Academic Integrity and Misconduct (AIM) Policy and Procedures

Please see a list of terminology/definitions at Appendix 1. This document refers to 'you' (which means 'the student/students') and 'we' (which means 'Birkbeck, University of London' or 'the University').

Introduction

1. Birkbeck, University of London (hereafter referred to as 'the University' or 'Birkbeck') has an obligation to maintain the standards of its awards (and those it offers on behalf of the University of London) by ensuring the integrity of all aspects of the assessment process. The University has signed up to the Academic Integrity Charter and is committed to upholding academic integrity across the University community.

2. The University expects that when completing work for assessment, you will adhere to the University's Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy and not take action which might give you an unfair advantage.

3. The purpose of the policy is to outline:

    a. what constitutes academic integrity and academic misconduct;
    b. some examples of academic misconduct and how they are categorised;
    c. how suspected academic misconduct will be considered;
    d. what outcomes students can reasonably expect;
    e. how students can appeal a finding of academic misconduct; and
    f. where students and Panels can find further information, advice and guidance.

4. This policy applies to any piece of work submitted for assessment towards an award at Birkbeck, University of London.

5. Where applicable for undergraduate students, this policy takes precedence over paragraph 21 of the Common Awards Scheme Regulations for Taught Programmes of Study relating to reassessment arrangements. This means, for example, that the outcome for an upheld academic misconduct might mean that you have to retake a module, even if you were only on your first attempt. In this case you will in effect have forfeited the capped, in-year reassessment usually offered at second attempt.

6. This policy also takes precedence over paragraph 24 of the Common Awards Scheme Regulations for Taught Programmes of Study relating to compensated credit. This means that you will not be eligible for compensated credit if you fail a module due to an upheld allegation. If the upheld academic misconduct is proven on your second or subsequent attempt at the module, you cannot revert to an earlier failed attempt to claim compensated credit.

Why is academic integrity important?

7. Part of your study is to develop key skills such as critical thinking, evaluating evidence, and the ability to develop your academic writing. Ensuring that academic integrity is observed at all times means that marks and academic credit are awarded for work which accurately demonstrates your true efforts and abilities and prevents students who have produced work by unfair means from being advantaged for doing so.

8. The University has a 'whole community' approach to academic integrity. This means that every member of the University, whether a student or a member of staff, has a responsibility to maintain academic integrity.

9. For staff, this means that the University has a responsibility to support you in your learning and to provide you with the tools to avoid academic misconduct. It also means that where you suspect that a student has produced work that breaches the Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy, you have an obligation to report it for investigation.

10. For students, this means that you must:

    a. properly acknowledge all sources of information, knowledge, and ideas by consistently and correctly using an acceptable referencing system;
    b. produce work that is wholly your own work (and see item c below);
    c. where an assessment brief specifically requires a single piece of work be submitted on behalf of a group of students, you should ensure that each student's contribution to group work is represented honestly;
    d. encourage others to behave with academic integrity;
    e. comply with all assessment instructions;
    f. adhere to and comply with all applicable regulatory, legal and professional obligations and follow any relevant ethical requirements;
    g. present accurate information and data that has been obtained appropriately;

h. represent honestly the results of research or experimental data; and
i. avoid any action which would give you an unfair advantage over others.

11. If you fail to adhere to these principles of academic integrity, your work may be suspected of academic misconduct.

12. Some types of academic misconduct are listed alphabetically below. This list is not exhaustive, and the Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy may be breached in ways not specifically referred to here.

