

# ARCHIVED VERSION - Assessment Regulations for Undergraduate Awards (2000 edition)

(30 September 2002 until 3 October 2004)

## ARUA (2000) - Part 1

1. Assessments by formal written examination shall be conducted in accordance with [Rules for the Conduct of University Examinations](#).
2. Programme Boards shall be as specified in [Ordinance XIX](#).

### Module Assessment

3. After each module has been assessed the Internal Examiner shall determine the marks obtained by each candidate in the assessments which are applicable to that module and publish the Module Mark. Where an External Examiner has been appointed for the module the marks shall have been approved by the External Examiner. The Senate will determine a date in each semester by which Module Marks will be published.
4. The Academic Registrar may make a written submission to an Internal Examiner 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.
5. All written submissions made in accordance with paragraph 4 hereof or in accordance with paragraph 9 of the General Regulations for Undergraduate Awards, together with any other related evidence, shall be given due consideration by the Internal Examiner.

Thereupon:

in every case the Internal Examiner shall provide the candidate's Programme Board with an assessment of the probable detriment caused by the circumstances described by the candidate. Internal Examiners' assessments shall be in whatever form shall be stipulated by The Senate.

6. The Internal Examiner shall consider the marks obtained by candidates who fail to obtain a Module Mark of at least 40% necessary for the award of modular credit (or any other mark as may be stipulated in Programme Regulations as necessary for successful completion of the Programme Part) and shall make recommendations to Programme Boards concerning decisions to be taken in accordance with Paragraph [18](#) hereof.
-

# ARUA (2000) - Part 2

## 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 Board Representative. The Pass List and the classification of each candidate thereon shall be determined by reference only to the Module Marks received by each candidate, amended as the case may be by the Programme Board acting in accordance with paragraphs [11](#), [13](#) or [27](#) hereof, save where a candidate has been examined viva-voce in accordance with paragraph [11](#) hereof when regard can be had to that viva-voce examination.
9. The quorum of a meeting of a Programme Board for any purpose shall be
  - i. The Chair or the designated Deputy Chair
  - ii. Either the member of Senate or the member of the Faculty Board
  - iii. Two Examiners

In addition, where a meeting of the Programme Board is held to award degrees, the quorum shall include the External Programme Assessor.

10. Where an External Programme Assessor is required to complete the quorum of a Programme Board but is for good cause prevented from attending the meeting the Academic Registrar may dispense with the requirement in which case the quorum shall be reduced accordingly.
11. Upon the instigation of the Chair or the designated Deputy Chair of the Programme Board any candidate who is to be considered by a Programme Board may first be examined viva-voce by a panel of the Programme Board. The viva-voce panel shall be appointed for the purpose by either the Chair or the designated Deputy Chair of the Programme Board. The findings of the viva-voce panel and its recommendations if any shall be reported to the Programme Board which shall take them into account in reaching a decision on any candidate who has been so examined.
12. The viva-voce panel shall be no fewer than three members of the Programme Board who shall include:

The Chair or the designated Deputy Chair of the programme Board

The External Programme Assessor if the Programme Board is held to promulgate the Pass List for the final part of a Programme, by prior permission of the Director of Registry Services, the External Programme Assessor may be replaced by an External Examiner of the University

Any viva-voce panel may co-opt 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 23 of the General Regulations for Undergraduate Awards.

The Pass List published by a Programme Board shall show the names of every candidate arranged in alphabetical order within each classification group. The classifications of those candidates who have failed to discharge all obligations to the University will be withheld from the published list until such time as all obligations have been met. These obligations include

the payment of fees and other charges  
the return of all books and other materials borrowed from the Library  
any debt and/or liability of a candidate for which the University has responsibility.

15. Programme Boards shall report upon their proceedings in a form and manner approved by Senate.

---

## ARUA (2000) - Part 3

### Reassessment

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. Candidates registered on full time programmes will be allowed as of right to repeat Module Assessments in accordance with paragraphs [18 or 19](#) of General Regulations for Undergraduate Awards on one occasion only. 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 21 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 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 (2000) - Part 4

### Termination of Studies

19. In accordance with paragraph [31](#) 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 (2000) - 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 paragraphs 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 re-designate 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 nominated by the Executive.  
The Academic Registrar shall appoint a member of Academic Registry staff to act as Secretary to the Committee. No individual who has any connection with the case to be heard may serve on the Academic Misconduct Committee or act as its Secretary.

*ii. Procedure*

38. In the case of an assessment taking place in an Examination Hall, any incident of alleged academic misconduct shall be reported immediately, with evidence, to the Academic Registrar. In the case of other assessed work, 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 and action shall be taken in accordance with paragraphs 29 and 30 above.

39. Candidates shall be notified in writing of alleged Major Offences by the Secretary of the Academic Misconduct Committee at least fifteen working days before the date of the Committee meeting. The notification shall include the nature of the charge, the evidence, and the date and time of the meeting of the Committee convened to consider the case together with details of the members of the Committee. Candidates shall be invited to admit or deny the allegation.

40. Candidates have the following rights:

- a) To submit a written defence and any other written evidence.
  - b) To attend the Committee meeting in person.
  - c) To be accompanied by an individual of their own choosing.
  - 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 the marks obtained by the candidate in any module in the current part 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 a module(s) offered by that department.
52. An annual report to the Learning and Teaching Committee on all incidents of academic misconduct and the outcomes thereof will be prepared by a member of Academic Registry staff nominated by the Academic Registrar.

---

## **ARUA (2000) - 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 paragraphs 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 re-designate 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 nominated by the Executive.  
The Academic Registrar shall appoint a member of Academic Registry staff to act as Secretary to the Committee. No individual who has any connection with the case to be heard may serve on the Academic Misconduct Committee or act as its Secretary.



*ii. Procedure*

38. In the case of an assessment taking place in an Examination Hall, any incident of alleged academic misconduct shall be reported immediately, with evidence, to the Academic Registrar. In the case of other assessed work, 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 and action shall be taken in accordance with paragraphs 29 and 30 above.
39. Candidates shall be notified in writing of alleged Major Offences by the Secretary of the Academic Misconduct Committee at least fifteen working days before the date of the Committee meeting. The notification shall include the nature of the charge, the evidence, and the date and time of the meeting of the Committee convened to consider the case together with details of the members of the Committee. Candidates shall be invited to admit or deny the allegation.
40. Candidates have the following rights:
  - a) To submit a written defence and any other written evidence.
  - b) To attend the Committee meeting in person.
  - c) To be accompanied by an individual of their own choosing.
  - 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 the marks obtained by the candidate in any module in the current part 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 a module(s) offered by that department.

52. An annual report to the Learning and Teaching Committee on all incidents of academic misconduct and the outcomes thereof will be prepared by a member of Academic Registry staff nominated by the Academic Registrar.