Regulations for Assessment for Taught Degrees

Framework

1. These are the Assessment Regulations described in the General Regulation on Assessment, and apply to University of London awards made by Goldsmiths.

2. Policies referred to in these Regulations set out guidance approved by Academic Board, and procedural notes to help in the conduct of examinations.

Boards of Examiners

Introductory

3. For each Programme leading to a degree, diploma, certificate or the award of credit there shall be a Board of Examiners.

4. One Board of Examiners may cover multiple programmes of study.

5. In the case of joint honours degrees, the Board of Examiners in each contributing Department shall consider the results for students on the programme, and shall report their recommendations to the other contributing departmental Board(s) of Examiners. There shall be a 'host' department for the joint programme, the Board of Examiners for which shall be responsible for making final recommendations to Academic Board, taking into account the recommendations of Boards of Examiners from the other Department(s).

6. In addition to recommending awards and the progression of students on programmes within a Board of Examiners' purview, a Board of Examiners may also confirm marks which are then considered by a different Board of Examiners.

7. Boards of Examiners responsible for programmes comprising modules run by other Departments shall use the marks for those modules determined by the relevant departmental Boards of Examiners

8. Boards of Examiners make recommendations to Academic Board, which has the final authority for awards decisions about student progression. Academic Board may make arrangements for the routine delegation of its responsibilities in this regard to an officer or committee.

9. Marks and judgments of Boards of Examiners are provisional until they have been confirmed by Academic Board; this includes marks provided to students through the academic year (for instance on coursework) to support their learning.

10. Any recommendations of a Board of Examiners which would require a suspension of the regulations must be approved by the relevant Pro-Warden prior to confirmation.

Terms of reference and composition

11. The terms of reference for a Board of Examiners are:

    a. To be responsible for the assessment, by whatever method, of all modules and programmes within its remit

    b. To assess the performance of students registered on the programme(s) of study concerned

    c. To consider any extenuating circumstances which may have affected students' performance

    d. To determine interim results and to report final recommendations to the Academic Board.

12. A Board of Examiners shall be composed of the following members:

    a. A chair, who shall normally be at least at Senior Lecturer level, and shall not normally be the Head of Department or the Programme Convenor for any programme within the Board's remit

    b. At least one External Examiner, appointed in accordance with the provisions below

    c. All Internal Examiners for the programme in question

    d. Programme Convenors for the programmes within the Board of Examiners' purview, if not covered by c

    e. Other members of staff involved in the programme may attend Boards of Examiners by invitation of the Chair but do not have voting rights

13. The Warden is *ex officio* a member of every Board of Examiners and may attend, speak at and vote at any Board. The Warden may delegate this duty to another member of staff.

14. A representative of the Registrar and Secretary may attend any Board of Examiners, at the invitation of the chair of the Board or at the direction of the Registrar and Secretary, to observe and to advise on procedural matters.

15. The Chair of each Board of Examiners is responsible to the Head of Department for all aspects of assessment associated with the work of the Board of Examiners, whether for programmes entirely within the Department or for assessed work which contributes towards programmes within other departments, including joint programmes.

Internal and External Examiners

Internal Examiners

16. An Internal Examiner is a member of the College's staff, whether full-time or part-time, who is responsible for teaching on the degree programme concerned or who teaches on modules covered by the Board of Examiners which contribute to a programme which is the responsibility of another Board of Examiners.

17. A member of staff may be an Internal Examiner on more than one Board of Examiners.

External Examiners

18. An External Examiner is a person not employed by the College who is appointed by the College to membership of a Board of Examiners.

19. In relation to academic standards, the External Examiner is expected to provide informative comment and recommendations upon whether or not:

    a. The College is maintaining the threshold academic standards set for its awards in accordance with the frameworks for higher education qualifications and applicable subject benchmark statements

    b. The assessment process measures student achievement rigorously and fairly against the intended outcomes of the programme(s) and is conducted in line with the College's policies and regulations

    c. The academic standards and the achievements of students are comparable with those in other UK higher education institutions of which the external examiners have experience.

