

# Assessment Regulations for Modular Postgraduate Awards

*(Version effective from 30 September 2002 until 3 October 2004)*

## ARMPA - Items 1 - 8

1. Assessments by formal written examination shall be conducted in accordance with Rules for the Conduct of University Examinations.
2. Module Boards and Programme Boards shall be as specified in Ordinance XIX.
3. Module Boards and Programme Boards shall report upon their proceedings in a form and manner approved by Senate.

### Module Assessment

4. After each module has been assessed the Module Board shall meet. The Internal Examiner shall provide the Module Board with the marks obtained by each candidate in the assessments which are applicable to that module. These marks shall have been approved by the External Examiner for the module. The Module Board acting on behalf of Senate and in accordance with the powers delegated to it by Senate shall approve and determine the outcome for each candidate. This outcome shall be determined by reference only to the marks received by each candidate amended as the case may be by the Module Board acting in accordance with paragraph 7 hereof.
5. The quorum for a meeting of a Module Board shall be the Representative of the Faculty Board, the Internal Examiner and one further member.
6. The Academic Registrar may make a written submission either to a Module Board or 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.
7. Any Module Board which receives a written submission in accordance with paragraph 6 hereof or in accordance with [paragraph 9 of the General Regulations for Modular Postgraduate Awards](#) shall give due consideration to the matters set out in the submission together with any other related evidence which the Internal Examiner may make available to the Module Board.

Thereupon:

the Module Board may agree to accept a mark obtained by a candidate from any form of assessment in place of the assessment method specified in the Module Specification;

where the Module Board considers that the circumstances have caused a candidate's marks in assessments applicable to that module to be lower than they would otherwise have been the Module Board shall have the power to increase the candidate's marks for the module as it may determine.

8. If a Module Board chooses to award an adjusted mark to a candidate in accordance with paragraph 7 hereof it shall report the matter to the appropriate Programme Board. A Module Board which receives a written submission in accordance with paragraph 7 hereof may bring the matter to the attention of the appropriate Programme Board.

(remade June 2001)

---

## ARMPA - Items 9 - 12

Reassessment

[Termination of Studies](#)

---

## Reassessment

9. A Module Board shall consider the marks obtained by candidates who fail to obtain credit in the module and shall 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.
10. 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.
11. Subject to the restrictions of paragraph 12 hereof, a candidate who fails to obtain credit in a module assessment will be allowed as of right to be reassessed on one

further occasion. This will be during the academic year next following the initial failure unless the programme regulations make provision for re-assessment during the University's special assessment period. In that case candidates must decide whether or not to take the re-assessment in the special assessment period. Any coursework reassessment must be completed by a deadline which, within the elected reassessment period, will be determined by the department responsible for the module.

### **Termination of Studies**

12. In accordance with [paragraph 21](#) of General Regulations for Modular Postgraduate Awards a Module Board will normally terminate the studies in the module of any candidate who is re-assessed in accordance with paragraph 11 hereof and fails to obtain credit. At its discretion a Module Board may choose not to terminate the candidate's studies if any part of paragraphs 17 and 18 hereof applies to the candidate.

(remade June 2001)

---

## **ARMPA - Items 9 - 12**

Reassessment  
[Termination of Studies](#)

---

## **Reassessment**

9. A Module Board shall consider the marks obtained by candidates who fail to obtain credit in the module and shall 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.
10. 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.
11. Subject to the restrictions of paragraph 12 hereof, a candidate who fails to obtain credit in a module assessment will be allowed as of right to be reassessed on one

further occasion. This will be during the academic year next following the initial failure unless the programme regulations make provision for re-assessment during the University's special assessment period. In that case candidates must decide whether or not to take the re-assessment in the special assessment period. Any coursework reassessment must be completed by a deadline which, within the elected reassessment period, will be determined by the department responsible for the module.

### **Termination of Studies**

12. In accordance with [paragraph 21](#) of General Regulations for Modular Postgraduate Awards a Module Board will normally terminate the studies in the module of any candidate who is re-assessed in accordance with paragraph 11 hereof and fails to obtain credit. At its discretion a Module Board may choose not to terminate the candidate's studies if any part of paragraphs 17 and 18 hereof applies to the candidate.

(remade June 2001)

---

## **ARMPA - Items 13 - 17**

### **Programme Assessment**

13. A Programme Board shall meet for the purpose of making awards and for any other purpose set out herein and shall receive for each candidate the Module Marks which are to be taken into consideration. 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 [17](#), [18](#) or [27](#) hereof, save where a candidate has been examined viva-voce in accordance with paragraph [18](#) hereof when regard can be had to that viva-voce examination.

14. The quorum of a meeting of a Programme Board held 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 make awards, the quorum shall include the External Programme Assessor.

15. 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 Vice-Chancellor acting with the authority of Senate may dispense with the requirement in which case the quorum shall be reduced accordingly.
16. 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.
17. If in accordance with paragraph [6](#) or paragraph [8](#) hereof a Programme Board receives details suggesting that a candidate's assessment performance has been impaired then the Programme Board may consider that candidate's performance in any module that is being taken into account. After due consideration of all the written evidence available to it the Programme Board shall have the power to increase the candidate's marks in any module as it may determine. In these same circumstances a Programme Board shall also have the power to defer its decision on a candidate for a fixed period of time during which the candidate will be required to carry out whatever assessed work that the Programme Board shall determine.

**(remade June 2001)**

---

# ARMPA - Items 18 - 52

## Viva-Voce Examination

### [Power to Annul an Assessment](#)

### [Academic Misconduct](#)

---

## Viva-Voce Examination

18. 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.
19. The viva-voce panel shall be not 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 make an award.

## 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 of 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 Module or Programme Board under paragraphs 7, 17 and 18 of ARMPA.

## **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 of 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.

(remade June 2002)

---

## **ARMPA - Items 18 - 52**

Viva-Voce Examination  
[Power to Annual an Assessment](#)  
[Academic Misconduct](#)

---

### **Viva-Voce Examination**

18. 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.
  
19. The viva-voce panel shall be not 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 make an award.

### **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 of 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 Module or Programme Board under paragraphs 7, 17 and 18 of ARMPA.

## **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 of 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.

**(remade June 2002)**

---

# ARMPA - Items 18 - 52

Viva-Voce Examination

[Power to Annul an Assessment](#)

[Academic Misconduct](#)

---

## Viva-Voce Examination

18. 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.
19. The viva-voce panel shall be not 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 make an award.

## 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 of 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 Module or Programme Board under paragraphs 7, 17 and 18 of ARMPA.

## **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 of 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.**

**(remade June 2002)**