Reference Number: *R37*

ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT PROCEDURE

Yeovil College

Yeovil College **University Centre**

Policy Review					
Author/Owner	**Position**	**Approved by:**	**Approval Date**	**Review Cycle Review Date**	**Published on Website Y/N**
Andrew Mitchell and Sian Pering	Quality Manager Head of HE and Adult Learning	SMT – Donna Short, Vice Principal Quality of Education	19.06.25	Annually	Yes

Document Control – Revision History (Policies only)					
Author/Owner	**Summary of Changes**	**Date**	**Date last reviewed by SED**	**Version**	**Recommend to SED Y/N**
Derrick Goddard	No changes.	12.09.17	11.11.15		No
Susie Peart	Integration of YCUC procedures, including addition of Appendix 3	04.08.20	11.11.15		No
Susie Peart	No changes except formatting	04.10.21			
Sian Deasy	Amendments to formatting (incl, alignment, spacing, and paragraph numbering) in line with accessibility good practice guidance. Inclusion of reference to generative AI, and AMBeR tariff for HE programmes.			v1	
Andrew Mitchell/ Scott Austin	Suggested review in July to coincide with the new academic year, Addition of JCQ and YCUC guides to related documents, further AI guidance. Addition of AI to the definition of Key Terms. Intent, and Impact added to front sheet. Additions to Appendix 1	25.03.25		v1.1	
Sian Pering & Hilary Yuille	Addition of YCUC Academic Integrity Guidance – AI appendix. Update of Process for investigation of academic misconduct for non-YCUC students to provide clarity on process and sanctions aligning to Learner Disciplinary Policy. Update of appeals process for YCUC learners to provide clarity on process rather than redirecting to other procedures.	May 2025			

Initial Equality Impact Screening					
Has anyone else been consulted on this policy and/or procedure?					
What evidence has been used for this impact screening (e.g. related policies, publications)?					

Declaration (please tick one statement and indicate any negative impacts)
 	
☒ I am satisfied that an initial screening has been carried out on this Policy and/or Procedure and a full Equality Impact   Assessment is not required. There are no specific negative impacts on any of the Protected Characteristics groups.
 	
☐ I recommend that an Equality Impact Assessment is required by the Equality and Diversity group, as possible negative impacts have been identified for one or more of the Protected Characteristics groups as follows:
 	
        ☐   Age
        ☐   Disability
        ☐   Gender Reassignment
        ☐   Race
        ☐   Religion or belief
        ☐   Sex
        ☐   Sexual orientation
        ☐   Marriage & civil partnership
        ☐ Pregnancy & maternity					

Completed by:	Andrew Mitchell	**Position:**	Quality Manager	**Date:**	24.04.25
Reviewed by Equality & Diversity Group: YES/NO If Yes: Date: I confirm that any recommended amendments have been made					
Summary of Comments including Recommendations from Equality & Diversity Group Review:					
Amended by Author:		**Position:**		**Date:**	

Contents

1 PURPOSE OF THE PROCEDURE

1.1 Plagiarism, cheating, collusion and attempting to obtain an unfair academic advantage are forms of academic misconduct and are entirely unacceptable for any student. This procedure defines what the College means by plagiarism, gives examples of the categories of other forms of unacceptable academic misconduct outside examinations, determines the procedures to be adopted in suspected cases and indicates the academic penalties which may be appropriate in proven cases.

2 SCOPE

2.1 In creating this procedure, the College is seeking to maintain the integrity of its academic awards and to give any students affected a fair opportunity to respond to any allegation of academic misconduct.

2.2 A breach of any part of Yeovil College academic regulations relating to assessment, or of the instructions issued in relation to a piece of assessed work, will be considered an offence, irrespective of the intentions of the students concerned. The procedure is for use in all cases except awarding organisations' examinations, where the examining board or awarding organisation and JCQ procedures will apply.

2.3 This process can also cover previous students and can be applied to marks that have already been approved, in exceptional cases. In such cases, the nature of the evidence presented; the seriousness of the offence; the time which has elapsed; the reasons why it was not discovered earlier; and the regulations of any professional validating and accrediting body will be taken into account when determining whether or not to take action. Outcomes could include the recommendation to rescind an award, where this is permitted by the awarding organisation.

2.4 The use of the word "academic" throughout this document is not intended to restrict its application to any particular group of courses and programmes.

3 ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

3.1 Academic misconduct refers to any action by a student that gives them an unfair academic advantage or compromises the integrity of the assessment process. The following are dishonest and therefore unacceptable and not allowed by the College:

3.1.1 Taking someone else's work, images or ideas and passing it off as your own (this is called plagiarism). This could include taking work, images, or ideas generated by

Artificial Intelligence (AI) and passing it off as your own. Appendix 5 (YCUC Academic Integrity Guidance – Artificial Intelligence) includes further information to help Yeovil College University Centre learners understand what ethical and unethical use of AI might look like.