a. 'Collusion' means presenting work as your own that has been done in unauthorised partnership with someone else, where this is not permitted by the requirements of the assessment.
b. 'Contract cheating', also known as 'essay mills', 'ghost writers' or 'third-party cheating', means submitting work as your own that has been purchased or commissioned from someone else. A fee does not have to be paid for contract cheating to have taken place. This might include using generative artificial intelligence tools such as ChatGPT to create content and/or argument for your assessment which you then present as your own intellectual work. If you are permitted to use generative AI tools to create content, this will be included in the assessment brief with guidance.
c. 'Examination misconduct' can include using the wrong or unauthorised equipment in an examination, such as a calculator or earpieces; accessing an examination paper or questions ahead of an assessment; and taking unauthorised notes or material into an examination.
d. 'Fabrication' means creating false data or other aspects of research or assessed work.
e. 'Falsification' means falsely claiming to have carried out part of an assessment, such as experiments, observations, interviews, or any form of research and/or data collection.
f. 'Impersonation' means assuming the identity of another student, or allowing someone to assume your identity, in an assessment.
g. 'Plagiarism' is when you present work as if it is your own, without full, accurate, and appropriate referencing. This can include paraphrasing someone else's work without citing the original source or copying/taking credit for someone else's argument even if you put it into your own words. This can also include using generative AI tools which can take other people's words and ideas without reference.

h. 'Self-plagiarism' involves submitting the same work for credit more than once, where this is not permitted by the requirements of the assessment. This could mean duplicating work:
   - that you submitted on a previous attempt at the same assessment;
   - that you submitted on another module;
   - that you submitted when studying towards another programme or at another institution; or
   - that you have produced during your academic study and you have had published elsewhere, for example in an academic journal, without adequate citation and referencing (and this might also have copyright issues).

13. Proofreading is an essential skill in the academic writing process. You should proofread your own work and should always allow plenty of proofreading time before submitting your work to correct any typographical, grammatical and spelling errors. Study Skills support is available to help you in this process. The Learning Development team provides guidance on using proof-reading or grammar checking software without being at risk of academic misconduct. The University recommends that you do not use professional third-party services.

14. The University is committed to ethical and responsible use of generative AI. This includes upholding our academic integrity (for staff and students). The University seeks to prepare its staff and students to work in an increasingly AI-enabled world. For detailed guidance, refer to supporting study information and guidance.

15. For more information on avoiding plagiarism and for additional support, please see the University's Plagiarism Guidelines. You can also:

    a. visit the Birkbeck Library and Information skills Moodle module, which includes online tools on how to reference, and how to avoid plagiarism
    b. explore the Study Skills support available
    c. book a place on one of the Learning Development workshops that run throughout the year. These are listed in My Birkbeck.

How we determine whether misconduct has taken place

16. If the University suspects academic misconduct has occurred, it is the responsibility of the University to prove the allegation against you. The standard of proof required is that of a balance of probabilities. A balance of probabilities means that it is more likely than not that academic misconduct has occurred.

17. The University considers academic misconduct using the concept of 'strict liability'. This means that academic misconduct can take place when you do something that, looked at from the marker's or invigilator's point of view, can reasonably be construed as academic misconduct, whether you meant to do this or not. This means that your intention, appreciation of risks and things like failure to check your work are not taken into account when determining whether misconduct has taken place However, these factors may be considered when determining whether it is appropriate to apply any penalty.

18. Mitigating circumstances will not be considered when determining whether academic misconduct has occurred.

19. Identifying suspected academic misconduct will often, but not always, involve academic judgment. This is based on the scholarly and/or professional knowledge and expertise which academic staff and external examiners draw upon in reaching academic decisions about assessment. Examples of academic judgment might include deciding the extent of the plagiarism or other academic misconduct (for example by interpreting Turnitin reports, or by assessing whether content has been appropriately or inappropriately paraphrased); in cases of alleged collusion, determining whether identical answers across more than one student's assessments is outside of common usage in the subject area; or deciding whether the standard of work is out of line with your other assessments, or whether your notes and drafts support a case that the submitted work is your own.

20. Where a marker considers something not to be 'misconduct' but rather poor academic practice, this will be referred to the Supporting Good Academic Practice Policy. Where a marker suspects that academic misconduct has occurred, they will inform the Sub-Board using a Suspected Academic Misconduct form.

