

Programme Assessment

7. The Academic Registrar may make a written submission to a Programme Board about any matter or circumstance which may have acted to the detriment of one or more candidates in all or any part of an assessment.
8. A Programme Board shall meet and shall receive for each candidate the Module Marks which are to be taken into consideration for the Part or those Parts of the programme being assessed. The Programme Board acting on behalf of Senate and in accordance with powers delegated to it by Senate shall thereafter promulgate a Pass List which shall be signed by those of the following who are present: the External Programme Assessor, the person chairing the meeting, the Senate Representative and the Faculty

may be replaced by any External Examiner of the University.

Any vivavoce panel may coopt to its membership any External Examiner of the University.

13. If in accordance with paragraph 5 or paragraph 7 hereof a Programme Board receives details suggesting that a candidate's assessment performance has been impaired then the Programme Board may for any module that is being taken into account:
 - a) increase the candidate's marks
 - b) require the candidate to repeat any or all parts of the Module Assessment, either in the University's special assessment period or on the occasion when the module is next routinely assessed (or if not routinely assessed in the next academic year, on the anniversary of the date of the original assessment), for consideration at the appropriate Programme Board. In such a case;
 - (i) no change will be made to the classification of the Module Assessment as a first or second attempt
 - (ii) the Module Mark considered for the Module Assessment will be the higher of the original and the new mark, subject, in the case of second attempt Module Assessments, to capping in accordance with paragraph

16. The University will determine a special assessment period each year falling between the end of Semester Two and the beginning of the next academic year.
 17. Subject to the limitations imposed by paragraphs [18](#), [19](#) and [20](#) of General Regulations for Undergraduate Awards a candidate registered on a full time programme who fails to obtain credit in a module assessment will be allowed as of right to take that assessment again on one further occasion. Except in the case of final-year candidates, or where a candidate does not achieve the minimum credit threshold indicated in Programme Regulations in accordance with paragraph 22 of the General Regulations for Undergraduate Awards, such re-assessment may take place at the option of the candidate either in the University's special assessment period or on the occasion when the module is next routinely assessed (or, if not routinely assessed in the next academic year, on the anniversary of the date of the original assessment). In the case of final-year candidates, such re-assessment shall normally take place on the occasion when the module is next routinely assessed (or, if not routinely assessed in the next academic year, on the anniversary of the date of the original assessment), except that Programme Regulations may make provision for re-assessment to be conducted in the University's special assessment period, in which case candidates may choose between these options. Candidates who have the option must decide whether to take their re-assessments entirely in or entirely after the special assessment period. Any coursework reassessment must be completed by a deadline which, within the elected re-assessment period, will be determined by the department responsible for the module.
 18. The Programme Board shall consider each candidate who will be required or may opt to be re-assessed in accordance with paragraph 17 hereof and shall for each module which is capable of re-assessment determine which of the candidate's present marks may without further assessment be carried forward in the re-assessment process should the candidate choose to repeat the module without attendance.
-

ARUA - Part 4

Termination of Studies

19. In accordance with paragraph [32](#) of General Regulations for Undergraduate Awards a Programme Board will normally terminate the studies of any candidate who is re-assessed in accordance with paragraph [17](#) hereof and who fails to qualify to progress or to qualify for the award of a degree. At its discretion a Programme Board may choose not to terminate the candidate's studies if any part of paragraphs [11](#) and [13](#) hereof applies to the candidate.
-

ARUA - Part 5

Power to Annul an Assessment

20. The Senate may annul any assessment and may require the candidates in any assessment that has been annulled to undergo further assessment, or may require a Programme Board to disregard marks in any assessment which has been annulled notwithstanding any other regulation or rule. The Senate may amend any regulation or rule to take account of the assessment which has been annulled.

Academic Misconduct

21. It is academic misconduct for any candidate in the course of any assessment to engage in one or more of the following activities:
 - a) Failing to comply with the Rules for the Conduct of Written Examinations (set out in Senate Regulation VII), for example by taking prohibited materials into an Examination Hall.
 - b) Assisting another candidate to gain an advantage by unfair means, or receiving such assistance, for example by impersonation or the passing off of one individual's work as another's. This includes undeclared failure to contribute to group coursework assignments.
 - c) Misleading the examiners by the fabrication or falsification of data.
 - d) Plagiarism; namely submitting work as the candidate's own of which the candidate is not the author. This includes failure to acknowledge clearly and explicitly the ideas, words or work of another person whether these are published or unpublished.
 - e) Engaging in any other activity likely to give an unfair advantage to any candidate.
22. A candidate shall certify, when submitting work for assessment, the extent to which the work is his/her own if required to do so by the department responsible for the module.
23. An offence of academic misconduct will be defined as Minor or Major depending

on its seriousness. Minor offences shall be considered by the Head of Department offering the module (the relevant Head of Department). Major Offences shall be considered by the Academic Misconduct Committee. Final interpretation of the nature of an offence under the definitions below shall be the responsibility of the Academic Registrar.

