

## Henley Business School Limited (Incorporated in the United Kingdom)

---

### ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AND ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT POLICY

Document Type: Policy

Policy Category: Student administration

---

<b>Last revision date</b>	January 2025
<b>Document owner</b>	Academic and Governance Director
<b>Date of policy review*</b>	January 2029
<b>Display staff intranet</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Display student portal</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Display public website</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

\*unless otherwise indicated, this policy will still apply beyond the review date

---

# Table of Contents

1. Purpose.....	3
2. Scope .....	3
3. Policy statement.....	3
4. Definitions.....	3
5. Policy objectives .....	3
6. Policy principles .....	4
7. Policy provisions .....	4
7.1 Academic Integrity .....	4
7.1.1 Application to academic writing.....	4
7.1.2 Henley studies in relation to previous studies or work related research .....	4
7.1.3 Academic integrity .....	4
7.2 Statement on Academic Misconduct .....	4
7.2.1 Cheating in assessed coursework and assignments includes .....	4
7.2.2 Cheating and other academic misconduct in written examinations .....	5
7.2.3 Other misconduct in written examinations .....	5
7.2.4 Cheating and other academic misconduct in online examinations .....	6
7.3 Penalties .....	6
7.4 Procedures in relation to Academic Misconduct .....	6
7.5 Guidance on scale of offences and penalties in respect of Academic Misconduct .....	6
7.5.1 Scale .....	6
7.6 Second offences .....	8
7.6.1 Penalties for second offences .....	8
7.6.2 What counts as ‘repeat’ offences?.....	8
7.7 Intent.....	9
7.8 Student’s experience.....	9
7.9 Consequences of penalties .....	9
7.10 Plagiarism and referencing.....	9
7.11 Mitigating circumstances .....	10
7.12 Use of Turnitin.....	10
7.13 Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) Tools.....	10
8. Monitoring and reporting.....	12
9. Right of appeal.....	12
10. Supporting documents .....	12
11. Associated documents.....	12
12. Policy life cycle.....	12

## Introduction

'Academic integrity' describes the values held to be essential in Henley Business School Globally. The five core values have been identified as:

1. Accuracy – making sure that your work is free from errors.
2. Honesty – being truthful about which ideas are your own and which are derived from others, and about methods and results of your research.
3. Fairness – not trying to gain an advantage by unfair means: for instance, by passing off others' work as your own.
4. Responsibility - taking an active role in your own learning: for instance, by seeking out the information you need to study effectively.
5. Respect – for your fellow students, your faculty, and the work of other scholars.

(Adapted from International Centre for Academic Integrity (1999), The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity, online at <http://www.academicintegrity.org/icaei/assets/FVproject.pdf>, accessed 20 May 2013.)

### 1. Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to help guide faculty and students on practicing academic integrity in line with the five values with a particular focus on academic honesty.

### 2. Scope

This policy applies to all areas of academic assessment at Henley Business School Africa, which includes, but is not limited to:

- Examinations;
- Assignments;
- Group work;
- Projects;
- The appointment of examiners and moderators (internal and external);
- Re-marking; and
- Assessment of student admission documentation.

### 3. Policy statement

Henley Business School is committed to ensure all programmes completed maintain the same level of academic integrity ensuring the reputation of the school and all its Alumni are maintained.

### 4. Definitions

In this policy, the terms below are utilised and the following meanings are associated to these terms in the context of academic integrity and academic misconduct:

- **AI** – Artificial Intelligence
- **GAIT** – Generative Artificial Intelligence Tools

### 5. Policy objectives

In pursuit of its commitment to maintaining academic integrity across the school, the policy outlines various aspects of assessment, referencing and plagiarism to ensure that all faculty and students are aware of what constitutes plagiarism as well as the consequences thereof.

## 6. Policy principles

- This policy is supported by the School's commitment to ensure all assessments sufficiently demonstrate the student's ability to apply learnings appropriately and are held to a high academic standard.
- The School must be satisfied that any assessment submitted is a true reflection of the student's ability.

## 7. Policy provisions

### 7.1 Academic Integrity

#### 7.1.1 Application to academic writing

You practice academic integrity in your academic writing by working with the five values in mind, and particularly by using correct and accurate referencing. This shows that you can: be accurate in transcribing details; be honest about which ideas were derived from others; act fairly by not taking credit for others' work; take responsibility by finding out what is required of you and how you should carry it out; and show respect for others by acknowledging the part they have played in building your knowledge and understanding.

