

Document title	KMMS Academic Misconduct Procedures
Version	2
Effective Date	September 2021
Date for review	September 2023
Document Owner	Karl Grice, Quality Manager
Developing committee/board	Student Life and Wellbeing Board/Undergraduate Programme Board
Approved by/date	Universities Joint Quality Committee/June 2020

Kent and Medway Medical School Academic Misconduct: Procedures

1 Introduction

- 1.1 All students at Kent and Medway Medical School (KMMS) have a responsibility to act with honesty, integrity and fairness in completing assessment requirements in relation to their course of study. Such academic integrity plays a positive role in student development both during study and when moving into employment.

In achieving this, students should take note of the concepts of good academic practice, and academic integrity as detailed at:

<https://www.kent.ac.uk/ai/students/goodpractice.html>

- 1.2 Where breaches of academic integrity occur, this is considered to be academic misconduct. Allegations of academic misconduct are dealt with in accordance with the procedures below. These procedures apply to all programmes of study within KMMS and are administered by the University of Kent.

2 General Regulation V.3: Academic Misconduct

- 2.1 The KMMS Regulations for the Conferment of the Award of Bachelor of Surgery Bachelor of Medicine states:

Students are required to act with honesty and integrity in fulfilling requirements in relation to assessment of their academic progress.

- 2.2 The following are some illustrative examples of academic misconduct which will be regarded as a breach of this regulation (the list is not exhaustive):

- **Misconduct in examinations and In Course Tests:** including the use of unauthorised materials, mobile phones and other prohibited electronic devices, obtaining or offering improper assistance to another candidate.
- **Attempting to influence a member of staff:** seeking to gain an advantage regarding work submitted for assessment by offering an examiner or teacher any inducement to treat that work more favourably than the work itself merits. This could also include an attempt to induce a professional service staff member to alter a mark or mark(s) for a more favourable outcome.
- **Plagiarism:** reproducing in any work submitted for assessment or review (for example, examination answers, essays, project reports, dissertations or theses) any material derived from work authored by another without clearly acknowledging the source. Presenting work copied directly from another student without their knowledge.
- **Duplication of material (self-plagiarism):** reproducing in any submitted work any material used by that student in other work for assessment, either at this University or elsewhere.

- **Collusion:** conspiring with others to reproduce the work of others, including knowingly permitting work to be copied by another student. Collusion is distinct from contract cheating as it does not depend on a payment or payment in kind being made for the work.
- **Impersonation:** allowing an individual or individuals to impersonate the student in an examination or other assessment event / activity.
- **Fabrication:** the falsification of data, evidence, quotations, citations or other information in any assessed work.
- **Failure to obtain Ethical / Research Approval:** the failure to obtain ethical approval where there is a requirement to do so. Carrying out research without appropriate permission.
- **Contract Cheating:** where a student (or several students collectively) pay a third party for services that result in the submission of work for assessment that is, either wholly or in part, not the student's own work. The payment may be financial or involve payments in kind. Where no payment is made the alleged offence should be treated as **collusion**, **plagiarism** or **impersonation**, as appropriate.

2.3 It may be appropriate in investigating an allegation of misconduct for a student to be referred to the procedure for non-academic disciplinary matters or the KMMS Low-Level Concerns, Fitness to Study and Fitness to Practise Procedure. For example, where it is alleged that a student has falsified documentation as part of an academic procedure, such as the mitigation of extenuating circumstances or where the misconduct raises questions about a student's honesty, trustworthiness or character.

3 Principles

- 3.1 **Guidance and Training** – KMMS will provide students with information regarding academic integrity and expectations of medical students during their first term of study.
- 3.2 **Advice** – students can access advice and guidance in relation to any allegation of academic misconduct via either Christ Church Students' Union or Kent Union.¹
- 3.3 **Confidentiality** – appropriate levels of confidentiality will be maintained throughout academic misconduct procedures. Data related to academic misconduct procedures will be kept in line with the KMMS Documentation Retention Schedule.²
- 3.4 **Timeliness** – allegations of academic misconduct will be dealt with in a timely manner, and without any undue delay. The University of Kent will aim to

¹ <https://ccsu.co.uk/> and <https://kentunion.co.uk/>

² Link to KMMS record retention schedule when approved and available on website

complete the investigation and the formal process of considering an allegation within 40 working days and hear any appeal within 20 working days of the appeal being lodged. Students will be kept informed of progress of any claim of academic misconduct against them.