3.1.2 Using the computer, either the internet or information stored on a hard disk or external device such as a flash drive, which belongs to someone else, and passing it off as your own.

3.1.3 Using Artificial Intelligence (such as 'ChatGPT') to complete all or parts of a piece of work so that the work does not reflect your own work, analysis, evaluation, or calculations.

3.1.4 Failing to acknowledge use of AI tools when they have been used as a source of information.

3.1.5 Submitting work with intentionally incomplete or misleading references or bibliographies.

3.1.6 Cheating by acting unfairly or dishonestly in any way that has the potential to give you an unfair advantage.

3.1.7 Secretly agreeing with others to cheat or deceive (this is known as collusion).

3.1.8 Falsification or attempting to falsify submission details (e.g. dates, times).

3.1.9 "Self-plagiarism" i.e. using the same assignment/work for different course assessments.

3.1.10 Trying to convince others to breach these Academic Misconduct regulations, or being aware of others attempting to cheat or otherwise breach these regulations and not informing a member of college staff.

3.1.11 Making false declarations in an attempt to gain examination concessions or special consideration (e.g. extenuating circumstances).

3.2 Further explanation is included in Appendix 1.

3.3 All these are examples of **Academic Misconduct**. If a student is discovered or suspected of doing any of the things shown in the list above, the College will investigate and may take action against them.

3.4   The College will seek to ensure that students are helped to avoid Academic Misconduct. Guidelines of appropriate steps to be taken by staff are given in Appendix 2.

4   ACTIONS TO BE TAKEN WHEN ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT IS SUSPECTED

4.1   **Yeovil College University Centre:** Please see **Appendix 3** for the process to be followed where there is a suspected case of academic misconduct by a University Centre student. For all other (non-YCUC) students, the below process should be followed for both formative and summative internally assessed assessment. Externally assessed assessment (e.g. cheating in exams) should be approached in line with the Malpractice and Maladministration Policy and Procedure[1] and awarding body requirements.

4.2   In very minor cases, the Study Programme Manager (SPM) should raise the issue with the student informally. This would be applicable in cases such as where a student has not followed referencing protocols correctly, but has attempted to clearly indicate where the work has come from, or where a SPM becomes aware that a study group are veering towards working collaboratively on assignments although have not yet colluded on a piece of assessed work. The SPM should discuss how the issue could end up amounting to academic misconduct if it is not resolved. The SPM should keep a record of this conversation, by adding as a comment to the learner's Individual Learning Profile (ILP).

4.3   In all other cases, if a member of staff suspects a breach of the College's Academic Misconduct Procedure or the awarding institution's regulations, they should share the work in question with an appropriate member of staff for a second opinion. In most cases, this should be the Lead Internal Verifier (Lead IV) for the course, although the Curriculum Area Manager (CAM) can be consulted in the Lead IV's absence or if the Lead IV identifies the suspected misconduct.

4.4   The consideration of the suspected misconduct should be appropriately documented using IV / moderation paperwork, including a brief account of who has been involved in the consideration and why their decision has been reached. If both parties agree that there is a reasonable possibility that misconduct has taken place, the steps outlined below should be taken to investigate further. Marks for the assessment in question should not be released to the student until the investigation has taken place.

4.5   If academic misconduct is suspected, the SPM should hold a tutorial meeting with the learner in question to raise the concerns. In most cases, this should take place within two

---

[1] Available at: https://www.yeovil.ac.uk/policies-reports/

working weeks of the concerns being raised. In this tutorial meeting, the SPM should explain what the concern is, and the specific reasons why academic misconduct is suspected. The learner should have the opportunity to explain what occurred, including the opportunity to provide evidence to support their case if appropriate (e.g. showing previous drafts of an assignment or essay plans on their device to evidence work is original).

4.6   If, following this meeting, the professional judgement of the SPM is that on the balance of probabilities academic misconduct has taken place[2], then consequences should be applied as per the table below. In addition, the SPM should confirm this in writing with their Lead IV, including a brief rationale for the decision. The Lead IV should retain this alongside the internal verification records for the course, and should consult with the Quality Manager as to whether notification to the awarding body is required. The Quality Manager would support the Lead IV with the proper process for notification of academic misconduct, as appropriate.

Academic Misconduct Categories and Consequences	
Minor Case of Academic Misconduct	**Description**
	First instance of academic misconduct for this broad type (i.e. plagiarism / AI misuse / collusion) on this programme of study, where the learner has not made deliberate attempts to conceal the misconduct when queried.
	Consequence
	4.7 The learner should be returned the work to complete again, this time without academic misconduct.
	• The penalty for 'minor cases of academic misconduct' should be applied in line with the Learner Disciplinary Procedure. This includes logging on the learner's ILP what sanction has been applied, and brief summary of situation and rationale for this judgement.
	• The learner should also be given the opportunity to ask whether any work they have currently submitted for marking, but that has not yet been returned to them, might include academic misconduct of a similar nature. If this is the case, the learner should have these pieces of work returned to them to re-do and re-submit without academic misconduct.
Moderate Case of Academic Misconduct	**Description**
	• Second occurrence of 'minor' academic misconduct, where there is a record on the ILP that a learner has received a 'Minor Academic

---

[2] Staff should note that in line with this wording, it is the responsibility of the SPM to be able to justify that – on the balance of probabilities – they believe there has been misconduct, rather than for the learner to definitively prove that misconduct did not take place.