20. In relation to the programme of study, the External Examiner is expected to provide informative comment and recommendations on:

    a. Good practice and innovation relating to learning, teaching and assessment that they have observed

    b. Opportunities to enhance the quality of the learning opportunities provided to students.

21. No qualification shall be awarded, or progression decision taken, without participation in the examining process by at least one External Examiner who shall be a full member of the relevant Board of Examiners. (See 100 below in the case where an External Examiner is unable to attend a Board of Examiners meeting.)

Duties of Examiners

22. Internal Examiners shall set examination questions and devise other assessments; invigilate examinations and mark examination papers, judge practical and performance assessments and generally participate in the examination process in accordance with the needs of their department and these Regulations.

23. External Examiners shall contribute to the assessment process in accordance with these regulations, the College's Guidelines for External Examiners, and in line with the processes used by the department in question.

24. If an External Examiner has a concern about the process or probity of any assessment they are expected to raise this at the earliest opportunity with the chair of the Board of Examiners, or if this is not possible or inappropriate, with the relevant Head of Department.

25. All Examiners are expected to carry out their examining duties in a professional manner and in particular to ensure:

    a. the absolute secrecy of examination papers at all stages until the papers have actually been used by the students. The contents must not be disclosed to any persons other than to members of the Board of Examiners, or to officers of the College who are specially appointed to deal with papers, except where the College has specifically approved the disclosure to students of the topic to be covered in advance of the examination. Failure to observe these instructions by an examiner or any other person having knowledge of the actual or probable content of an examination paper shall constitute an examination offence.

    b. that impartiality is shown at all times;

    c. that where there is or has been any familial, sexual or other potentially compromising relationship between a student and an Examiner involved in the examining process, the Examiner so involved does not take part in any assessment of the student concerned. The Examiner shall be required to declare his/her interest to the member of the administrative staff designated for this purpose by the Registrar and Secretary, who shall take appropriate steps to make alternative examination arrangements. Failure to declare an interest shall be a disciplinary offence.

Conduct of Examinations

26. There shall be a Policy and Code for the Conduct of Examinations which shall have the force of Regulation.

Marking

27. ‘Double marking’ means that a piece of assessed work is marked independently by two Examiners.

28. ‘Double blind marking’ means that a piece of assessed work is marked independently by two Examiners, with the second Examiner unaware of the marks or comments made by the first Examiner.

29. ‘Anonymous marking’ means that the identity of the student is not known to the Examiners when they mark the work in question.

30. ’Moderation’ means that a second Examiner reviews the marks awarded by the first Examiner, including reviewing only a sample of papers. A moderator may not change an individual mark: in the event of concern by the moderator about marks or patterns of marking the Board of Examiners may determine to amend on a consistent basis the marks for all students who have taken the assessment.

31. All forms of assessment contributing to the award shall be marked by two Examiners, or by at least one Examiner with a second Examiner moderating the work.

32. Wherever possible examining will be conducted to ensure anonymous marking, in line with policy agreed by Academic Board.

Success and Failure

33. With the exception of aegrotat degrees, an award should not be made to a student who has not completed the requirements of a programme. This will prevent an award being made, for example, to a student who has successfully completed the minimum requirements for an award but who has been found guilty of plagiarism in, or has otherwise failed to make a valid attempt in, one or more modules.

34. Where a student is absent from a written paper or fails to submit any work for assessment (unless there are extenuating circumstances) a mark of zero (fail) should be recorded. A student enrolled on an undergraduate programme who fails a module shall be subject to penalty upon re-entering.

Non-Valid Attempt

35. The following constitute non-valid attempts:

    a. A non-submission, for which a mark of 0% must be awarded.

    b. or a plagiarised assessment, for which a mark of 0% must be awarded.

    c. A very bad fail, including a submission that does not even attempt to address the specific learning outcomes: in this case a mark between 1% and 9% must be awarded.

36. For non-valid attempts, the module must be re-sat as directed by the Board of Examiners.

Appeals

37. A Board of Examiners may reconsider its decision only when invited to do so through an Academic Appeal.

Resit and Re-entry to examinations

38. As a general rule, students are required to pass all of the summative assessments set out in a Programme Scheme to achieve the award.