- 3.5 **Strict Liability** – all types of academic misconduct are considered under the principle of strict liability. This means that whether a student intended to commit an academic misconduct offence or not, is not of relevance.
- 3.6 **Balance of Probabilities** – the standard of proof used for academic misconduct is the balance of probabilities. This means that decisions on allegations of academic misconduct will be based on whether the Chair of/ the Academic Misconduct Committee believes, given the information available, it is more likely that the allegation is true, or untrue.
- 3.7 **Members of Academic Misconduct Committees** – Members of Committees who consider academic misconduct allegations will be given appropriate training by the University of Kent.

4 Links to Other University Policies and Procedures

- 4.1 Other policies and procedures may need to be consulted when considering cases of alleged academic misconduct. These are:
- 4.3.1 KMMS Mitigation of Extenuating Circumstances Procedures.
- 4.3.2 The University of Kent's Code of Ethical Practice for Research.
- 4.3.3 Code of Practice for the Investigation of Allegations of Misconduct in Research.
- 4.3.4 KMMS Student Discipline in Relation to Non-Academic Matters Procedures.
- 4.3.5 KMMS Low-Level Concerns, Fitness to Study and Fitness to Practise Procedures.

5 Academic Misconduct Committees

- 5.3 KMMS students referred to an Academic Misconduct Committee (AMC) will be dealt with by an AMC of the division. Committees shall consist of three academic members of the Division one of whom shall act as Chair, and one student representative from either University but not from the same programme of study as the student being considered by the Committee. Each Committee will have a Secretary who shall ensure that appropriate records are kept of all academic misconduct allegations and their outcomes.
- 5.3.1 It is recognised that the Division will organise the Chairing of Committee(s) in line with their own requirements (i.e., the Division may have one

committee Chair for each committee or may have a single Chair who Chairs each of the committees).

5.3.2 All committees should operate under the procedures outlined in this document.

5.3.3 The Division will take steps to ensure that there is consistency between its committees, through the on-going monitoring and review of decisions made.

5.4 For the avoidance of doubt, neither the marker(s) raising the allegation of academic misconduct, nor the Module Convener carrying out the informal assessment of an allegation of misconduct, may be part of the Academic Misconduct Committee.

6 Procedures for Considering Allegations of Academic Misconduct

6.3 The procedures for considering allegations of academic misconduct will consist of the following stages, as necessary:

6.3.1 An informal investigation stage, which will seek to establish if there is a case to be considered; on the basis of the available evidence the Chair of the AMC will determine whether the case should be dismissed or should proceed to the formal stage;

6.3.2 A formal stage, where necessary, in which the student is informed of the investigation; as relevant to the case, the Chair of the AMC determines whether (i) a penalty be proposed or (ii) the matter be referred to a hearing;

6.3.3 A hearing stage, as necessary, in which the student may contest the allegation and the proposed penalty before it is recorded and applied;

6.3.4 An appeal stage, where students are entitled to submit an appeal against the decisions of the Chairs/Academic Misconduct Committees, in line with the grounds for appeal set out in section 9 below.

7. Informal Stage

7.1 The informal stage commences when a member of staff suspects that a case of academic misconduct has occurred and so initiates a preliminary investigation.

7.2 Where the suspected offence involves a piece of assessed coursework or non-invigilated examination or test, the marker (or other member of staff raising the concern) will complete an ALERT form requesting that the module lead complete an investigation. The Module Lead, on the basis of the evidence gathered, may elect either to dismiss the case or to refer it to the Chair of AMC for review.

7.3 Where the suspected offence takes one of the other forms of academic misconduct, such as an examination hall offence, the initial investigation will be undertaken by the most appropriate member of University staff and be reported directly to the Chair of the Academic Misconduct Committee.

7.4 The following procedures will apply at the informal investigation stage for suspected cases of academic misconduct relating to coursework assessment/non-invigilated remote examination or test:

7.4.1 Where the Module Lead suspects a case of academic misconduct has occurred, they will carry out an initial investigation of the evidence. It should be noted that the student should not be contacted by the marker at this stage of proceedings.

7.4.2 Should the investigating staff member determine that the allegation is without foundation, they will dismiss the case and no further action shall be taken. An ALERT form should be completed to notify the KMMS Student Life and Wellbeing Team of this decision.