#### 7.1.2 Henley studies in relation to previous studies or work related research

You may have used a simplified referencing system at school or a previous educational institution, with only direct quotes given citations. At Henley Business School, you need to give a citation whenever you refer to an idea that you derived from a source. This is the case whether you use a direct quote, a paraphrase, or just a mention. There are many different styles of referencing, however, Henley Business School prescribes that all students utilise the Harvard Referencing method.

#### 7.1.3 Academic integrity

Critical analysis and building new knowledge are key aims of academic study. This means you will be expected to read widely to gather a range of ideas, be critical by questioning everything you read and hear, and draw your own conclusions. You then need to support these in your writing by reference to what you have read, and to acknowledge the sources with correct citations.

### 7.2 Statement on Academic Misconduct

Cheating, which is the attempt to gain an advantage for oneself or another by deceit, and other misconduct, are breaches of discipline under the Henley Business School Regulations and are punishable by a range of sanctions.

#### 7.2.1 Cheating in assessed coursework and assignments includes, but is not limited to:

##### a) Plagiarism

For the purpose of these regulations, plagiarism is defined as the fraudulent representation of another's work as one's own. This applies whatever the source of the material (for example, a published source, the web, or the work of another student), whether the material is copied word for word or paraphrased, and whatever the extent of the material used. Wilful and deliberate disregard for good academic practice in respect of attribution of material will be construed as plagiarism.

##### b) Taking a copy of another student's work without his or her permission (whether or not this work is subsequently plagiarised).

- c) **Reproduction of work assessed elsewhere**  
Unless otherwise stated, it is not permissible for a piece of work submitted for assessment to include substantial sections which are drawn from another piece of work submitted for a programme, whether of this School or another awarding body. In the case of assessments where the incorporation of work from another assessment is permitted, students will be informed of this accordingly. Any material in an assignment which has been drawn from another piece of work submitted for a programme should be clearly indicated with a reference to the assessment and programme for which the material was previously submitted.
- d) **Falsifying data, evidence, or experimental results.**
- e) **Collusion: acting with another student with the intention to deceive.**

7.2.2 Cheating and other academic misconduct in written examinations (including tests and examinations administered by the School) include, but are not restricted to:

- a) Taking into the examination hall, or possessing while in the examination hall, any books, memoranda, notes or similar materials (including material held electronically) except in the case of open book examinations. Material which has been supplied by the invigilator or authorised by the Examiners is exempt from this proscription;\*
- b) Taking into the examination hall or possessing while in the examination hall any device which permits communication with others or receipt of communication from others or receipt of information;\*
- c) Copying from, consulting or otherwise making use of another student's script; or attempting to copy from, consult or otherwise make use of another student's script;
- d) Improperly aiding or attempting to aid a student, or improperly obtaining or attempting to obtain aid from any person;
- e) Consulting or attempting to consult, any books, memoranda, notes or other similar material (including material held electronically) while present in the examination hall during the period of the examination;\*
- f) Impersonating or attempting to impersonate another student or being knowingly impersonated.

*\* Please note: For the purposes of these regulations, "examination hall" includes the examination room, the toilets and any other areas to which students have access during the examination.*

7.2.3 Other misconduct in written examinations

Students are not allowed under any circumstances to talk to each other or to behave in a manner likely to disturb or distract other students during an examination.

Students are not permitted to smoke in the examination room.

Students are not permitted to eat in the examination room and are permitted to drink water only, except where a specific alternative arrangement has been agreed in respect of eating and/or drinking in the examination room, which would normally be on the grounds of health or wellbeing.

It is forbidden to remove an examination script or part of an examination script from the examination room.

Students are not allowed to leave the examination before it has finished without the permission of the invigilator or to leave the examination room temporarily for any purpose without the permission

of the invigilator.

Invigilators are authorised to instruct students who are talking or behaving in a disruptive manner to leave the room.

Invigilators will report students whose conduct appears to constitute cheating.

It is an offence to disregard a legitimate instruction given by an invigilator. Students failing to comply with such instructions will be subject to disciplinary action.