39. Once an assessment has been passed, it cannot subsequently be reseat for the purpose of improving the student's mark.

Undergraduate programmes

40. The Goldsmiths credit framework sets out rules whereby failure in one or more modules may be condoned, or compensated by performance in other modules, in order to allow a student to progress.

41. Students are required to re-sit only those modules which they have failed, and for which condonement or compensation is not possible.

42. Where assessment for a module comprises a number of different elements, a student is required to re-sit only those elements in which she/he failed.

43. Resits should normally take place at the next possible occasion.

44. A student may have three attempts at an assessment (ie the first attempt and two re-sits in the event of failure).

45. The mark awarded for a re-taken examination shall, unless there are extenuating circumstances deemed acceptable by the Board of Examiners, be subject to a penalty. The mark awarded shall be capped at the pass mark for the assignment.

46. A final year student who has met all other criteria but has failed modules at level 5 and 6 may be considered for compensation of that credit, to allow them to graduate.

Postgraduate awards

47. A student may have three attempts at an assessment (ie the first attempt and two re-sits in the event of failure).

48. The mark awarded for a re-taken examination shall, unless there are extenuating circumstances deemed acceptable by the Board of Examiners, be subject to a penalty. The mark awarded shall be capped at the pass mark for the assignment.

Extenuating Circumstances

49. Boards of Examiners may, when considering progression and award decision, take into account extenuating circumstances faced by a student which:

    a. Might be considered to have brought into question the validity of a particular assessment

    b. Are outside of the student's reasonable control

50. Details of extenuating circumstances must be submitted in writing by the student to the Department as soon as possible after the assessment and unless there are exceptional reasons no later than seven days after the deadline for submission of coursework or the date of the assessment in question. Submissions by staff or by other students on behalf of a student who has not presented a written case him/herself must not be accepted. Submission must be supported by documentary evidence; retrospective medical certificates and notes submitted seven days after the deadline will not normally be considered.

51. The marks presented to a Board of Examiners shall not take into account the extenuating circumstances. The decision on what adjustments, if any, to make to the outcome of an assessment shall be the Board of Examiners' alone, and shall be taken in accordance with guidelines agreed by Academic Board or its Committees.

Academic misconduct

Preamble

52. Academic misconduct is defined by Goldsmiths' College as any attempt by a student to gain an unfair advantage in any assessment. The term academic misconduct includes all forms of cheating, plagiarism, and collusion.

53. If plagiarism is suspected students will be required to supply an electronic copy of the work in question so that it may be subjected to electronic plagiarism detection testing (if this has not already been done).

54. Students taking any examination or subject to any academic assessment conducted by the College are required to abide by the relevant general and specific regulations issued from time to time by the College Services and to observe all instructions given to them by the Examiners, Invigilators or Officers of the College responsible for the conduct of examinations or academic assessments.

55. Any failure to observe any of the regulations or instructions mentioned in the above paragraph shall constitute misconduct in assessment and shall be dealt with in accordance with these regulations, as will any case of alleged cheating, plagiarism or other similar examination or assessment irregularity, including conduct affecting the security of an examination.

56. In the context of these regulations, unless the context otherwise requires, words and phrases which appear in the Statutes shall have the meaning assigned to them in the Statutes. Any dispute as to the interpretation of these regulations shall be referred to the Warden of the College, whose decision in the matter shall be final.

57. In these misconduct regulations, reference to the Head of Department may be taken to refer to the her/his representative where the Head of Department is the Examiner who suspects a student of an assessment misconduct, or where the Head of Department is indisposed or otherwise unable to act. In the case of postgraduate research students the Dean of the Graduate School will play the role of the Head of Department; and the Departmental Postgraduate Committee will act in the place of the Board of Examiners.

58. All communications from the College to the person accused of an examination offence shall be sent by first class mail and recorded delivery to his or her last known term time and/or home address as notified by the student to the Student Centre. The College can take no responsibility if a student has failed to notify it of a change of address.