7.4.3 Where the investigating staff member considers that there is a case to answer, or if there is uncertainty as to whether there is a case to answer, it will be referred to the Chair of the AMC via the Secretary (natsmisconduct@kent.ac.uk) for formal consideration. An ALERT form should be completed to notify the KMMS Student Life and Wellbeing Team of this decision.

7.4.4 The relevant section of the Academic Misconduct Referral Form should be completed and forwarded to the Secretary to the AMC. The form will state the nature of the allegation and reasons for referral. Evidence relating to the allegation will be provided with the form.

7.4.5 The student concerned will not be informed of the referral at this stage of the informal investigatory process, so as not to cause them unnecessary concern.

7.4.6 Where the Chair considers after investigation that the allegation requires no further action, they shall so inform the Module Lead and no further action shall be taken. The Module Lead should complete an ALERT form to notify the KMMS Student Life and Wellbeing Team of this decision.

7.4.7 The Chair will complete the relevant section of the Academic Misconduct Referral Form, outlining the reasons why no action will be taken. This form will be provided to the Secretary of AMC who will hold a record of the investigation and outcome in order only that a record of the proceedings is retained. No reference to a case so dismissed will be held on the student's permanent record.

7.4.8 Where, as a result of the informal investigation the Chair considers that the evidence indicates there is a case to answer, proceedings will progress to the formal stage.

7.5 The following procedures will apply at the informal investigation stage for other suspected cases of academic misconduct:

7.5.1 Where a case of academic misconduct is suspected the member of staff involved will refer the matter and any available evidence direct to the Chair of the relevant Academic Misconduct Committee in the Division in which the student is registered for their consideration. An ALERT form should be completed to notify the KMMS Student Life and Wellbeing Team of this decision.

7.5.2 Where the suspected offence occurs in an examination hall, the KMMS Curriculum and Assessment Team will ensure that the University's procedures for invigilation are followed and that the incident report forms are forwarded to the Chair of the relevant Academic Misconduct Committee in the Division in which the student is registered for their consideration. An ALERT form should be completed to notify the KMMS Student Life and Wellbeing Team of this decision.

8. Formal Stage – A Case to Answer

8.1 First Offences, Minor Offenses, Significant Offenses and Serious Offenses

8.1.2 Where as a result of the informal investigation the Chair considers that the evidence indicates there is a case to answer, they will determine if the alleged breach should be regarded as constituting a minor, a significant or a more serious offence. In reaching this determination, the Chair will take into account such factors as the following:

- The contribution to the overall mark for a module made by the piece of work in which the instance of alleged misconduct has been identified;
- For plagiarism or self-plagiarism, the proportion of the piece of work that is plagiarised;
- Whether the student is already in receipt of a formal warning for academic misconduct;
- The number of previous or contemporaneous offences, if any, with any instances of repeat offending normally to be regarded as constituting a significant or more serious offence;
- Evidence of intent to deceive, with any such evidence normally to be regarded as requiring the treatment of the case as per a significant or more serious offence.

8.2 In determining the severity of an offence, and its associated Penalty Category, the Chair can also consult the indicative Exemplar Offences and Penalties provided in Appendix B.

8.3 First Offence – Plagiarism/Self-Plagiarism – UG Stage 1

8.3.1 KMMS and The Universities acknowledges that at the start of a student's career, plagiarism may be inadvertent and a result of inexperience or poor academic practice. In recognition of this fact, the following procedures

have been developed to manage first offences of plagiarism or self-plagiarism.