	Misconduct' sanction about the same broad type of academic misconduct previously whilst enrolled on this programme of study (i.e. plagiarism / AI misuse / collusion).
	• *OR* First instance of academic misconduct where the learner makes a deliberate effort to conceal that misconduct has taken place when this is raised – for example, through attempting to falsify previous drafts of work, attempting to use an AI tool to make work appear to be their own, or asking another student to lie for them.
	Consequence
	4.8 The learner should be returned the work to complete again, this time without academic misconduct.
	• The penalty for 'moderate cases of academic misconduct' should be applied in line with the Learner Disciplinary Procedure. This includes logging on the learner's ILP what sanction has been applied, and brief summary of situation and rationale for this judgement.
	• The learner should also be given the opportunity to ask whether any work they have currently submitted for marking, but that has not yet been returned to them, might include academic misconduct of a similar nature. If this is the case, the learner should have these pieces of work returned to them to re-do and re-submit without academic
Severe Case of Academic Misconduct	**Description**
	• A repeat occurrence of academic misconduct, where there is a record on the ILP that a learner has already received a 'Moderate Academic Misconduct' sanction for the same broad type of academic misconduct previously whilst enrolled on this programme of study (i.e. plagiarism / AI misuse / collusion).
	• *OR* Second instance of 'minor' academic misconduct where there is a record on the ILP that a learner has received a 'Minor Academic Misconduct' sanction about the same broad type of academic misconduct previously whilst enrolled on this programme of study (i.e. plagiarism / AI misuse / collusion) and the learner makes a deliberate effort to conceal that misconduct has taken place when this is raised – for example, through attempting to falsify previous drafts of work, attempting to use an AI tool to make work appear to be their own, or asking another student to lie for them.
	Consequence
	4.9 The learner should be returned the work to complete again, this time without academic misconduct.

| | • The penalty for 'severe cases of academic misconduct' should be applied in line with the Learner Disciplinary Procedure. This includes logging on the learner's ILP what sanction has been applied, and brief summary of situation and rationale for this judgement. |
| | • The learner should also be given the opportunity to ask whether any work they have currently submitted for marking, but that has not yet been returned to them, might include academic misconduct of a similar nature. If this is the case, the learner should have these pieces of work returned to them to re-do and re-submit without academic |

4.10   If, following the meeting, the suspicion of academic misconduct is not or cannot be upheld, the SPM should confirm this in writing with their Lead IV, including a brief rationale for the decision. The Lead IV should retain this alongside the internal verification records for the course.

5   APPEALS

5.1   Appeals against decisions made under Section 4 of this Academic Misconduct Procedure may be made as detailed in the College Learner Disciplinary Procedure (Conduct).

6   RELATED POLICIES, PROCEDURES, DOCUMENTS, DEFINITIONS

6.1   Learner Disciplinary Procedure

6.2   Malpractice and Maladministration Policy

6.3   The YCUC Academic Integrity Guidance – Artificial Intelligence (AI)

6.4   The JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres

6.5   The JCQ AI Use in Assessments Guidance: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications

6.6   [Generative artificial intelligence (AI) in education – DfE](#)

6.7   [Jisc National Centre for AI – AI use in education primer (regularly updated)](#)

6.8   [Jisc – Principles for the use of AI in FE colleges](#)

1. DEFINITIONS

1.1. Plagiarism

1.2. Plagiarism is the presentation of someone else's work, words, images, ideas, opinions or discoveries, whether published or not, as one's own, or alternatively appropriating the artwork, images or computer-generated work of others, without properly acknowledging the source, with or without their permission.

1.3. Examples of plagiarism include:

    1.3.1. Directly copying from written physical, pictorial or electronically stored material, without crediting the source.

    1.3.2. Paraphrasing someone else's work without crediting the source.

    1.3.3. Either directly copying from or paraphrasing from work created by an Artificial Intelligence source (such as 'ChatGPT') without crediting the source.

    1.3.4. "Self-plagiarism" is using the same assignment/work for different course assessments without the explicit permission from the Programme Leader to do so. Presenting the same assignment/ work again could lead to a student gaining credit twice for a single piece of work.