7.2.4 Cheating and other academic misconduct in online examinations (including tests and examinations administered by the School) include, but are not restricted to:

- a) Making use of software plug-in tools to aid in the compilation of examination answers;
- b) Making use of Generative Artificial Intelligence Tools including the use of any language enhancement tools for example Co-Pilot and Grammarly;
- c) Copying from, consulting or otherwise making use of another student's examination answers; or attempting to copy from, consult or otherwise make use of another student's examination answers;
- d) Improperly aiding or attempting to aid a student, or improperly obtaining or attempting to obtain aid from any person;
- e) Improper or omitted references of external sources (including books, memoranda, notes or other similar material whether in hard copy or electronic copy) used as permitted during the examination; and
- f) Impersonating or attempting to impersonate another student or being knowingly impersonated.

### 7.3 Penalties

It must be emphasised that a very serious view is taken by the School of cheating and other academic misconduct, whether in written examinations or coursework. Any such case will be treated as a disciplinary matter and will be referred to the Disciplinary Committee who may impose a penalty. In the most serious cases, the Disciplinary Committee will refer the matter to the Academic Board which may lead to the student being failed in all assessments for the relevant programmes or being removed from membership of the school.

### 7.4 Procedures in relation to Academic Misconduct

Staff and students are expected to refer to the Student Code of Conduct for the procedures which are to be followed in cases of Academic Misconduct.

### 7.5 Guidance on scale of offences and penalties in respect of Academic Misconduct

It is a fundamental principle that the penalty for academic misconduct should be in line with the severity of the offence committed. This principle will stand unless there are mitigating circumstances of a medical or personal nature for which supporting evidence was submitted prior to the finalisation of the outcome.

#### 7.5.1 Scale

It is recognised that the severity and circumstances of offences will differ and the Disciplinary Committee will be expected to exercise discretion in determining an appropriate penalty.

Students must refer to the diagram indicating the Indicative scale of offences and penalties located at the end of the policy.

Students are also required to read this in conjunction with the Henley Business School Rubric for plagiarism & GAIT misuse for clear examples on the differences in the offences stated below.

### **Gross academic misconduct**

For example:

- Plagiarism which is substantial in extent. The extent of the plagiarism depends on the centrality of the material to the piece of work and the intended gain: for example, reproducing material which is substantial from a source or sources without acknowledgement; or the substantial use of ideas and arguments of a source or sources which does not appear in the references or bibliography, where the context is such that it is presented as the student's own ideas.
- Contracting (i.e. agreement with another student or party) to cheat.
- Falsification of data which is substantial in extent or importance, including the principal data on which the results of a postgraduate dissertation or thesis are based.
- Impersonation. Impersonation is a deliberate act of deception, often aimed at gaining unfair academic advantages by substituting one individual's identity for another's. This can involve physical presence (such as taking a test for someone) or technological methods (such as hacking or using someone else's credentials to complete tasks).
- Cheating in written examinations or in-class tests and assignments which is extensive or systematic.

Penalty: Normally expulsion from the School

Lowest penalising body: Disciplinary Committee (recommendation to Academic Board for ratification)

### **Major academic misconduct**

For example:

- Plagiarism which is major in extent. The extent of the plagiarism depends on the centrality of the material to the piece of work and the intended gain: for example, the substantial use of others' ideas and arguments where the source has been included in the references or bibliography, although the ideas and arguments are not themselves acknowledged.
- Falsification of data which is major in either extent or importance.
- Cheating in written examinations, assignments or in-class tests which is less extensive.

Penalty: Failure of Part with marks of zero in the module pertaining to the misconduct which results in a module failure. The student retains the right to re-registration for the module or part of module where offence occurred. A final written warning will be issued.

Lowest penalising body: Disciplinary Committee

### **Significant academic misconduct**

For example:

- Plagiarism which is significant in extent or importance. The extent of the plagiarism depends on the centrality of the material to the piece of work and the intended gain: for example, plagiarism that falls short of being substantial but still has a potentially significant bearing on the outcome of the assessment.

- Falsification of data which is significant in either extent or importance, including work where the data are the basis on which conclusions are derived and knowledge is claimed to be based.
- Cheating in written examinations, assignments or in-class tests which may not be extensive.

Penalty: Normally fail the specified assessment with normal right to resit. A written warning will be issued. The mark of the resit is capped at 50%.

Lowest penalising body: Disciplinary Committee

### **Minor academic misconduct**

For example:

- Plagiarism which is minor in extent. The extent of the plagiarism depends on the centrality of the material to the piece of work and the intended gain: for example, a clear example of plagiarism, although it is of little significance to the piece of work.
- Falsification of data which is minor in either extent or importance, for example data associated with demonstrating known practices. Any falsification of experimental data which are intended to or would normally be expected to generate knowledge, including those in a postgraduate or a final year undergraduate project, cannot be regarded as minor.
- Cheating in written in-class tests or assignments which is minor.