21. The University offers modules that are taught between its Schools and where a module(s) from one School may form part of the programme offered by another School. In cases of suspected academic misconduct, the Faculty that 'owns' the module concerned will be responsible for dealing with the academic misconduct. The Academic Integrity and Misconduct Lead (or their nominee) for the home School for that module will also be informed that an investigation is underway and of the outcome. If the School that identifies the misconduct is not the student's

home School, they should inform the home School as soon as is practicable and usually within five working days.

22. If a suspected academic misconduct occurs during an in-person examination, the invigilator will complete a report which will be provided to the relevant central support team (for example, Examinations). The team will confirm whether the matter is progressed to an Academic Misconduct Panel.

23. Online examinations will be treated in the same way as a submitted piece of online assessment.

Viva voce

24. A viva voce is different from an Academic Misconduct Panel Meeting and will not require you to respond to an allegation of misconduct. The viva should not extend to areas of your overall programme (for example, other modules), not covered by the assessment suspected of academic misconduct.

25. The purpose of the viva is to allow you to demonstrate your knowledge of the subject matter being assessed and your process for completing the work.

26. A viva voce examination is conducted by two members of academic staff, at least one of whom has not been involved in marking the originally submitted work. A note will be taken of the viva either by a separate note-taker or one of the viva examiners (provided they did not mark the original work). These notes may be used as evidence in their deliberations by a Panel convened to consider academic misconduct under this Policy and Procedures.

27. If you fail to attend the viva or request an alternative date, then you will be offered one further date. If you do not respond or fail to attend without reasonable explanation, the matter will usually be referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel.

28. You will not usually be permitted to bring someone with you to a viva, unless it is deemed necessary e.g. if support in such situations is considered necessary within your Study Support Plan (SSP).

29. If you do not engage with the request to attend a viva or provide a reasonable explanation for non-attendance, this matter may be referred under the Academic Integrity and Misconduct policy for a Panel to consider.

30. There are two possible outcomes from a viva voce: either there is insufficient evidence, and the matter will be closed and a note made on your student record, or there is sufficient evidence, and the matter will be referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel for further action.

Stage One: Faculty-level Academic Misconduct Panel

31. The Faculty Head of Education and Student Experience will depute to one of the Academic Misconduct and Integrity Leads the operation of a Panel comprising a minimum of two academic members of staff, including a Chair, to consider the allegation. The Panel will not include any member of academic staff who has been involved in referring the allegation under consideration; where administratively practicable, it will not include any member of academic staff involved in previous investigations regarding the student. The diversity of the Panel will be considered when the Panel is convened.

32. You will be informed of the suspected misconduct including the alleged category/categories of misconduct and details of any investigation undertaken and will receive copies of any evidence to be used to support the allegation. You will be offered the opportunity to make representations to the Panel. This can be in writing and/or by attending the Panel and speaking in person. If you admit to the alleged misconduct, a formal Panel will not be scheduled. You will be informed of the outcome applied in writing, within 10 working days. Possible outcomes are listed in Appendix 3 of this policy.

33. If you contest the allegation, a Panel Meeting will take place. If you wish to attend the Meeting, you will be offered a date. If you do not respond within 10 working days without good reason, or decline the date offered, the Panel may decide the case in your absence. The University will make reasonable efforts to notify you of the hearing and provide a reasonable opportunity to attend the Panel Meeting. If you fail to engage after at least two written notifications, the panel may proceed in your absence.

34. You may choose to be accompanied by a companion, who should be a member of the University (for example a fellow student, member of staff, someone from the Student Union Advice team or a University-approved mentor). The role of the companion is to provide support to you. Anyone acting in a companion role is not a

member of the Panel and will not be involved in determining the outcome. Companions may not contribute to any Panel Meeting unless invited to do so by the Panel. Companions shall not be professional legal representatives.

35. Where the finding is that misconduct has occurred, the Panel will apply an outcome, a list of which is provided in Appendix 3. In addition, you may be asked to undertake specific tuition in relation to academic misconduct.