2.1. Artificial Intelligence

2.2 Artificial Intelligence (AI) refers to a machine's ability to perform cognitive functions that we typically associate with human minds, such as learning, reasoning, and problem-solving. A specific type of AI called Generative Pre-trained Transformers (GPT) uses deep learning techniques to generate natural language text. Deep learning is a type of learning that allows machines to process a wide range of data, making it possible for GPT to understand and produce human-like text.

2.3. AI has been built into large language models (LLMs) like ChatGPT and Google Bard that enables these tools to respond to prompts in a human-like way, answering questions and

complete written tasks. With prompts these AI tools can respond with structured written text, turning written prompts into audio, video and images

2.4   Examples of AI misuse include, but are not limited to, the following:

    2.4.1   Copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the evidence submitted for assessment is no longer the learners' own work.

    2.4.2   Copying or paraphrasing whole responses of AI-generated content.

    2.4.3   Using AI to complete parts of the assessment so that the work does not reflect the student's own work, analysis, evaluation or calculations.

    2.4.4   Failing to acknowledge use of AI tools when they have been used as a source of information.

    2.4.5   Using AI as an image creator and faking video content to generate work which prevents learners from properly showcasing their creativity and developing their own creative thinking skills.

    2.4.6   Human impersonation - AI could be misused to impersonate a learner, or an assessor, which would compromise the authenticity of the assessment cycle.

    2.4.7   Ising AI to solve complex mathematical calculations, preventing the learner to understand the problem-solving process properly.

    2.4.8   Using AI tools to generate programming codes, this reduces the learner's ability to develop their own coding solutions.

3.0   Cheating and Collusion

3.1   Examples of other forms of academic misconduct (such as cheating, collusion and attempting to obtain an unfair academic advantage) include:

    1.3.5.   Getting someone else to produce part or all of the work submitted.

    1.3.6.   Colluding with one or more student(s), or other people, to produce a piece of work and submitting it individually as your own, including the use of online essay writing services.

    1.3.7.   Copying the work of another person, with or without their permission.

1.3.8. Knowingly allowing another student to copy your own work.

1.3.9. Using forbidden notes, books or technology in producing assigned work or tests.

1.3.10. Fabrication of results (including experiments, research, interviews, observations).

1.3.11. Submitting work with intentionally incomplete or misleading references or bibliographies.

APPENDIX 2 – GUIDELINES FOR STAFF TO AVOID ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

1.   GUIDELINES FOR STAFF TO AVOID ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

1.1.   To prevent the occurrence of academic misconduct, staff should:

1.1.1.   Inform students clearly of the need for academic integrity and honesty:

1.1.2.   Include statements on academic misconduct where appropriate in College policies and student handbooks

1.1.3.   Make students aware of the penalties for academic misconduct at the earliest stage of the course

1.1.4.   Provide students with guidance on the format of formal acknowledgement of source material

1.1.5.   Inform students, in writing if possible, of the extent to which they can collaborate in coursework

1.1.6.   Be aware that most students are very computer literate and can scan text and surf the web for model essays etc with ease. Ensure that students are adequately supervised when using computers to prevent students from copying or printing out other people's work as part of their own

1.1.7.   Devise procedures for assessing work in such a way that plagiarism, cheating and collusion are more detectable. These might include: ensuring that coursework assessment is supported by unseen and supervised work under test conditions; changing assignment topics yearly, on at least a three-yearly cycle; making less use of generic assignments in favour of tailored assignments; getting to know the style of students' writing/submissions early on in the course; comparing subsequent work to initial assessment tests; assessing a class group's coursework on a single occasion, to enhance the likelihood of the assessor spotting plagiarised passages, or other collusion

1.1.8.   Fully investigate all instances of suspected academic misconduct utilising the proper disciplinary procedures

YEOVIL COLLEGE UNIVERSITY CENTRE PROCESS

1.   IF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT IS SUSPECTED

1.1.   Suspected academic misconduct can be identified in a range of ways. This may include, but is not limited to, via staff reviewing information provided by the College's plagiarism detection software (including both similarity checking reports and AI detection reports), and / or via suspected misconduct being identified by a teacher or assessor when marking a student's work, and / or via a member of staff witnessing or being made aware of reports of a student intending to or having committed academic misconduct.

1.2.   In very minor cases, the Programme Leader involved should raise the issue with the student informally. They should discuss how the issue could end up amounting to academic misconduct if it is not resolved. The Programme Leader should keep a record of this conversation, for example by sending a follow-up email to the student. This would be applicable in cases such as where a student has not followed referencing protocols correctly, but has attempted to clearly indicate where the work has come from, or where a Programme Leader becomes aware that a study group are veering towards working collaboratively on assignments although have not yet colluded on a piece of assessed work.

1.3.   In all other cases, if a member of staff suspects a breach of the College's Academic Misconduct Procedure or the awarding institution's regulations, they should share the work in question with the Programme Leader. If the Programme Leader identifies the suspected misconduct, they should ask their Curriculum Area Manager (CAM) or an experienced member of the Programme teaching team for their opinion.