59. Should a student against whom an allegation of assessment misconduct is lodged fail to respond, within a period of 14 days following notification of the allegation, the proceedings under these regulations shall continue and shall not be invalidated thereby.

60. In the event that an allegation of assessment misconduct by a student is under consideration and has not been resolved when a Board of Examiners meets to consider the result(s) of that student, the Board of Examiners shall not consider that student's results until the allegation has been upheld or dismissed. When the allegation has been investigated in accordance with these regulations, the Board of Examiners, in consultation with the appropriate External examiners(s), will determine how to proceed.

Presumption of Innocence

61. In any proceedings under these misconduct regulations the person against whom allegations have been made shall be presumed to be innocent until the contrary is established by consideration of the available evidence, on the balance of probabilities.

Outline of process

62. Although academic misconduct falls within the definition of student misconduct in the General Regulations, and in the most serious cases may be considered in this way, the College seeks to place academic judgment at the heart of the investigation of academic misconduct and its resolution.

63. There are three stages to the process for consideration of allegations of academic misconduct.

a. In the first stage, a Head of Department shall conduct an initial investigation, including seeking a statement from the student concerned, and shall make a judgment as to the appropriate course of action. If the Head of Department feels that there is no case to answer, no further action shall be taken, although a note will remain on the student's file. If the Head of Department feels that there is evidence of academic misconduct, s/he shall recommend a penalty to the Board of Examiners. See Appendix A for level of offence.

b. In the second stage, a student may seek a review of this judgement. This shall take the form of a departmental hearing which will consider the evidence, question the student and any witnesses, hear any statement the student wishes to make, and on the basis of this determine whether academic misconduct has taken place and the appropriate penalty to be recommended to the Board of Examiners.

c. In the third stage, the student may seek an external review, which will be conducted by a person outside the Department. This review will not be a further hearing of the case, but will consider the process undertaken. The review may uphold the judgment of the hearing committee, or recommend a different penalty. At the absolute discretion of the reviewer a re-hearing by a panel comprising academic staff from another department may be convened.

64. At the conclusion of these stages the student will be entitled to complain to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) and a completion of procedures letter will be issued.

65. Extenuating circumstances cannot mitigate the fact of an offence of academic misconduct having taken place, but they must be taken into account whenever a penalty is being considered, at any stage of this procedure. Guidance issued by Academic Board sets out considerations relating to the level of offence and the suggested penalty.

Stage 1 – initial investigation and Head of Department judgment

66. If a marker or invigilator or any other members of staff suspects that assessment misconduct has been committed, s/he shall immediately inform the Head of the relevant Department. The person making the report is required to submit to the Head of Department an analytical statement of the evidence, including, in the case of suspected plagiarism, the identification of source material.

67. The Head of Department shall provide the student with a written statement of the allegation making it clear what type of misconduct is alleged and shall give the student an opportunity to respond to it. Students may be invited to a special oral or written examination arranged for the purpose of establishing the original source of any work submitted. Failure to attend a viva voce or written examination without adequate reason, shall be treated as non-completion of the assessment, and will be classified as a failure.

68. If a student has not responded to the Head of Department within 14 days the Head of Department shall consider the evidence and any recommendation, and make a judgment on the case.

69. The Head of Department shall decide either:

    a. That there is no case to answer, in which case no penalty shall be applied. The Head of Department may nevertheless consider that the student's actions constitute poor academic practice, in which case the Head of Department should (for more information see Appendix A):

        i) meet with the student, with a note taker present, and issue a written formal warning, that may be considered in the event of any subsequent offences.

        ii) require the student to read and sign the Academic Misconduct Statement and study the online good academic practice \tutorial available on learn.gold (https://learn.gold.ac.uk/), and

        iii) require the student to resubmit the work within 3-5 days, appropriately referenced without any additional changes to the substance of the submission. If a student fails to submit the amended coursework by the deadline, it will be considered as non-completion of the module and a mark of zero will be awarded.

    b. That the investigation reveals substantive evidence of an assessment misconduct. In this case the Head of Department shall determine the penalty, from the tariff set out in paragraph 80, and taking into account the definitions of level of offence and suggested penalties agreed by Academic Board. In determining the penalty the Head of Department should consider any mitigating circumstances. (In finally reporting these cases to the Board of Examiners, Heads must make a full report where a student has contested the judgment, but may refer to uncontested judgments in summary)

70. The Head of Department shall write to the student, normally within seven days of making the decision, setting out the decision they have reached on the allegation; and, in the case where the Head has judged that there is academic misconduct, the details of the penalty to be applied and that the student may ask for the matter to be referred to stage 2, a formal hearing.