- 8.3.2 Where a first offence of plagiarism/self-plagiarism is suspected in a piece of coursework submitted by a stage 1 undergraduate student and is referred by a Module Lead to the Chair of the Academic Misconduct Committee for consideration, discretion is afforded the Chair to treat the case as warranting at most an unpenalised resubmission for the piece of work in question and a referral for academic support, provided that:
- The Chair is satisfied that the incidence of plagiarism is a result of poor academic practice;
 - There is, therefore, no evidence of any intent to deceive;
 - The piece of work constitutes the first such incidence of inadvertent plagiarism or self-plagiarism for that student.
- 8.3.3 Where the Chair determines that the work concerned constitutes an instance of inadvertent plagiarism or self-plagiarism, the student will be informed of this in writing, along with the proposed penalty. In such cases the Chair, in consultation with the marker, will determine if a mark may be returned for the piece of work based on the portion which is not plagiarised or whether the student should be permitted to resubmit the piece of work without penalty by an agreed deadline. Where, subsequent to the discounting of the plagiarised portion, the mark awarded is lower than the pass mark, the student may be given the opportunity to resubmit the work where it is considered appropriate to do so, by an agreed deadline for an uncapped mark.
- 8.3.4 Students will not be issued with a formal warning where such inadvertent breaches are upheld.
- 8.3.5 This opportunity to resubmit in term time prior to the next available resubmission opportunity only applies to first offence plagiarism cases in Stage 1.
- 8.3.6 A record of the outcome will be kept by the Secretary to the Academic Misconduct Committee. This record will be deleted when the student progresses from Stage 1. Such cases will not be regarded as constituting a breach of academic misconduct and will not be recorded on the student's transcript or academic reference. An ALERT form should be completed to notify the KMMS Student Life and Wellbeing Team of this decision.
- 8.3.7 Where the student elects to contest the allegation of inadvertent plagiarism or self-plagiarism, the matter will be considered remitted for consideration by the Academic Misconduct Committee under the procedures set out at the formal stage for the conduct of Minor Offences at sections below.

8.3.8 Academic Practice Referral - a referral for further guidance on Academic Practice will be made for the student, in the cases of minor offences

8.4 Minor Offences

8.4.1 Where the Chair determines on the basis of the available evidence that the case should be treated as per a minor offence, they will propose a penalty from those available in Appendix B (normally Penalty Categories A to B);

8.4.2 The Secretary to the Academic Misconduct Committee will write to the student and set out the details of the allegation, the nature of the evidence, the proposed penalty and state that the proposed penalty will be automatically applied should the student either decide not to contest the allegation or fail to respond to the Secretary within the prescribed deadline (normally 10 working days, though this may be a shorter period if this is necessary to ensure that the outcome can be made available to a meeting of the Board of Examiners).

8.4.3 Should the student either decide not to contest the allegation or fail to respond to the Secretary within the prescribed deadline of 10 working days the penalty will be applied automatically, and a formal warning issued (other than with respect to first cases of inadvertent plagiarism or self-plagiarism at UG Stage 1. The Secretary will inform the Chair of the relevant Board of Examiners of the decision. Students may appeal against this outcome in line with the grounds set out at section 11 below.

8.4.4 Should the student contest the allegation and/or the proposed penalty, the Chair will refer the case to the Academic Misconduct Committee. The student will be invited to submit representations in writing. A hearing in person will be convened where the Chair considers that there are sound reasons for doing so.

8.4.5 Following consideration by the Academic Misconduct Committee, the Secretary will inform the student of the outcome of their case, including whether the original outcome has been upheld, or a new outcome reached;

8.4.6 The Secretary will inform the Chair of the relevant Board of Examiners of the decision of the Academic Misconduct Committee for its information. Boards of Examiners will accept the decision of the Academic Misconduct Committee and may not reopen the case or vary the penalty prescribed.

8.4.7 In receiving the outcome of the Academic Misconduct Committee, the student shall be informed of their right to appeal as per the procedure referenced in section 9.

- 8.4.8 The final outcome for the allegation of academic misconduct will be recorded on the Academic Misconduct Referral Form. The form shall be held on file by the Secretary to the Academic Misconduct Committee. An ALERT form should be completed to notify the KMMS Student Life and Wellbeing Team of this decision.
- 8.4.9 Understanding and Avoiding Plagiarism module - there is a requirement for the module to be completed for all acts of minor academic misconduct where a penalty has been applied.
- 8.5 Significant to Serious (including repeat) Offences
- 8.5.1 Where the Chair of the Academic Misconduct Committee determines on the basis of the available evidence that the case should be treated as an alleged significant or serious offence, they will ask the Secretary to convene the Academic Misconduct Committee to hear the case.
- 8.5.2 The Committee will determine on the basis of the available evidence, and representations of the student, the penalty that should be imposed from those available in Appendix B (normally, Penalty Categories C-E);
- 8.5.3 The Secretary will inform the student of the outcome of their case.
- 8.5.4 The Secretary will inform the Chair of the relevant Board of Examiners of the decision of the Academic Misconduct Committee for its information. Boards of Examiners will accept the decision of the Academic Misconduct Committee and may not reopen the case or vary the penalty prescribed.
- 8.5.5 In receiving the outcome of the Academic Misconduct Committee, the student will be informed of their right to appeal as per section 9 below.
- 8.5.6 The final outcome for the allegation of academic misconduct will be recorded on the Academic Misconduct Referral Form. The form shall be held on file by the Secretary to the Academic Misconduct Committee. An ALERT form should be completed to notify the KMMS Student Life and Wellbeing Team of this decision.
- 8.5.7 Understanding and Avoiding Plagiarism module – Other than where a student’s registration is terminated there is a requirement for the module to be completed for acts of academic misconduct where a penalty has been applied for a significant or serious offence.