Penalty: Normally reduce the mark of the assessment in which misconduct took place. A verbal warning will be issued.

Lowest penalising body: Head of Department

## 7.6 Second offenses

### 7.6.1 Penalties for second offences

Previous offences will be considered during the hearing if they are of the same nature. All previous offences or/and warnings will be considered when agreeing the appropriate penalty to impose. In the case of a student who is found to have committed 'repeat' offences of academic misconduct where the second offence is significant or above, a student will normally be expelled from the School. This principle applies whether or not the sequential offences are of the same type of academic misconduct (cheating in coursework or cheating in written exams).

The convention that a student is not normally removed from the School for a second offence which is minor is deemed proportionate, and should not be construed as condoning serial minor offences. A third offence, whether minor or not, should normally result in expulsion from the School.

### 7.6.2 What counts as 'repeat' offences?

It should be noted that an offence is deemed to be 'sequential' if, at the time of committing the second offence, the student could reasonably be assumed to be aware that they were committing a second offence.

In respect of written examinations and in-class tests, there is a presumption that a student who brings notes into examinations or who copies from another student is fully aware that they are committing an offence. A student who commits offences in two examinations or in-class tests would

normally be considered to have committed 'repeat' offences, whether or not they have been apprehended and interviewed in respect of the first offence.

In respect of plagiarism, there is normally a presumption that a student who commits plagiarism, having received the School's standard documentation in respect of academic misconduct and the guidance included in programme handbooks, is fully aware that they are committing academic misconduct. However, consideration should be given to whether there are factors, such as lack of experience of higher education, which lead to a failure fully to appreciate the distinction between poor practice and academic misconduct and which mean that such a presumption would be unsafe. Where such factors apply, it may not be appropriate to deem a second offence as a 'repeat' unless a warning has been given.

### 7.7 Intent

It should be noted that the School's definition of plagiarism as academic misconduct incorporates the concepts of intent and wilful disregard for good academic practice; and that other forms of academic misconduct are based on the principle of strict liability (i.e. there is no requirement that intent be established). In the case of academic misconduct other than plagiarism, however, intent should be taken into account in determining the penalty.

### 7.8 Student's experience

The level of a student (Higher Certificate, Advanced Certificate, etc) is not in itself a relevant factor in determining the seriousness of the offence or the penalty to be imposed. However, the relevant body should, in appropriate circumstances, give due consideration to a student's experience of higher education (or equivalent) studies. The relevant body, for example, may consider that a student's inexperience may have contributed to their failure to understand the seriousness of an offence, and, in these circumstances, may decide to mitigate the penalty. Such a consideration is likely to be more relevant in cases of plagiarism than in cases of cheating in written examinations or in-class tests.

### 7.9 Consequences of penalties

In determining an appropriate penalty, the relevant body should impose a penalty corresponding with the offence. Due consideration should be given to the consequential implications of the penalty for the individual student: for example, in some cases failure in a module and removal of the normal right to resit might mean, due to the progression rules for the programme, that the student had irredeemably failed their programme and would result in the student's removal from the School. If the relevant body believes that such an outcome would be disproportionate, it may impose a variant on the normal penalty. Equally, however, due consideration should be given to the significance of the offence in relation to the core requirements for the student's programme: an offence in a core module which is testing competences central to the award may be considered as particularly serious, and may therefore merit a more severe penalty.

### 7.10 Plagiarism and referencing

In considering allegations of plagiarism, the relevant body should determine whether the student has attempted to pass off another's work as their own. In this context, failure to observe normal referencing conventions or failure to include quotation marks would normally be treated as poor academic practice rather than academic misconduct provided there is a serious attempt at attribution. For example, a general attribution to unnamed 'authorities', while far from ideal, indicates that the student is not seeking to pass off the views as their own. Similarly, where a

student includes in the reference list (or bibliography) the source for material which is discussed in an essay without specific in text referencing, it may be appropriate to treat such a case as poor academic practice (except in the case of postgraduate students).

For allegations of plagiarism, where a marker considers work to be excessively derivative and poorly referenced but not to be plagiarism (within the terms of the School's definition) the work should be treated as an instance of poor academic practice and not academic misconduct. It is not subject to disciplinary procedures. The student should be given an appropriately low mark, appropriate advice, and an informal warning in respect of future academic conduct. Non-official record will be made to determine whether additional support is required in the case of repeat offences. Records of advice and warnings will be recorded appropriately.