36. The Panel will inform you of its decision within five working days.

37. If more than one allegation of academic misconduct is suspected during the same assessment period and before you are informed about the allegation, this will be considered as one incident under this policy. In another words, if more than one instance of academic misconduct is suspected concurrently but only discovered subsequently, this would only be considered as one allegation.

38. Further allegations of academic misconduct, or allegations brought against you in your second or subsequent year of study, will be considered at a new Academic Misconduct Panel.

Stage Two: University-level Academic Misconduct Panel

39. The Student Complaints, Conduct and Appeals team will convene a Panel in circumstances including but not limited to the following:
    a. you already have two proven instances of academic misconduct;
    b. the allegation fits one of the categories of serious academic misconduct as outlined in Appendix 2; and/or
    c. the allegation (including for a first or second proven misconduct) may lead to the termination of your registration, for example because you are on your final permissible assessment attempt.

40. The Panel comprises a minimum of two members of academic staff, one of whom shall be Chair, and a representative from the Students' Union, to consider the case. The Panel will not include any member of staff who has participated in Misconduct Panels pertaining to the cases under review. The diversity of the Panel will be considered when the Panel is convened.

41. You will be informed of the suspected misconduct including the alleged category/categories of misconduct and details of any investigation undertaken and

will receive copies of any evidence to be used to support the allegation. You will be offered the opportunity to make representations to the Panel. This can be in writing and/or by attending the Panel and speaking in person. If you admit to the alleged misconduct, a formal Panel will not be scheduled. You will be informed of the outcome applied in writing, within 10 working days. Possible outcomes are listed in Appendix 3 of this policy.

42. If you contest the allegation, a Panel Meeting will take place. If you wish to attend the Meeting, you will be offered a date. If you do not respond within 10 working days without good reason, or decline the date offered, the Panel may decide the case in your absence. The University will make reasonable efforts to notify you of the hearing and provide a reasonable opportunity to attend the Panel Meeting. If you fail to engage after at least two written notifications, the panel may proceed in your absence.

43. You may choose to be accompanied by a companion, who should be a member of the University (for example a fellow student, member of staff, someone from the Student Union Advice team or a University-approved mentor). The role of the companion is to provide support to you. Anyone acting in a companion role is not a member of the Panel and will not be involved in determining the outcome. Companions may not contribute to any Meeting unless invited to do so by the Panel. Companions shall not be professional legal representatives.

44. Where the finding is that misconduct has occurred, the Panel will apply an outcome, a list of which is stipulated in Appendix 3. See the next section for how outcomes are applied. In addition, you may be asked to undertake specific tuition in relation to academic misconduct.

45. The Panel will inform you of its decision within 10 working days.

How outcomes are applied

46. Where the work of a student has been suspected of multiple allegations of academic misconduct, previous proven misconduct may be considered when determining an appropriate outcome.

47. If your third or more allegation of academic misconduct proceeds to a Stage Two-University-level Academic Misconduct Panel, the outcome will normally be higher than the previously imposed outcome.

Appeal

48. You can appeal decisions made at any stage of this policy by submitting an appeal form, following the University's Appeals Policy and Procedure.

Impact of reported allegations of misconduct on marking/awards

49. Where an allegation of an academic misconduct has been made and the case is being investigated, you will not be disadvantaged unless there is evidence to substantiate an allegation with an associated outcome. Where alleged academic misconduct is under investigation, the relevant Board of Examiners will not defer a decision on your progression or classification until the investigation is completed.

50. In the instance that an allegation of academic misconduct is made, you should continue with your studies while the investigation is ongoing, including by continuing to attend teaching and submitting work for assessment. If you stop attending or submitting work, you may be subjected to the University's usual procedures in relation to attendance and to satisfactory academic progress; see the Common Awards Scheme Regulations for Taught Programmes of Study, the Student Engagement and Attendance Policy, and the Discontinuation of Registration Policy for more information.