24. Any decision made in accordance with the regulations on academic misconduct shall not be overturned subsequently by a Programme Board under paragraphs 11 and 13 of ARUA.

Minor Offences

i. Definition and Jurisdiction

25. An incident shall be deemed to be a Minor Offence of academic misconduct if it relates to work for assessment not undertaken in an Examination Hall, and if the nature of the incident together with the circumstances of the candidate make appropriate a relatively limited penalty. Examples include first offences of failure to acknowledge sources in a limited amount of coursework, and limited copying of another student's work. These examples are not intended to be exhaustive.
26. A candidate suspected of committing a Minor Offence will automatically be referred for action under the Major Offence procedure if s/he has previously been found guilty of any offence of academic misconduct, or is suspected of an offence in more than one assessed element of his/her programme.
27. The relevant Head of the Department is empowered to consider charges of Minor Offences against candidates and to levy penalties as specified in paragraph 33 below.

ii. Procedure

28. Any circumstances which appear to an examiner to suggest that a candidate has committed any act of academic misconduct shall be reported immediately to the relevant Head of Department.
29. The relevant Head of Department shall decide whether any action shall be taken and if so whether that should be under the procedures for Minor Offences. If the

relevant Head of Department considers the incident to constitute a Major Offence, s/he shall consult the Academic Registrar.

30. The Academic Registrar shall either refer the case for action under the Major Offences procedure set out in paragraph 36 to 50 below or advise the relevant Head of Department to consider the case under the Minor Offences procedure.
31. Candidates shall be notified in writing of alleged Minor Offences and the evidence against them by the relevant Head of Department. Candidates shall be invited to admit or deny the allegation and be permitted to defend themselves in writing and in person, accompanied by an individual of their own choosing. Any written defence or request to be heard in person including the name and status of any accompanying individual must be received by the relevant Head of Department within five working days of the notification of the alleged misconduct.
32. Having taken into account the evidence and the defence, if any, the relevant Head of Department shall decide whether the candidate is guilty of the offence, and if so, the appropriate penalty under paragraph 33 below. The candidate shall be notified in writing of the relevant Head of Department's decision and of the penalty, if one is to be applied, within fifteen working days of the candidate being notified of the allegation. S/he shall also be notified of the right of appeal under paragraph 34 below.

iii. Penalties

33. Where a candidate is found guilty of a Minor Offence, the relevant Head of Department shall be empowered to impose one or more of the following penalties:
 - a) The issue of a formal reprimand.
 - b) The reduction by any amount of any or all of the marks obtained by the candidate in the module concerned.

iv. Appeals

34. Candidates found guilty of Minor Offences shall have the right of appeal against the decision of the relevant Head of Department. Appeals should be submitted in writing to the Secretary of the Academic Misconduct Appeals Committee (see

paragraph 48 below) within 10 working days of the candidate receiving notification of the decision of the relevant Head of Department, and should set out the grounds for, and nature of the appeal together with any evidence. Possible grounds for appeal include:

- a) that there were serious circumstances affecting the candidate of which the relevant Head of Department was not made aware when the decision was taken.
- b) that there were procedural irregularities in the conduct of the investigation.
- c) that there is evidence of prejudice or bias against the candidate on the part of one or more of those involved in the case.
- d) that the penalty imposed was disproportionate to the offence.

The Secretary of the Academic Misconduct Appeals Committee may request further information or evidence from the candidate. The appeal will then be referred, together with the original documentation relating to the allegation of academic misconduct, to the Dean of a Faculty other than the student's own.

35. The Dean shall review the case and may request further information from the candidate or from the relevant Head of Department. The Dean may confirm, set aside or amend the decision and penalty which are the subject of the appeal. In exceptional circumstances, if s/he deems it appropriate, the Dean may refer the case to a full meeting of the Academic Misconduct Appeals Committee. The Dean shall convey his/her decision in writing to the candidate within 15 working days of receipt of the complete appeal documentation from the candidate by the Secretary of the Academic Misconduct Appeals Committee. The decision of the Dean shall be final.

Major Offences

- i. Definition and Jurisdiction

36. An incident shall normally be deemed to be a Major Offence of academic misconduct if it relates to an assessment undertaken in an Examination Hall, or to other assessed work where the nature of the incident together with the circumstances of the candidate make appropriate a substantial punishment. Examples include failure to acknowledge sources in a substantial amount of coursework, and substantial verbatim (or near verbatim) copying of another student's work. These examples are not intended to be exhaustive. In exceptional

circumstances the Academic Registrar may redesignate an offence of academic misconduct relating to an assessment undertaken in an Examination Hall as a Minor Offence.