#### 7.11 Mitigating circumstances

The School does not accept a student's medical or personal circumstances as an excuse/reason for cheating. However, the bodies responsible for imposing penalties for academic misconduct are obliged to consider whether the penalty should be mitigated in the light of personal or medical circumstances.

If students are experiencing difficult circumstances, they should discuss their problems with their Programme Director or Programme Management team and submit an extenuating circumstances form in respect of assessments. In consequence, a student's medical or personal circumstances shall not constitute grounds for exonerating a student from an offence of academic misconduct, other than in the exceptional case where a student's capacity for rational judgement has been severely impaired.

Exceptionally, where a student's capacity for rational judgement has been severely impaired, the body responsible for considering the case may determine that the student has not committed academic misconduct.

In cases where a student has been found to have committed academic misconduct and was experiencing difficult medical or personal circumstances which were beyond their control and are judged to have contributed to the commission of the offence, the body responsible for considering the case is required to take due account of the circumstances in determining the penalty for the offence.

#### 7.12 Use of Turnitin

For guidance on the use of Turnitin, please see the Student Handbook and other resources shared by your programme management team.

#### 7.13 Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) Tools

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has been part of our everyday life for a long time and includes applications such as the GPS navigation systems in cars, the targeted ads you see online, the autocomplete features in messaging apps, or the automatic transcripts in live videos, just to name a few.

As the definitions and capabilities of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Generative Artificial Intelligence Tools (GAIT) continue to evolve, it is important to recognize that for the purposes of this policy, GAIT will encompass all AI-powered tools that generate new content, utilize decision-making abilities, and apply critical thinking skills in the context of academic assignments. This ensures that the policy remains adaptive to advancements in AI technology while providing clear guidance on its ethical and

responsible use in higher education.

The next generation of AI tools are called 'Generative AI'. Generative AI tools (for example ChatGPT, Google, Gemini, CoPilot, Grammarly, Editor on Microsoft Word and Quill Bot) are based on a technology called Large Language Models (LLMs). LLMs are trained with 'big data': vast amounts of text, sourced from the internet. Within these huge datasets, they identify patterns of how words are being used, in particular which words occur next to which other words and in what frequencies. Then, based on probabilistic calculations, they produce new text by guessing the next likely element in a sentence. This process has resulted in plausible replication of human-like language.

Beyond just the chatbots, other types of Generative AI tools can produce audio and/or visual outputs following verbal prompts. Such models are trained in similar ways to LLMs, relying on huge datasets made up of images and/or audio recordings available online, with assigned labels to categorise them.

### 7.13.1 Responsible use and misuse of Generative AI tools

The School recognises that there are legitimate uses of Generative AI tools while engaging with assessment. There will be assessments that direct students to engage with such tools in order to promote an understanding of how they work and to develop relevant skills and graduate attributes. Learners with English as a second language or Specific Learning Difficulties might use the tools to summarise key points from complex articles which aid their understanding but not used directly in the completion of the assessments.

Key to the responsible use of Generative AI tools is the student's intellectual ownership of the piece of work and the proper acknowledgement of the role played by the Generative AI tool in developing the piece of work.

Where Generative AI tools have been utilised for a particular assignment, in order to maintain good academic practice and fairness in assessment, students must acknowledge when they have used Generative AI technologies in the development of their work. This includes acknowledging how and when they have used the Generative AI tools. Normally, such a statement should name each Generative AI tool used (providing a URL for the tool) a description of each of the prompts or questions used, and all the outputs generated. It is each student's responsibility to make it clear the extent of and how a Generative AI tool has been used.

The acknowledgement should be included as an appendix at the end of the work and/or a separate attachment for large files. The following format to standardise acknowledgements is recommended for students:

- Prompts used with <insert name of AI tool>: <provide a list of prompts used>
- Output generated: <include a copy of the outputs generated>

Students must refer to the Henley Guidelines on Referencing as found in the Referencing in the Harvard Style Referencing Guidebook. If the School suspects that the outputs from Generative AI tools have been used without proper referencing and/or exceeded the permissible allowed percentage (%) of GAIT, the student would be investigated under the terms of the Academic Integrity and Academic Misconduct policy.