51. Marking of the work in question, progression and enrolment will be processed in the normal way where alleged academic misconduct is under investigation.

52. If you are in the final year of your programme and about to graduate but alleged academic misconduct is under investigation, the relevant Board of Examiners will not confirm and confer your final award until the outcome (and where appropriate appeal) has reached a conclusion.

53. Your academic transcript does not include reference to academic misconduct allegations, whether proven or otherwise. Transcripts solely provide details on the final marks awarded for modules taken, together with the class of award made (where appropriate).

Academic misconduct after a mark of module result has been assigned or an award has been made

54. If evidence of proven academic misconduct is produced after a mark has been awarded, the mark, module result or an entire award may be revoked.

55. The University will consider whether to revoke a mark, module or degree result as a result of academic misconduct in accordance with the stages and outcomes of this Policy and Procedures. The result of any Panel should be communicated to the relevant Sub-Board Chair. Where a decision is made to revoke a degree, the Chair of the relevant University Board of Examiners will also be informed.

Policy review

Created: June 2008
Latest update: July 2025
Date of next review: 2026-27 academic year
Owner: Student Complaints, Conduct and Appeals Manager
SLT owner: DVC Education and Student Experience
Committee oversight: Education and Student Experience Committee for Academic Board

Appendix 1- Terminology/definitions

1. ‘the University’ refers to Birkbeck, University of London.

2. ‘You’ means ‘the student/students’, i.e. a person/people registered to study at the University.

3. ‘Academic integrity’ means being honest in your academic work, taking responsibility for the contents of the work that you produce, and making sure that you formally recognise and reference the existing knowledge and ideas on which your work is based.

4. ‘Academic judgment’ is a judgment that is made about a matter where the opinion of an academic expert is essential: for example, a judgment about marks awarded, degree classification, research methodology, whether feedback is correct or adequate, and the content or outcomes of a course.

5. ‘Academic misconduct’ means a breach of academic integrity, through actions which could lead you to gain an unfair academic advantage in an assessment; for example, by taking credit for someone else’s work, words, or ideas. Academic misconduct can be broken down into two categories:
   a. ‘academic misconduct’ covers medium-level plagiarism, and allegations of minor exam misconduct.
   b. ‘serious academic misconduct’ is the most serious category of allegation and suggests intention to deceive. Students committing these do not have a sufficient understanding of the course content or study skills to progress.

6. An ‘Academic Misconduct Panel’ or ‘Panel Meeting’ is a body of academic staff tasked with deciding whether an instance of academic misconduct has taken place and what outcome should be imposed, if applicable. Panels can be held at Faculty level for more minor cases of misconduct, or for more serious cases, Panels will be run by the University’s Student Complaints, Conduct and Appeals team.

7. ‘Academic Lead for Misconduct’ is appointed by the Head of School to lead on academic misconduct.

8. 'Essay mills' are businesses that complete work in exchange for money, for a student who then submits it to an education provider as their own. This is known as ghost-writing or contract cheating and is illegal in England. Essay mills are

frequently involved in other forms of cybercrime and are known to blackmail students and to whistle blow on students to their academic institution.

9. An ‘outcome’ is the sanction applied to a student if academic misconduct is found to have been committed.

10. ‘Paraphrasing’ means putting someone else’s work into your own words. When you paraphrase someone else in your academic writing, you must still acknowledge the source of the idea: you should not pass off someone else’s ideas as your own. As with direct quotation, the full details of the source should be given in your footnotes and bibliography (as applicable).

11. ‘Proofreading’ is the final stage of producing a piece of academic writing. It is the process of checking your work to make sure it is of a high academic standard and quality.

12. ‘Turnitin’ is the University's text-matching software, which detects any similarities between submitted coursework and work published on the internet and provides an indicative similarity report. This is a tool for alerting markers to high levels of similarity but is not a substitute for academic judgment in detecting a breach of this policy. A low similarity score is not a guarantee that no academic misconduct has taken place.