71. A student against whom the Head of Department has determined that there is no case to be heard may not ask for the matter to be considered at a hearing.

72. A Head of Department may nominate a suitable representative to take their role in these procedures.

Stage 2 – Hearing

73. If a student wishes the matter to be referred to a hearing committee, they must write to the Head of Department within fourteen days of the notification to them of the Head of Department's decision and the penalty.

74. The Head of Department will refer the case to the Chair of the Board of Examiners to convene a formal disciplinary hearing. If the Head of Department is also the Chair of the Board of Examiners, advice should be sought from the Head of Assessments so that an appropriate person outside the Department could be appointed to Chair the hearing.

75. The hearing shall be conducted by a Panel comprising the Chair of the Board of Examiners and another Internal Examiner, neither of whom has been involved in or consulted about the alleged academic misconduct. A full record of proceedings shall be kept.

76. The student and the person who identified the academic misconduct shall be invited to attend the hearing as witnesses. Other witnesses may be called as relevant.

77. If a student fails to attend a Hearing other than for a reason acceptable to the Chair of the Board of Examiners, notified in advance, its proceedings shall not be invalidated thereby. A student unable to attend a Hearing for good reason may seek a postponement of that Hearing.

78. The student may be accompanied at the hearing by a member of staff (including a member of staff of the Students' Union) or a student of the College. A student who is so accompanied must submit to the Chair of the Board of Examiners, not less than two days before the date appointed for the Hearing, the name, address and description of the person concerned.

79. The procedure for the conduct of the hearing shall be as follows:

    a. The person who identified the academic misconduct shall be invited to present the allegation and their evidence and may be questioned by the panel and by the student.

    b. The student shall be invited to respond to the allegation and to present any evidence.

    c. Any other witnesses called may, after giving their evidence, be questioned by the panel and by the student.

    d. The student shall be invited to give a closing statement to the panel.

    e. The Panel shall consider their judgment in private.

    f. If the panel finds that no academic misconduct has taken place they will rule that no further action be taken in the matter, and that the

student's performance be consider as normal by the Board of Examiners. The Panel may also advise that learning or other support be offered to the student.

g. If the Panel finds that academic misconduct has taken place they should determine the penalty to be applied, from the tariff set out in paragraph 80, and taking into account the definitions of level of offence and suggested penalties agreed by Academic Board. In determining the penalty the Panel should consider any mitigating circumstances. The Panel will normally apply the same penalty as that given by the Head of Department in stage 1, but may apply a lesser penalty if they feel that the initial penalty was too harsh.

80. The Chair of the Board of Examiners shall notify the student in writing of the Panel's decision. In the case where the panel finds that academic misconduct has taken place the student will be advised of their right to seek a review of the case at Stage 3.

Tariff of penalties

81. The penalty for students found guilty of academic misconduct shall be selected from the following list:

a. The subtraction of ten percentage marks from the final mark for the module overall

b. A mark of zero for the element of the module

c. A mark of zero for all elements of the module

d. The minimum pass mark for the module

e. Degree class to be reduced by one class (unless by doing so a pass would be turned into a 'fail')

f. Degree class to be 'capped' at a certain level

g. Suspension from College (an interruption of one academic year)

h. A mark of zero be awarded for the module and the Examination Board be instructed to consider the student only for an exit award on the basis of credits already achieved (where Programme Regulations provide interim awards)

i. The student be required to withdraw without being awarded a degree or exit award (earned credits - that is, credits which have already been ratified by a Board of Examiners - can be recorded).