### 7.13.2 AI and Academic Misconduct

The misuse of Generative AI is a form of cheating. When submitting assessments, you are required

to confirm that it is your own work.

Example of GAIT Misuse include but not limited to:

- a) An assessment that has been constructed using the outputs from Generative AI tools (either wholly, or partially) without appropriate acknowledgement.
- b) An assessment that has been constructed using the outputs from Generative AI tools when not permitted
- c) An assessment that has been constructed using the outputs from Generative AI tools, where the use of the Generative AI tool has gone beyond the scope of what the School has permitted.

### 7.13.3 Investigation and sanctions

Where a student is suspected of misconduct in their misuse of Generative AI tools their case would be considered under the procedures outlined in the Student Code of Conduct.

## 8. Monitoring and reporting

The Academic Board is accountable and responsible for establishing the required controls for the policy monitoring and reporting. Administrative responsibility for the implementation of the policy is located within the Teaching & Learning Committee (TLC).

## 9. Right of appeal

Students are directed to the Student Code of Conduct for guidance on the appeals process.

## 10. Supporting documents

Higher Education Act 101 of 1997 (as amended)  
Higher Education Qualifications Sub-Framework (HEQSF)

## 11. Associated documents

Student AI Usage Guide  
Assessment Policy  
Programme Handbooks  
Student Code of Conduct  
Referencing in the Harvard Style Guide

## 12. Policy life cycle

This policy should be reviewed every four years or where required during the intervening period.

## Indicative scale of offences/penalties

Type	Explanation	Max Penalty	Decision making body
Gross academic misconduct	Plagiarism which is substantial in extent. The extent of the plagiarism depends on the centrality of the material to the piece of work and the intended gain: for example, reproducing material which is substantial from a source or sources without acknowledgement; or the substantial use of ideas and arguments from a source or sources which does not appear in the references or bibliography, where the context is such that it is presented as the student's own ideas.	Expulsion from the School	Disciplinary Committee (recommendation to Academic Board for ratification)
	Contracting to cheat.		
	Falsification of data which is substantial in extent or importance, including the principal data on which the results of a postgraduate dissertation or thesis are based.		
	Impersonation.		
	Cheating in written examinations or in-class tests and assignments which is extensive or systematic. This includes the misuse of GAIT. The deliberate misuse of GAIT for any assessment includes for example using GAIT to write answers.		
Major academic misconduct	Plagiarism which is major in extent. The extent of the plagiarism depends on the centrality of the material to the piece of work and the intended gain: for example, the substantial use of others' ideas and arguments where the source appears in the references or bibliography, although the ideas and arguments are not themselves acknowledged.	Failure of Part with marks of zero in the module pertaining to the misconduct which results in a module failure. The student retains the right to re-registration for the module or part of module where offence occurred. A final written warning will be issued.	Disciplinary Committee
	Falsification of data which is major in either extent or importance.		
	Cheating in written examinations, assignments or in-class tests which is less extensive. This includes the misuse of GAIT. The deliberate misuse of GAIT for major parts of any assessment includes for example using GAIT to write major portions of the answers.		
Significant academic misconduct	Plagiarism which is significant in extent or importance. The extent of the plagiarism depends on the centrality of the material to the piece of work and the intended gain: for example, plagiarism that falls short of being substantial but still has a potentially significant bearing on the outcome of the assessment.	Fail specified assessment with normal right to resit. A written warning will be issued. The mark of the resit is capped.	Disciplinary Committee
	Falsification of data which is significant in either extent or importance, including work where the data are the basis on which conclusions are derived and knowledge is claimed to be based.		
	Cheating in written examinations, assignments or in-class tests which may not be extensive. This includes the misuse of GAIT. The deliberate misuse of GAIT for significant		

	parts of any assessment includes for example using GAIT to write significant portions of the answers.		
Minor academic misconduct	Plagiarism which is minor in extent. The extent of the plagiarism depends on the centrality of the material to the piece of work and the intended gain: for example, a clear example of plagiarism, although it is of little significance to the piece of work.	Reduce mark of assessment in which misconduct took place. A verbal warning will be issued.	Head of Department
	Falsification of data which is minor in either extent or importance, for example data associated with demonstrating known practices. Any falsification of experimental data which are intended to or would normally be expected to generate knowledge, including those in a postgraduate or a final year undergraduate project, cannot be regarded as minor.		
	Cheating in written in-class tests or assignments which is minor. This includes the minor misuse of GAIT.		