13. A ‘viva voce’ is a meeting held to test your subject knowledge and gain more information on how you completed your assessment. It differs from oral presentations in that you are required to respond to unknown questions around a specified topic.

Appendix 2- Categories of academic misconduct

Factors such as premeditation, seriousness, level of study, intention etc. may be considered when determining what possible outcome should be imposed. The 'Possible Outcomes' column listed below is for guidance and consistency only; academic judgement should ultimately determine the appropriate outcome.

A. Academic misconduct

Category	Type of academic misconduct	Possible Outcome/s
AM1	Removing any script, paper, or other official stationery (whether completed or not) from the examination room, unless specifically authorised by an invigilator or examiner.	Outcome 1 and Outcome 2
AM2	Possession or use of devices or hardware of any kind other than those specifically permitted in the rubric of the paper, without inappropriate usage having been detected.	Outcome 1 and Outcome 2
AM3	Communicating with another student or with any third party other than the invigilator/examiner during an in-person examination or test, where there is **no attempt made** at copying the other person's work.	Outcome 1 and Outcome 2
AM4	Communicating with another student or with any third party about the contents of a remote examination or test prior to the conclusion of the assessment, including over social media or WhatsApp, where there is **no attempt made** at copying the other person's work.	Outcome 1 and Outcome 2
AM5	**Extensive** use of quotations or close paraphrasing without the use of quotation marks and/or referencing, where the student **has** cited the plagiarised material in the bibliography.	Outcome 2 and Outcome 3
AM6	**Extensive** use of quotations or close paraphrasing without the use of quotation marks and/or referencing, where the student **has not** cited the plagiarised material in the bibliography.	Outcome 3 and Outcome 4

AM7	Self-plagiarism where the duplication concerned is uncited and **extensive** (i.e. submission of work submitted previously by the student, which has contributed to the student's mark on the current or any previous programme, either at the University or another institution; or work submitted for assessment that has previously been published elsewhere, including online).[1]	Outcome 3 and Outcome 4
AM8	General indebtedness to the ideas, arguments, and work of others, which are presented as the student's own and either not sufficiently or nowhere referenced, and where the arguments taken from other sources predominate over the student's own argument.	Outcome 3 and Outcome 4
AM9	Duplicating diagrams, computer programs, hypotheses, text, code, graphics, tabulated data or other elements from books or journals; from unpublished sources such as lecture notes and handouts; or from the web, without suitable acknowledgement and referencing.	Outcome 3 and Outcome 4
AM10	Fabricating references.	Outcome 3 and Outcome 4
AM11	Possession of crib sheets or revision notes (including, for example, those held on digital media devices) in an in-person examination or test; accessing the internet in contravention of the examination rubric.	Outcome 3 and Outcome 4
AM12	Using another student's work and submitting some or all of it as if it were the student's own.	Outcome 3 and Outcome 4
AM13	The presentation of data in laboratory work, projects etc based on work purporting to have been carried out by the student but which has been invented, altered or falsified.	Outcome 3 and Outcome 4
AM14	During an examination or test, copying or attempting to copy the work of another student, whether by overlooking their work, asking them for information, or by any other means including over social media or WhatsApp.	Outcome 3 and Outcome 4

[1] Note that reworking material that has previously been submitted at the University but which received a failing mark (i.e. has not contributed to an overall grade) will not be considered self-plagiarism.

AM15	Being party to any other arrangement that would constitute a breach of this Policy; or agreeing, assisting, encouraging, advising or attempting to persuade another member of the University (student or staff) to participate in actions that would breach this Policy.	