82. These penalties may be applied singly or in combination.

Stage 3 - Review

83. A student who has been found by a Panel to have committed academic misconduct may seek a review of this decision, by writing to the Governance Services Manager within fourteen days of the notification to them of the outcome of the Hearing.

84. Valid grounds for the review of outcomes of Stage Two investigations are confined to the following:

    a. There were procedural irregularities in the conduct of the investigation or subsequent proceedings; or

    b. Significant fresh evidence can be presented which could not reasonably have been made available at the hearing; or

    c. The outcome of the hearing was not reasonable in all the circumstances.

85. If the Governance Services Manager is satisfied that any of the above conditions apply, s/he will undertake a review of the case, considering whether any procedural irregularities occurred, the impact of any further evidence on the outcome, and whether the outcome was reasonable. Where appropriate s/he will consult with senior officers, who may include the Pro-Wardens and/or the Registrar & Secretary.

86. The Governance Services Manager may decide to uphold the decision of the Panel, or may (following consultation with senior officers) overturn the Panel decision and/or penalty. S/he may decide, where fresh evidence has been presented or where circumstances otherwise merit it, that a rehearing of the case be conducted by a panel comprising senior academic staff from another department, who have had no connection with the case.

External review

87. There is no further procedure internal to Goldsmiths after stage 3. A student will be issued with a 'Completion of Procedures' (CoP) letter within one-month of the completion of Stage 3. The CoP letter will confirm that internal procedures have been exhausted; list the issues raised and considered, and the outcome; and inform the student of his or her right to submit a complaint to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator together with the deadline for doing so.

Aegrotat degrees

88. Where a student for an undergraduate degree only has completed his/her full period of study but is absent from examinations during his/her final year, through illness or other cause judged sufficient by a Pro-Warden appointed by the Warden, such as death of a near relative, he or she may be considered under the Aegrotat Provisions. Consideration for an award under these

provisions must be supported by a medical certificate or other statement on the ground for mitigation which must be submitted as soon as possible and, in any case, within six weeks from the last date of the examination(s) in question.

89. The examiners shall recommend the award of the degree with a Pass and shall not consider the student for the award of an Aegrotat degree if the student has completed the taught element of modules valued at least 300 credits, at least 60 of which must have been passed at level 6. The examiners shall not recommend the award of a class of degree higher than the overall level that the student has achieved in the work actually presented. The examiners shall inform the student that he/she may either:

    a. Accept the award of the pass degree under the Aegrotat provisions; or

    b. Not accept but re-enter module assessments for which he/she is eligible.

90. A student who has been considered by the examiners as above shall be considered for the award of an Aegrotat degree only if the examiners have been unable to recommend the award of a degree with a Pass classification. In such a case the examiners, having considered the work which the student has submitted at the examination or in such part of the examination as he/she has attended, if any, records of the student's performance during the period of study, and assessment provided by the student's teachers, shall determine whether evidence has been shown to their satisfaction that, had he/she completed the examination in normal circumstances, the student should clearly have reached a standard (and achieved the necessary module credits) which would have qualified him/her for the award of the degree. Where the examiners are so satisfied the student shall be informed that he/she may either:

    a. Accept the award of the Aegrotat degree; or

    b. Not accept the Aegrotat degree but re-enter module assessments for which he/she is eligible with a view to completing the requirements for the award of a degree.

91. Upon accepting an Aegrotat degree in writing to the Head of Assessments a student shall be informed that the degree has been conferred.

92. A student who has accepted the award of an Aegrotat degree shall not be eligible thereafter to re-enter for the examination for a classified degree.

93. A student who chooses not to accept the award of the Aegrotat degree and chooses to re-enter, shall no longer be eligible for the award of the Aegrotat degree.

94. Aegrotat degrees shall be awarded without distinction or class.

95. Holders of Aegrotat degrees may not subsequently be considered for Honours, except that they may apply to register de novo for a degree under these regulations.

Posthumous degrees

96. Where a student has died before completing the requirements for a degree, the College may consider the award of a degree to the student, subject to the following provisions.