1.4.   If both parties agree that there is a possibility that misconduct has taken place, they should inform the HE Coordination Officer via email. The email should include a brief account of who has been involved in this discussion, and why they have decided misconduct may have taken place.

1.5.   Marks for the assessment in question should not be released to the student until the investigation has taken place. If the alleged offence has been discovered very shortly before the scheduled return date, this should be brought to the HE Coordination Officer's attention.

2.   YCUC PANEL OF INVESTIGATION

2.1.   When the HE Coordination Officer is made aware of suspected academic misconduct, they will call a YCUC Panel of Investigation.

2.2.   A panel will comprise:

2.2.1. A chair (usually a member of the Senior Management Team)

2.2.2. Two further panellists - members of the College Management Team or experienced HE Programme Leaders who do not teach the student in question.

2.3. The HE Coordination Officer should give staff the opportunity to recuse themselves if they feel they have a conflict of interest, or that it is reasonable to think there would be a perception of bias.

2.4. The Programme Leader will be invited to attend the panel meeting to present the case, answer any questions that arise and provide relevant subject-specific context, but will not be able to influence the final decision made.

2.5. A HE Coordination Officer or nominee will act as secretary and minute taker to the panel.

2.6. Where possible, the panel meeting should be arranged for a day when the student would normally have teaching in order to ensure availability.

2.7. In most cases, the panel meeting should be organized so the student has 1-3 weeks' notice. In certain circumstances, for example vacation periods, it may take longer to arrange the meeting. Panel meetings may be called with less notice in exceptional circumstances, such as where this will allow the matter to be resolved before an Assessment Board, or if there is a very serious matter under investigation.

2.8. The student will be informed in writing of the suspected academic offence, the purpose of the panel meeting, and the date and time it is scheduled to take place, as well as how to access support during the process. They will be informed of their opportunity to accept or contest the allegation, the opportunity provide evidence in mitigation, and any timescales for doing so. They will have the opportunity to attend the meeting, if they choose, and will be informed of their choice to bring a support person. They may also request to call witnesses, although should give the HE Coordination Officer at least five working days' notice of this. A document will be supplied to support the student to put together a statement of mitigation, outlining potential mitigating factors such as previous academic and behavioural record, intent, or extenuating personal circumstances.

2.9. A student can provide a written statement so that the meeting can take place without them, but they do not have the right to demand the panel meet at an alternative date or time.

2.10. The HE Coordination Officer should send all panel members and the student in question the evidence of suspected misconduct at least five working days before the panel meeting. In cases involving multiple students, students themselves will only be sent copies of their own work. The HE Coordination Officer should also inform the student of any witnesses the College are calling to speak at the meeting. The Programme Leader is responsible for ensuring the HE Coordination Officer has this information in good time.

2.11. The panel meeting should begin with the Chair briefing the other panel members, followed by the Programme Leader presenting the relevant evidence. Then the student will be invited to join, discuss the evidence of suspected academic misconduct, and share any evidence to

contest the allegation and / or evidence in mitigation. The panel will have the opportunity to ask questions. The student will then be asked to leave whilst the panel deliberate and will be called back when they have decided an outcome. Where this is not possible on the day, the student should be informed of when they should expect to hear the outcome, which should be no later than five (5) working days after the date of the panel meeting.

3. SUPPORT AND REASONABLE ADJUSTMENTS

3.1. Students can contact the HE Coordination Officer if they would like support in understanding the procedure or the operational parts of this process and how it will work.

3.2. Students can contact the HE Student Support Officer for pastoral, wellbeing, or emotional support throughout the process.

3.3. Students who require reasonable adjustments to be implemented in order to engage with this process are welcome to request this by contacting the University Centre (university.centre@yeovil.ac.uk). For example, a student who usually has in-class non-medical-helper support such as a sign language interpreter or communication support worker would be welcome to request that equivalent support was made available during this process.

4. DECIDING UPON AN OUTCOME

4.1. When reaching a decision, the burden of proof is upon the panel to prove that 'on the balance of probabilities' academic misconduct has taken place.

4.2. When deciding upon a penalty, the panel should take into account any mitigating factors, and also unintended consequences of certain penalties, for example, the impact upon Visa status.

4.3. The penalties that will typically be applied by the College are laid out below. The panel will work through the penalties from the least to the most severe when deciding which to impose. If imposing a sanction which involves the resubmission of a piece of work, the panel should be clear whether this is a fresh chance to undertake the assessment opportunity, or whether this would count as a 'reassessment' or 'rework' opportunity in line with the regulations of the appropriate Awarding Organisation.

4.4. For cases of plagiarism, the panel should use the points-based system outlined in the 'AMBeR Tariff' (Appendix 4) to identify which series of outcomes could be applied, and then work through the outcomes in the relevant category, from least to most severe (as outlined in 4.3) when deciding which sanction to impose.