37. Major Offences shall be considered by an Academic Misconduct Committee appointed by the Senate on an annual basis with the following constitution:
Three academic members of the Learning and Teaching Committee one of whom shall act as Chair.
One University member of the Loughborough Students' Union Executive

d) To call witnesses for examination at the meeting.

41. The written evidence, together with the name and status of any accompanying individual, and of any persons to be called as witnesses must be received by the Secretary at least 7 working days before the date of the meeting. The full documentation shall be circulated to all participants at least 5 working days before the meeting.
42. The relevant Head of Department may make a written submission to the Committee and recommendations as to the outcome. The External Examiner may be consulted in the preparation of this submission. Any submission of this kind must be received by the Secretary at least 7 working days before the date of the meeting. The Committee shall consider, but will not be bound by, any such submission.
43. The Committee may require the relevant Head of Department or his/her nominee and the internal examiner to attend the meeting in person.
44. The proceedings of the meeting shall normally take the following form:
The evidence against the candidate shall be presented. Where the allegation relates to an assessment undertaken in an Examination Hall, the invigilator who detected the incident shall normally present the evidence. Otherwise, the evidence will normally be presented by the relevant Head of Department or his/her nominee.
The candidate shall be allowed to respond to the allegations.
The Committee shall ask questions of the candidate, and any witnesses.
The candidate shall ask questions of any witnesses, and make his/her final statement. Within this framework the Committee has discretion over the conduct of the proceedings. With the agreement of the candidate, the procedure may be simplified in cases where the candidate has admitted the allegation.
45. Having taken into account all the evidence, the Committee alone, advised by its Secretary, shall decide whether the candidate is guilty of the offence, and if so, the appropriate penalty from those permitted under paragraph 46 below. The candidate shall be informed of the decision and the reasons for it in writing within 3 working days of the meeting. The Committee may notify the candidate orally in advance of the written communication at its discretion. If the Committee decides against the candidate, he/she shall be notified of the right of appeal under paragraph 47 below.

iii. Penalties

46. Where a candidate is found guilty of academic misconduct, the Academic Misconduct Committee shall be empowered to impose one or more of the following penalties:

- a) The issue of a formal reprimand.
- b) The reduction by any amount of any or all of the marks obtained by the candidate in any module in the current part of of the candidate's programme.
- c) The withdrawal of reassessment rights in any module in the current part of the candidate's programme.
- d) The immediate termination of the candidate's studies.

iv. Appeals

47. Candidates found guilty of Major Offences shall have the right of appeal to the Academic Misconduct Appeals Committee against the decisions of, and / or penalties imposed by the Academic Misconduct Committee. Appeals should be submitted in writing to the Secretary of the Academic Misconduct Appeals Committee (see paragraph 48 below) within 10 working days of the candidate receiving notification of the decision of the Academic Misconduct Committee, and should set out the grounds for, and nature of the appeal together with any evidence. Possible grounds for appeal include those listed in paragraph 34 above.

48. The constitution of an Academic Misconduct Appeals Committee shall be:
Three academic members of Senate one of whom shall act as Chair
One University member of the Loughborough Students' Union Executive nominated by the Executive.
The Academic Registrar shall appoint a member of Academic Registry staff to act as Secretary to the Appeals Committee. No individual who has any previous connection with the case to be heard may serve on the Academic Misconduct Appeals Committee or act as its Secretary.

49. The Academic Misconduct Appeals Committee shall decide upon a procedure for the meeting that is appropriate to the nature and grounds of the appeal being considered.

50. Having reviewed the case, the Academic Misconduct Appeals Committee shall reach a decision on the appeal. The Appeals Committee may confirm, set aside or

amend the decision and penalty which are the subject of the appeal. The appellant shall be informed of the decision and the reasons for it in writing within 3 working days of the meeting. The Committee may notify the candidate orally in advance of the written communication at its discretion. The decision of the Appeals Committee shall be final.

Monitoring and Review

51. The relevant Head of Department shall inform the Academic Registrar immediately of any alleged Minor Offences of academic misconduct under investigation and the Academic Registrar shall be responsible for identifying concurrent allegations relating to one candidate. A record of all incidents of academic misconduct that are upheld and any penalties shall be kept on the candidate's central University record. All documentation arising from incidents, including appeals, shall be forwarded to the Academic Registrar who shall ensure that the department responsible for the student is informed if the incident of academic misconduct does not relate to