marks for any work already submitted for outstanding modules (with no opportunity for reassessment or retake) and to consider the student for an exit award based on the credit achieved. The student's transcript will show that the student was required to withdraw for academic misconduct.
Gross misconduct	Penalty 7	Fail module (mark of 0% for all components, recorded as fail infringement (FI)) and the student required to withdraw immediately without being awarded a degree or exit award. Credits which have already been ratified by an Assessment Board will be recorded on a record of achievement only. The record of achievement will show that the student was required to withdraw for academic misconduct.

All students who receive a penalty between 1 and 5 will be offered support through an appropriate Learning Services package on plagiarism and academic writing. Uptake of the support will be monitored for evaluation.

APPENDIX B: INDICATIVE OFFENCES AND STANDARD PENALTIES FOR FIRST OFFENCES

Coursework and Time Constrained Assignments (including, but not limited to, written work, presentations, images, designs, artefacts and code)

	Indicative offence	Standard penalty	
Minor offence	Making work available to another student, either intentionally or as a result of naivety or negligence, that can be presented as their own.	Penalty 1	
	Limited use of quotes or close paraphrasing (not more than a few lines) without the use of quotation marks and/or correct referencing, where the student has cited the plagiarised material in the reference list and/or bibliography.	Levels 3 and 4	Penalty 1
		All other levels	Penalty 2
	Using work previously submitted for another assignment without acknowledgement (self-plagiarism).	Penalty 2	
Extensive use of quotes or close paraphrasing without the use of quotation marks and/or correct referencing, where the student has cited the plagiarised material in the reference list and/or bibliography.	Levels 3 and 4	Penalty 2	
	All other levels	Penalty 3	
Serious offence	Submission of work produced in collaboration by two or more students as the work of a single student.	Penalty 3	
	Using another person's work or ideas and submitting some of it as if it were the student's own.	Penalty 3	
	Submitting a fraudulent claim for extenuating circumstances.	Penalty 3	
	Using another person's work or ideas and submitting all of it as if it were the student's own.	Penalty 4	
	The presentation of data based on work purporting to have been carried out by the student but which has been fabricated (i.e. invented, altered or falsified).	Penalty 4	
	Failure to have ethical approval where required and embarking on research activities which require ethical approval without that approval being formally granted.	Penalty 4	
	Extensive use of quotes or close paraphrasing without the use of quotation marks and/or correct referencing, where the student has not cited the plagiarised material in the reference list and/or bibliography.	Penalty 4	
	Grave offence	Commissioning another person to complete an item of assessment that is submitted as the student's own work. This includes, but is not limited to, the use of professional essay writing services and essay banks as well as friends and family members.	Penalty 5
Disguising work in a deliberate attempt to conceal its origins.		Penalty 5	
Offering a bribe or inducement to persons connected with the assessment in order to gain an unfair advantage.		Penalty 5	
Attempting to persuade another student or a member of staff to participate in any other actions in order to gain an unfair advantage.		Penalty 5	

Examinations and Time Constrained Assignments (including, but not limited to, written, online, viva and practical)

	Indicative offence	Standard penalty
Minor offence	Removing any script, question paper, or other official stationery (whether completed or not) from the examination room, unless specifically authorised by an invigilator or examiner.	Penalty 1
	Possession of devices (such as mobile phones, smart watches or personal multimedia devices) of any kind other than those specifically permitted.	Penalty 2
Serious offence	Communicating with another student or with any third party other than the invigilator or examiner during an examination.	Penalty 3
	Copying or attempting to copy the work of another student, whether by overlooking, asking for information, or by any other means.	Penalty 3
	Behaviour in a manner likely to prejudice the chances of another student.	Penalty 3
	Submitting a fraudulent claim for extenuating circumstances.	Penalty 3
	Possession or use of crib sheets, revision notes or unauthorised texts; unauthorised access of the internet; or use of devices (such as mobile phones, smart watches or personal multimedia devices) of any kind other than those specifically permitted.	Penalty 4
Grave offence	Being party to any arrangement whereby a person other than the student represents, or intends to represent, the student in an examination.	Penalty 5
	Taking into an examination a pre-written examination script for submission.	Penalty 5
	Obtaining, or seeking to obtain, access to an unseen examination paper prior to the start of an examination.	Penalty 5
	Offering a bribe or inducement to invigilators, examiners or other persons connected with the examination in order to gain an unfair advantage.	Penalty 5
	Attempting to persuade another student or a member of staff to participate in any other actions in order to gain an unfair advantage.	Penalty 5

Note

The tables above are provided as a guide to the recommended standard penalty to be imposed for first offences of academic misconduct with examples given as an indication of the type of offence. The penalty for a second or subsequent proven offence will normally be one penalty point higher than the standard penalty shown or one point higher than the previously imposed penalty, whichever is higher.

The examples given above do not represent an exhaustive list of potential offences and should not be interpreted as such.