B. Serious academic misconduct

Category	**Type of academic misconduct**	**Outcome/s to consider imposing**
SM1	Commissioning another person or service to complete an item of University assessment, where the commissioned work is **not** submitted. This could include the use of professional essay writing services, essay banks, homework assistance sites, ghost-writing services or other tools/services.	Outcome 3 and Outcome 4
SM2	The use of proofreading services to alter, add to or improve the argument or academic quality of the work submitted.	Outcome 4 and Outcome 5
SM3	Using technological aids, including translation software, paraphrasing tools, text generation software, and tools to generate text, graphics or artwork, without citation or specific authorisation.	Outcome 4 and Outcome 5
SM4	Where an assignment is required to be written in English, writing in a language other than English and then using translation software or assistance from a third party to convert into English.	Outcome 4 and Outcome 5
SM5	Falsifying a mitigating circumstances claim or evidence.	Outcome 4 and Outcome 5
SM6	Commissioning another person or service to complete an item of University assessment, which is then submitted as a student's own work. This could include the use of professional essay writing services, essay banks, homework assistance sites, ghost-writing services or other tools/services.	Outcome 4 and Outcome 5
SM7	Failure to secure appropriate ethical approval in advance of conducting research, an experiment, study or similar.	Outcome 4 and Outcome 5

SM8	Being party to any arrangement where a person other than the candidate impersonates, or intends to impersonate, the candidate in an examination or test.	Outcome 4 and Outcome 5
SM9	Stealing another student's work and submitting it as the student's own work (where the originator **is not** denied the opportunity of submission).	Outcome 4 and Outcome 5
SM10	Stealing another student's work and submitting it as the student's own work (where the originator **is** denied the opportunity of submission).	Outcome 5 and Outcome 6
SM11	Taking into an examination a pre-written examination script / answer book for submission and exchanging it for a blank examination script / answer book.	Outcome 5 and Outcome 6
SM12	Obtaining access to an unseen examination or test prior to the start of an examination/test.	Outcome 5 and Outcome 6
SM13	Being party to any other arrangement that would constitute a breach of this Policy; or agreeing, assisting, encouraging, advising or attempting to persuade another member of the University (student or staff) to participate in actions that would breach this Policy.	

Appendix 3- Academic misconduct outcomes

Outcome 1	Issue a formal warning. The Module Convenor shall mark the work, but the mark may be reduced by a maximum of ten marks to reflect a student's failure to address the assessment criteria in areas of collation of sources and their citation. In some instances, this might lead to a fail mark being awarded; in this case the marker should make this clear in their feedback to the student.
Outcome 2	Award a mark of zero for the element of assessment in question, not determining reassessment and/or retake (as this is a Board decision). To note- a **reassessment element mark** would be capped at a bare pass.
Outcome 3	Award a mark of zero for the element of assessment in question, not determining reassessment and/or retake (as this is a Board decision). To note- a **module mark** would be capped at a bare pass.
Outcome 4	Award a mark of zero for the module in question, the student must retake the same module and the module result will be capped at a bare pass. Where the module in question is an option module, the cap should be applied to any optional module attempted by the student as a substitute. Where a retake of the same module, or suitable alternative, is not permissible the student will be allowed to complete the academic year and to obtain an exit award, if available, but will not be able to continue on the programme in the next academic year.

Outcome 5	Award a mark of zero for the module in question, the student must retake the same module and the module result will be capped at a bare pass. Where the module in question is an option module, the cap should be applied to any optional module attempted by the student as a substitute. Where a retake of the same module, or suitable alternative, is not permissible the student will not be able to continue on the programme. Additionally the following outcome will be applied to the student's final award: Undergraduate Honours - student's final classification will be reduced by one level Unclassified Bachelors to Diploma in Higher Education Foundation Degree – Distinction to Merit; Merit to Pass; Pass to Certificate in Higher Education Masters - Distinction to Merit; Merit to Pass; Pass to PG Dip
Outcome 6	Terminate a student's registration and enrolment on the programme of study immediately with permission granted to exit with an intermediate award, provided the student has satisfied the requirements for that award. Where academic misconduct has been substantiated for a student who has completed their studies and on whom a final award has been conferred, the most serious outcome that may be applied shall be withdrawal of the relevant final award previously conferred on the student.