9 Procedures for Academic Misconduct Committees

9.3 The following procedures should be observed in operating Academic Misconduct Committees.

- 9.3.1 The student shall be informed by the Secretary of the date on which the Academic Misconduct Committee will consider the case.
- 9.3.2 Students will be informed that they may submit evidence to the Committee in writing or, where the Chair considers a hearing in person appropriate, during the hearing.
- 9.3.3 Where the evidence suggests that the case will be complex or that the outcome might potentially lead to serious consequences for the student (i.e., Category E penalties such as Termination of Studies), it would be appropriate for the Chair to indicate that a hearing in person will be staged. Students will be informed by the Secretary that the case will proceed via a hearing and for these reasons.
- 9.3.4 Except where the Chair decides that evidence provided by either party should be confidential to the Committee, students and Committee members will each be provided with copies of the written evidence submitted by the other and, where a hearing in person is held, they will both be permitted to hear the other's evidence.
- 9.3.5 Where a student attends a hearing of the Academic Misconduct Committee, they may be accompanied by a member of staff or a student of the Universities or a member of staff of the Students' Unions or a relative. Where a student representative attends a hearing as a panel member, it will not be their role to provide guidance or support to those students whose work or behaviour is the subject of the allegations under review. Where such support is required, it must be supplied by an individual who is not a panel member.
- 9.3.6 Hearings are not legal proceedings, and a student may not normally be accompanied by a legal representative, even if the legal representative is a member of staff or a student of the Universities or a member of staff of the Students' Union or a relative. However, in complex disciplinary cases, or cases where the outcome can lead to serious consequences, (i.e., Category E penalties such as Termination of Studies) students are permitted to have legal representation.
- 9.3.7 Students must give the Chair of the Academic Misconduct Committee advance notice where they intend to use legal representation, so that the Universities can support the Academic Misconduct Committee in obtaining its own legal advice/support.

- 9.3.8 Where legal representation is required by both parties, the date of the Academic Misconduct Committee hearing may need to be amended, taking into account that the consideration of allegations should be completed within 40 working days (see 3.4).
- 9.3.9 Where a student does not attend an Academic Misconduct Committee hearing on the scheduled date without good reason, they will have no further right of redress within the University's appeals procedures.
- 9.3.10 Where non-attendance is found to be for good reason, the Chair will reconvene the Committee at a later date, taking into account that the consideration of allegations should be completed within 40 working days (see 3.4).
- 9.3.11 The Chair shall have the right to decide that evidence submitted verbally or in writing should be ignored by the Committee on the grounds that it is irrelevant or inappropriate and shall give reasons for doing so.
- 9.3.12 The Secretary shall be responsible for ensuring that a confidential record is kept of all cases. The University of Kent is obliged to release details relating to academic discipline offences if these are explicitly requested by prospective employers as part of an academic reference or where disclosure is an obligatory professional requirement.

10 Other Matters to Note

- 10.3 Formal Written Warning – a formal written warning will be sent to all students where it is found that academic misconduct has taken place, regardless of the severity of the offence.
- 10.4 Academic Practice Referral – a referral for further guidance on Academic Practice will be made for students where a minor offence has been investigated, but no penalty applied.
- 10.5 Academic Integrity Training – there is a requirement for Academic Integrity Training to be completed for all acts of academic misconduct where a penalty has been applied.³
- 10.6 First and Subsequent Offences – students must receive a formal written warning for a first offence, prior to a second offence being established. This is to recognise that students may submit multiple assessments at the same time, where the same academic integrity issues arise. In such cases it would be inappropriate to establish a second offence prior to academic integrity training having been completed.