97. In the case of a student who has completed the taught element of the programme and some of the required assessment, the Board of Examiners may consider the student for the award of a degree, certificate or diploma on the basis of the assessed work which has been completed.

98. In the case of a student who has completed the taught element of the programme but has not undertaken any element of the required assessment, the Board of Examiners may consider the student for the award of a degree, certificate or diploma on the evidence available to them.

99. In the case of a student who has completed some but not all of the taught elements of the programme, the Board of Examiners may consider the student for the award of a degree, certificate or diploma on the evidence available to them if the student has completed not less than two-thirds of the study normally required for the programme, including at least half of the work at the highest level covered by the award.

100. The award of any degree, diploma or certificate under these provisions shall be assigned a date of award the day before the student's death.

Special and emergency provisions

Absence of External Examiner

101. From time to time, unavoidably and at short notice, it is possible that no External Examiner will be able to attend in person a meeting of a Board of Examiners where students are to be recommended for an award. In such circumstances permission should be sought from the appropriate Pro Warden for the Board of Examiners to go ahead. The External Examiner should be asked to be available at the time of the meeting by telephone if required. If this is not possible, the meeting may proceed if all of the following conditions are met:

    a. the External Examiner has completed all moderating duties

    b. he/she has presented a written report by the time of the start of the meeting

    c. he/she has agreed that the meeting may proceed with these conditions in his/her absence

d. any decision which would, in the presence of the External Examiner, have been referred to him/her, should be deferred to Chair's action to enable the Chair to speak with the External Examiner at a later point.

e. a senior member of the Assessments Office, or their appointed representative will be present at the meeting in order to provide procedural guidance if necessary.

Appendix A
Academic Misconduct: Guidance on Level of Offence and Suggested Penalty

Definitions of Level of Offence

Minor or Technical

- Poor referencing
- Incorrect (or an absence of) attribution for copied work inserted in an assignment
- Paraphrasing without adequate attribution.

- **Moderate**
- Ideas or concepts which appear to originate from the student but are in fact the work of others, not fully referenced, cited or otherwise acknowledged as required
- Work that is inappropriately paraphrased or directly quoted without speech marks and is not referenced
- Identical or closely related work and ideas to another assignment previously submitted by the student
- Minor infringement of the examination venue rules (as set out in the conduct of examination rules).

- **Severe**
- Plagiarism extending to a substantial proportion of the work
- Falsifying some data or evidence
- Cheating in an examination
- Taking notes relevant to the examination in to the examination halls*
- Using an electronic device to access data or calculations in an examination*.

- **Very Severe**
- Commissioning work from someone else
- Copying the work of another student
- Collusion with other students to produce a piece of work as if it was an individual student's own work
- Falsifying the majority of data or evidence
- Impersonation of a student in an examination.

*Unless use of text, notes or electronic devices is permitted in the examination and recorded within the examination paper rubric

Suggested penalties that could be applied, appropriate to the level of offence committed

Undergraduate Degrees

Level of offence being considered	First Offence	Repeated Offence
Minor or Technical	ai, aii and aiii	aiii and (d)
Moderate	aiii and (a)	(e)
Severe	aiii and (b) or (c)	(f) or (g)
Very Severe	aiii and (c) or (d)	(g) or (h)

Taught Postgraduate Degrees

Level of offence being considered	First Offence	Repeated Offence
Minor or Technical	(b)	(e)
Moderate	(c) or (d)	(f) or (h)
Severe	(e) or (f)	(i)
Very Severe	(h)	(i)

Postgraduate Research Degrees

Level of offence being considered	First Offence	Repeated Offence
Minor or Technical	(g)	(i)
Moderate	(g)	(i)
Severe	(i)	(i)
Very Severe	(i)	(i)

In the above tables ai, aii and aiii refer to the actions available to Heads of Department (paragraph 68), and (a) to (i) refer to the actions available to Panels (paragraph 80) Regulations for Assessment.

Whilst extenuating circumstances cannot mitigate the fact of an offence they should be taken into account when determining the penalty.