4.5. In cases of franchised university learners, then the appropriate list of penalties from the awarding institution may be used instead.

4.6. In addition to these academic penalties, penalties in line with the Learner Disciplinary Procedure (Conduct) may also be applied as appropriate.

4.7. Academic Misconduct has not been committed:

4.7.1.   No further action to be taken.

4.7.2.   The student to be cautioned about their conduct moving forwards, and a copy of the letter and meeting minutes will be kept on the student's file for future reference.

4.8. Academic Misconduct has been committed:

In all of the instances below a copy of the letter and meeting minutes will be kept on the student's file for future reference.

4.8.1.   The work will be marked, omitting any portions affected by the academic misconduct.

4.8.2.   The student will be permitted an opportunity to repeat the assessment, uncapped.

4.8.3.   The student will be permitted an opportunity to repeat the assessment, capped at 40% / PASS.

4.8.4.   The student will receive a mark of zero for the piece of work in question.

4.8.5.   The student will receive a mark of zero for the module in question.

4.8.6.   The student will receive a mark of zero for the module in question and is barred from taking that module again.

4.8.7.   The student is withdrawn from their programme.

4.8.8.   The student is expelled.

4.9.   All students should be informed of the outcome in writing, within five working days of the panel reaching their decision. Where an outcome includes the release of marks and / or feedback to a learner, the notice of outcome should also make clear to the learner when this will be released by, and via what format (e.g. Moodle).

4.10.   All decisions of the Academic Offences Panel will then be taken to the next available Assessment Board for approval. Where the Assessment Board does not approve the Academic Offences Panel's recommendation, a student should be informed of this, and the new outcome, in writing within five days of the decision being made.

5.   APPEALS

5.1.   A student has the right to appeal the decision of the panel. Appeals should be made within 10 working days of a student being sent the outcome of the panel in writing, and should be addressed to the Principal's PA, and should include the following details:

5.1.1.   Name

5.1.2.   Contact Details (ideally phone and email)

5.1.3.   Programme of Study

5.1.4.   Date on which disputed decision took place

5.1.5.   The reasons for your appeal

5.1.6.   Any other relevant information

5.2. An appropriate member of the Senior Management Team will be allocated to investigate the appeal, including reviewing evidence to confirm whether internal processes were appropriately followed during the Academic Misconduct investigation processes. During this review process,

5.3. An appropriate member of the Senior Management Team will be allocated to investigate the appeal, and will consider whether the relevant procedures were followed during the academic misconduct investigation, whether the outcome reached was reasonable in all aspects and whether you have received clear reasons why the outcome was reached. If new material evidence has been provided, the Senior Manager investigating the appeal will consider whether you have given valid reasons for not supplying this earlier.

5.4. A student should receive a written outcome of their appeal within 20 working days, which will state whether the decision of the Academic Offences Panel has been upheld, partially upheld, or not upheld. Upon completion of the appeal, a student should be issued with a Completion of Proceedings letter. If a student is still not satisfied they can appeal the decision with the Office of the Independent Adjudicator, The Independent Ombudsman Service for Higher Education[3]. Template Completion of Proceedings letters can be obtained from the Head of Higher Education and Adult Learning, or as appendices to other College policies, such as the Customer Feedback Policy and Procedure (including complaints).

6.   JOINT ALLEGATIONS

6.1. In cases involving multiple students, the learners in question have the right to know who else is involved. However, it should be made explicit that any attempts to collude with other students to create a cover story, or any attempts to intimidate or coerce another student into sharing, or not sharing, certain information with the panel will be treated very strictly.

6.2. Effort should be made to ensure students involved attend the same panel. If this is not possible, it may mean an outcome is not reached for the first student until any subsequent students have also had the opportunity to meet with the panel.

6.3. Students will be given the opportunity to speak to the panel individually. Once the panel has spoken to all students involved, they will then all be called to join the panel together, where the Chair will give a summary of whether individual accounts of the situation were consistent or if there were any discrepancies. As appropriate, students may then be given further opportunity to contest the issue and answer any questions as a group, or individually.

6.4. Different outcomes may be given for different students. However, the panel should be clear in their reasoning where there is a difference in outcomes / sanctions. Students do not have the right to know what outcome has been given to another learner.

---

[3] www.oiahe.org.uk

7. PREVIOUS OFFENCES

7.1. Information about any previous academic misconduct investigations will be shared with members of the panel. This should not bias the panel but may help to inform decisions about whether misconduct has been committed, and if so, what penalty to apply. For example, if a student has previously been explicitly informed by a panel about the extent to which collaborative working is permitted before becoming collusion, this will be relevant to a future case of suspected collusion if the student is claiming a lack of awareness of the regulations around collaborative working as a defence.