³ The exceptions to this are where a student has had their studies terminated, or where a claim of academic misconduct is being considered against a graduate.

10.7 Re-assessment – where, as a result of academic misconduct, a piece of work is failed (i.e., a plagiarised piece of work has its mark reduced to '0') this might result in the failure of a module if there are no further permitted attempts remaining for the assessment (as per the published regulations). If there is a further attempt available, the student may submit a new piece of work for marking. The module lead has discretion if this should be on a new or the same topic as the misconduct related piece of work.

11. Appeals

11.1 Students wishing to appeal against the decisions of Chairs of Academic Misconduct Committees, may do so on the following grounds:

- Where there are reasonable grounds, supported by objective evidence, to believe that there has been an administrative, procedural or clerical error of such a nature as to have affected the recommendation of the Committee; and/or;
- That fresh evidence can be presented, which could not reasonably have been made available before the decision was made, and which casts reasonable doubt on the reliability of the decision; and/or
- that the outcome and/or penalty were unreasonable or not justified given the evidence which was available at the time; and/or
- Where there is evidence of prejudice or bias or the reasonable perception of prejudice or bias against the student.

11.2 Appeals on these grounds must be submitted in line with the procedures set out in *KMMS Appeals Procedure*.

12. Contract Cheating

12.1 The Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) defines Contract Cheating as:

“... A form of cheating where a student submits work to a higher education provider for assessment, where they have used one or more of a range of services provided by a third party, and such input is not permitted.”

The contract with the student can include payment or other favours, but this is not always the case.

- 'Services' may include essays or other types of assignments, conducting research, impersonation in exams and other forms of unfair assistance for completing assessed work.
- 'Third parties' include web-based companies or auction sites (essay mills), sharing websites (including essay banks), or an individual such as a lecturer, colleague, friend or relative.

- 'Input' means that the third party contributes to the work of the student, such that there is reasonable doubt as to whose work the assessment represents."⁴

12.2 The University takes Contract Cheating in any form extremely seriously, and as such any proven case of academic misconduct which involves Contract Cheating will result in one of the highest levels of penalty available being applied, including termination of studies with no award.

13. Academic Misconduct in Examinations

13.1 Students should familiarise themselves with the guidance on examination conduct provided in the General Regulations and related examinations information provided by the examination office concerned. Failure to observe these requirements may lead to the academic misconduct procedures being instigated. KMMS examinations may be held under the auspices of Canterbury Christ Church University or University of Kent

13.2 Where a case of suspected cheating is identified within an examination, the examination office concerned will inform KMMS and provide them with relevant incident report pro-forms so that an investigation can be carried out.

13.3 Where applicable, following investigation, the above academic misconduct procedures will be followed.

14. Revocation of Awards

14.1 The Universities reserve the right to investigate an allegation of academic misconduct made following a student receiving their award. In such cases, the University will investigate the allegation under the procedures above to determine what action should be taken.

14.2 As outlined in the KMMS Regulations for the Conferment of the Award of Bachelor of Surgery Bachelor of Medicine, the Academic Board of Canterbury Christ Church and the Senate of the University of Kent acting jointly shall have the power at any time to deprive any holder of an award of the University following the recommendation of a Panel appointed jointly by the Chairs of the Academic Board of Canterbury Christ Church and the Senate of the University of Kent for the purpose of reviewing the case.

⁴ Contracting to Cheat in Higher Education - How to Address Contract Cheating, the use of Third-party Services and Essay Mills, QAA, 2017, <https://www.qaa.ac.uk/quality-code/supporting-resources>, last accessed 30 January 2020.

Appendix A - Academic Misconduct Penalties

Criteria

All academic misconduct offences are considered under the principle of strict liability.

In determining the appropriate penalty for an offence, the following criteria will be considered:

- i. The type and severity of academic offence.*
- ii. The level of study and previous educational background of the student.*
- iii. Whether the student admits or denies the allegation.*
- iv. Previous or concurrent academic offences.*
- v. The impact of the penalty on the student's progress or award.*

Categories of Offence:

- Minor (including first offences) – Typically A and B penalties.
- Significant – Typically C and D penalties.
- Serious (including repeated offences) – Typically E penalties.