8. BEING ACCOMPANIED TO PANEL MEETINGS

8.1. A student can be accompanied to the panel meeting by a friend, family member, or other appropriate support person such as the HE Student Support Officer. This person would attend to provide moral support, rather than to speak on the student's behalf. The student should give the HE Coordination Officer at least two working days' notice if they would like to bring someone to accompany them to the meeting.

8.2. In particularly complex disciplinary cases where the consequences for the student may be severe, a student may request permission to bring a legal representative. Requests for a legal representative to attend will be considered by the Chair of the panel on a case-by-case basis and only granted in severe and exceptional circumstances. When considering whether it is appropriate for a legal representative to attend, the Chair will consider:

8.2.1. The seriousness of the charge;

8.2.2. Whether any points of law are likely to arise;

8.2.3. The capacity of the individual to understand the case against them;

8.2.4. Procedural difficulties;

8.2.5. The need to avoid delay;

8.2.6. The need for fairness between the student and those making the allegation.

8.3 A student may request to appoint someone else to speak on their behalf. This will be considered on a case-by-case basis, and decided upon by the panel's Chair. For example, in the case of a student with a disability who usually receives in-class support with communication this may be appropriate.

9. REPORT TO THE SENIOR MANAGEMAENT TEAM

9.1. At the first HE group meeting of the each academic year, the Head of Higher Education and Adult Learning must report on the number of cases considered by the Academic Offences Panel, detailing the number where the allegation was found to be true, the nature of the allegation in each such case and the penalty invoked. The report shall not name individual students.

9.2.   As part of this report, the Head of Higher Education and Adult Learning will monitor both instances and outcomes of cases considered by the Academic Offences Panel in line with protected characteristics, identifying any relevant trends or data which may suggest there is inequity of experience for any groups sharing one or more protected characteristics.

STEP 1 – Award points based on the following criteria.

HISTORY

1st Time	100 points
2nd Time	150 points
3rd Time or more	200 points

AMOUNT / EXTENT

Below 5% **AND** less than two sentences	80 points
As above but with **critical aspects*** plagiarised	105 points
Between 5% and 20% **OR** more than two sentences but not more than two paragraphs	105 points
As above but with **critical aspects*** plagiarised	130 points
Between 20% and 50% **OR** more than two paragraphs but not more than five paragraphs	130 points
As above but with **critical aspects*** plagiarised	160 points
Above 50% **OR** more than five paragraphs	160 points
Submission purchased from essay mill or ghost-writing service	225 points

*Critical aspects are key ideas central to the argument

LEVEL / STAGE

Level 4	70 points
Level 5	115 points
Level 6 or Postgraduate	140 points

VALUE OF ASSIGNMENT

Standard weighting	30 points
Large project (e.g. final year dissertation)	60 points

ADDITIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Evidence of deliberate attempt to disguise plagiarism by changing words, sentences, or references to avoid detection **40 points.**

STEP 2 – Award penalties based on the points.

PENALTIES (Summative Work)

In all cases, a formal warning is given and a record made contributing to the student's previous history.

280 – 329	• No further action beyond formal warning • Assignment awarded 0% - resubmission required with no penalty on mark.
330 – 379	• No further action beyond formal warning • Assignment awarded 0% - resubmission required with no penalty on mark. • Assignment awarded 0% - resubmission required but mark capped or reduced.
380 - 479	• Assignment awarded 0% - resubmission required but mark capped or reduced. • Assignment awarded 0% - no opportunity to resubmit.
480 - 524	• Assignment awarded 0% - no opportunity to resubmit. • Module awarded 0% - re-sit required, but mark capped or reduced. • Module awarded 0% - no opportunity to re-sit, but credit still awarded.
525 - 559	• Module awarded 0% - re-sit required, but mark capped or reduced. • Module awarded 0% - no opportunity to re-sit, but credit still awarded. • Module awarded 0% - no opportunity to re-sit, and credit lost. • Award classification reduced. • Qualification reduced (e.g. Honours to no Honours). • Expelled from institution but with credits retained. • Expelled from institution but credits withdrawn.
560+	• Module awarded 0% - no opportunity to re-sit, and credit lost. • Award classification reduced. • Qualification reduced (e.g. Honours to no Honours). • Expelled from institution but with credits retained. • Expelled from institution but credits withdrawn.

PENALTIES (Formative Work)

280 – 379	• Informal Warning.
380+	• Formal warning, with record made contributing to student's previous history.

APPENDIX 5 – YCUC ACADEMIC INTEGRITY GUIDANCE: ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI)

<div align="center">YCUC Academic Integrity Guidance – Artificial Intelligence (AI)</div>

<div align="center">A guide to help students to conduct themselves with academic integrity and avoid AI misuse.</div>

Why Academic Integrity Matters: Developing Vital Skills

Becoming critically analytical and developing higher-level research skills are key parts of university-level study. A core part of learning at university-level is undertaking assessments and taking the opportunity to reflect, learn, and develop from the feedback you are given – both areas of strength and areas for improvement. Academic misconduct of any kind deprives you of the chance to develop these vital skills, not to mention wasting the time and money you're investing in learning. Moreover, it can create significant issues down the line, both in future studies, but especially if you go into the world of work without the skills and knowledge employers expect someone with a university-level qualification to have. It is important to have some faith in your own abilities – at university-level we are expecting students to be bringing together concepts in new and interesting ways!

Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Academic Misconduct: An Overview

Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) is a new and emerging technology. At Yeovil College, we recognise that AI can be used to enhance learning, so have not fully banned its use. Students are allowed to appropriately use AI tools to support their own study and research. However, using any content generated by artificial intelligence within a piece of work submitted for assessment is considered academic misconduct, unless explicitly stated otherwise in the assessment brief. Academic misconduct, including AI misuse, can lead to a range of sanctions, up to and excluding expulsion. It is therefore essential that students do not misuse AI when creating assignments.

It is also important to note that whilst AI may answer questions, it isn't necessarily correct. AI can provide incorrect information, or outputs that are culturally biased or impacted by the way in which a question is asked. Therefore, AI is not considered an academically credible source to use.

Academic Misconduct Procedure Information

Students should always refer to the College's Academic Misconduct Procedure for the final word on what academic conduct is, and is not, acceptable. The College's Academic Misconduct Procedure includes the following wording about AI:

"The following is dishonest and therefore unacceptable and not allowed by the College:

- Taking someone else's work, images or ideas and passing it off as your own (this is called plagiarism). This could include taking work, images, or ideas generated by Artificial Intelligence (AI) and passing it off as your own.

- Using Artificial Intelligence (such as 'ChatGPT') to complete all or parts of a piece of work so that the work does not reflect your own work, analysis, evaluation, or calculations."

The Procedure later states that an example of Plagiarism could be "Either directly copying from or paraphrasing from work created by an Artificial Intelligence source (such as 'ChatGPT') without crediting the source".

Examples of AI Use and Misuse

Below are some examples of AI use and misuse. This is not a definitive list; there are many other ways to use or misuse AI. If you are unsure, check the [Academic Misconduct Procedure](#) or speak to a tutor.

Acceptable:

Using AI to help to provide you with an overview of new concepts.

This could involve using AI like you might use Google or Wikipedia – to form a basic understanding of a new topic before going on to research it in more detail in academic sources. However, consider if there would be a better way to find this information – maybe using Google or checking lecture notes?

Reinterpreting information to understand new or complex terminology.

AI could be used to help reinterpret information or understand complex terminology. However, we would usually recommend a more academic source than AI for this – e.g. using a dictionary to define new terms or reviewing lecture slides to understand new concepts. Always speak to your tutor if you don't understand the wording in an assignment brief.

Supporting time management and / or suggesting methods of approaching complex tasks.

Some people use AI as a tool to help break down a big piece of work into a manageable to-do list. You must not use AI to help to structure an assignment (more below) but using it to help manage your workload would be permissible. However, it may be that other tools can support you with organising ideas and workload, such as Evernote, Mindview, Trello, or the [YCUC Study Skills Programme](#).

Not Acceptable:

Putting your own work into an AI tool and asking it to rewrite / refine / enhance your writing.

You must not use AI to enhance your writing, make your work sound 'more academic', or cut down on words to hit a word count. Even if the ideas are your own, if the wording has been edited by AI, it is no longer your own work and would be considered Academic Misconduct. For support with academic writing, you could use resources on [Moodle](#), tools such as spellcheck, or products such as Grammarly. However, still think critically about your writing – spellcheck isn't always right! Similarly, you must not use AI to create your reference list. You should create your reference list / bibliography yourself, based on the sources you've used to create your assignment. The LRC can

help with referencing – speak to the team, use their information on [Moodle](), or you could try tools like the reference builder in Word.

Lifting words or ideas directly from AI or paraphrasing information from an AI source in an assignment.

When writing an assignment, you can't take wording or ideas directly from AI, or paraphrase what AI has told you. AI is not an academically robust source, so any 'information' it provides cannot be used in an assignment. Furthermore, if you do use an AI tool to generate research ideas, you must then go to those sources to find information directly (you cannot use secondary referencing from an AI source, and indeed may find that the 'quote' or 'source' from AI is inaccurate or entirely made up). Reading lists on Moodle and the LRC catalogue should usually be used as a starting point for finding sources.

Getting AI to tell you a list of what to include in your assignment or give you an essay plan.

You can't ask AI to structure your assignment (i.e. putting your assignment brief into an AI tool and asking how to structure your response, or asking an AI tool what you should include in an assignment about [whatever your topic is]). If you're unsure about content for an assignment, go back to your assignment brief and mark scheme to get an idea of what to include, or look through lecture notes and the reading lists. If you are struggling to understand what to cover, speak to your tutors for help.