It is recognised however that the specific circumstances of an allegation of misconduct may require discretion to be used on whether or minor, significant or serious penalty should be applied. The below table provides some examples of penalties that may be applied. Not all will be applicable to KMMS students

Category	Level	Penalty	Referral to Low Level Concerns /Fitness to Practise Procedures	Warning Letter	Academic Practice Referral	Academic Integrity Training Requirement
A.	0	No penalty - no offence committed; student referred for academic support		✓	✓	
	1	No penalty - first/minor offence committed; student referred for academic support	✓	✓	✓	
B.	1	Minimum penalty - formal warning placed on student record	✓	✓		✓
	2	Penalised assessment mark of 10 percentage points	✓	✓		✓
C.	1	Penalised assessment mark appropriate to the nature of the offence (may be greater than 10 percentage points)	✓	✓		✓
	2	Penalised assessment mark capped at the pass mark	✓	✓		✓
	3	Penalised assessment mark capped at the pass mark following resubmission	✓	✓		✓
	4	Penalised module mark capped at the pass mark	✓	✓		✓
D.	1	Penalised assessment mark of zero	✓	✓		✓
	2	Penalised module mark of zero (regardless of other assessment marks), capped resit permitted	✓	✓		✓
	3	Reduce overall Stage mark by 10 percentage points	✓	✓		✓
E.	1	Reduce programme classification by one or more class (not available to Stage 1 UG)	✓	✓		✓
	2	Award a mark of zero for the academic year with no opportunity for referral	✓	✓		✓
	3	Termination of academic studies with exit award where appropriate	-	-		-
	4	Termination of academic studies with no award	-	-		-

Notes

1. Penalties involving a deduction of marks should ensure that the deduction is proportionate to the offence committed and the nature of the assessment.
2. Penalties may be applied singly or in combination where a candidate has previously committed an offence.
3. Any of the penalties may also be applied where an offence is committed in relation to reassessment (e.g., resubmission &/or referral).
4. Where a penalty involves resubmission of assessment, the resubmission will count as a referral opportunity for Credit Framework purposes.
5. Where an academic penalty is not appropriate (e.g., where it is alleged that a student has falsified documentation as part of an academic procedure, such as the mitigation of extenuating circumstances) the Chair of the Academic Discipline Committee may refer the offence for consideration under the Regulations on student discipline in relation to non-academic matters.

Appendix B - Exemplar Offences and Penalties (indicative only – not all are applicable to KMMS students)

Academic Offence	Severity	Penalties	Exemplar
Exam or ICT Misconduct	Minor (including first offences)	B1	<i>Breach of guidance for students but deemed not to have gained an advantage or placed other students at disadvantage (e.g., possession of unauthorised materials).</i>
	Significant	D1-D2	<i>Breach of guidance for students and deemed to have gained an advantage or placed other students at disadvantage (e.g., use of unauthorised materials).</i>
	Serious (including repeated)	D1-D3, E2	<i>Serious and/or repeated breach of guidance for students and deemed to have gained a significant advantage (e.g., use of unauthorised materials).</i>
Attempting to influence an examiner or teacher	Any	E2-E4	<i>Seeking to gain an advantage by offering inducements to an examiner to treat the work more favourably than is merited.</i>
Plagiarism	Minor (including first offences)	A1-B2	<i>Poor academic practice, unattributed material characteristic of general approach.</i>
	Significant	C1-C4	<i>Lengthy incidences of material inappropriately close to original source.</i>
	Serious (including repeated)	D1-E4	<i>Little or no independent academic value and/or repeated offence.</i>

Self-plagiarism	Any	A1-B2 C1-D2	<i>Minor failure to attribute prior work. Significant failure to attribute prior work.</i>
Collusion	Any	D1-E4	
Impersonation	Any	E2-E4	<i>Intent to deceive as evidenced via false representation by a third party.</i>
Fabrication	Minor (including first offences)	C3	<i>Minor inappropriate manipulation of data or source material to support the piece of work.</i>
	Significant	D2	<i>Inappropriate manipulation of data or source material to support the piece of work.</i>
	Serious (including repeated)	E2-E4	<i>Fabrication or falsification of data to support the piece of work.</i>
Failure to obtain ethical research approval	Minor Significant Serious	B1-B2 C1-C4 D1-E4	
Contract Cheating	Any	E2 to E4	<i>Submission of work for assessment that is wholly or in part the product of third-party services.</i>

Appendix C – KMMS Procedures for cases of suspected Academic Misconduct

