

Henley Business School

Assessment of Taught Programmes

1. Notes

These procedures are applicable to Greenlands-based programmes only. They will be reviewed during the 2008-09 academic year as part of the ongoing integration of such provision into the University of Reading and are therefore subject to change. Such changes will be appropriately communicated.

These procedures have been drawn up from the previous Henley Management College Regulation AR5 *Assessment relating to Taught Programmes of Study*, and AP7 *Procedures and Guidelines for Assessment relating to Taught Programmes of Study*, combined where appropriate with University of Reading procedures.

2. Interpretation

Assessment

2.1 Assessment is the evaluation of attainment of a programme member, or of the quality of work produced by a programme member in partial fulfilment of the requirements of a programme of study which contributes or leads to an award, including the requirements for progression from one stage of a programme to another.

2.2 Assessment may cover:

- (i) written work, such as essays, reports and projects
- (ii) dissertations
- (iii) examinations
- (iv) practical work, group presentations etc
- (v) any other element of the approved Scheme of Assessment.

Examination

2.3 An examination shall be deemed to be any form of assessment of work or attainment which is undertaken by a candidate under formal supervision, in respect of which the date, time, place and maximum duration is prescribed by the Henley Business School.

2.4 An examination may be written, practical, *viva voce*, or in any other form as may be determined by the Henley Business School.

3. General Requirements

Attainment and Standards

3.1 The assessment requirements shall be designed to enable programme members in a particular programme of study leading to an award of the University of Reading to demonstrate that they have attained the standard expected of comparable awards in the United Kingdom.

3.2 The assessment of each module or other element of a programme of study shall test the attainment of the programme member in respect of the requirements for the standard of the award to which it leads or contributes and the fulfilment of the aims, objectives and learning outcomes of the programme.

- 3.3 For a candidate to be eligible for the award to which a particular programme leads, he or she shall complete the required modules and other elements of the programme to the satisfaction of the Examiners' Meetings established to assess the performance of each candidate

Programme Assessment Requirements

- 3.4 For each programme of study leading to an award there shall be an approved Programme Specification and Scheme of Assessment which shall specify all the assessment and examination requirements for the programme. Each module or other assessed element of a programme of studies contributing to an award shall normally be assessed within the period specified in the Programme Specification and Scheme of Assessment

- 3.5 The Programme Specification and Assessment shall:

- (i) state all the modules or other elements of the programme which are to be assessed, and the weighting to be given to each in contributing to the award being sought
- (ii) indicate the way(s) in which each module or other element will be assessed and at what stage or in what order in the programme the assessment will be made, including the requirements for the submission of any assessed project work or dissertation
- (iii) state clearly which modules or other elements must be passed to obtain the award to which the programme leads and the weighting which will be given to each assessment
- (iv) where appropriate, specify the conditions to be satisfied for awarding of any distinction available
- (v) where applicable, specify the maximum time after completion of the taught modules or elements of a programme by the end of which a project or dissertation shall be submitted
- (vi) indicate the assessment criteria on which an award will be recommended and the conditions under which an intermediate award may be recommended in the event of partial successful completion
- (vii) describe the conditions and arrangements under which a candidate who has failed any module(s) or other element(s) of the programme of study may be permitted to be re-assessed or re-examined.

Grades and Marks

- 3.6 Each candidate shall be informed of the result he or she has gained for each module or element of the programme. Counselling by an appropriate member of staff shall be provided as necessary.
- 3.7 Where condonation of a narrow failure of an assessed element is provided for in the Programme Specification and/or the Scheme of Assessment the mark attained in a condoned failure shall be recorded.

Guidelines on Assessment

- 3.8 The marks and grades awarded in respect of each assessed element of the programme of study may be subject to moderation. They should be regarded as providing the basis for judgement by the Programme Examiners' Meeting on the performance of each candidate in meeting the aims, objectives and learning outcomes of the programme and in respect of the overall attainment of standard.
- 3.9 Subject to the requirement that the standard of the academic award to which a particular programme leads shall not be compromised, the Programme Examiners' Meeting may take a variety of factors into consideration and shall have wide discretion when reaching its decisions and making its recommendations.

- 3.10 Except where specifically provided for, the decisions of Examiners' Meetings shall be final and the examiners' academic judgements shall not be open to question.
- 3.11 Each candidate should be made aware of the nature of the role and remit of the Programme Examiners' Meeting and of the discretion that may be exercised in reaching its decisions and making its recommendations.

Eligibility for Conferment of an Award

- 3.12 No person shall be eligible for the conferment of the award being sought unless he or she has satisfactorily completed all the assessed elements of the programme's Programme Specification and Scheme of Assessment, subject to any provisions for mitigation in the event of poor performance.

Distance Learning or e-Learning

- 3.13 The procedures relating to assessment or re-assessment and examinations in respect of a programme delivered by distance learning or e-Learning, may be modified to reflect the nature of the communications between a programme member and the Henley Business School, whether directly or through an Associate Organisation or an Accredited Centre.

Dissertations

- 3.14 Each candidate registered on a programme of study leading to the award of a Master's degree shall be required to complete a dissertation to the satisfaction of the relevant Examiners' Meetings.
- 3.15 A candidate shall submit his or her dissertation at the prescribed time, as specified in the Programme Specification.
- 3.16 In exceptional circumstances a candidate in a programme leading to a Master's degree may be examined on the dissertation *viva voce*.
- 3.17 The Henley Business School shall provide guidance on the form, presentation, nature and length of the dissertation.

4. Examiners' Meetings

- 4.1 A Programme Examiners' Meeting is convened for each programme of study leading to an award. The following is an extract from the University's *Examinations and Assessment Procedures Handbook*.

Programme Examiners' Meetings

- 4.2 The powers of Programme Examiners' Meetings are:
- (i) to recommend for submission to the Faculty Examiners' Meeting results in respect of the programmes within their purview;
 - (ii) by means of a Special Cases Sub-Committee (see Appendix 1), to consider mitigating circumstances and, on the basis of evidence of mitigating circumstances, to exercise discretion in determining a result or mark or to recommend to the Faculty Examiners that a candidate be deemed not to have sat.
- 4.3 The membership of the Programme Examiners' Meeting comprises the Internal Examiners (from among whom the Head of the School should appoint a Chair), the Programme Director and, where appropriate, the External Examiners for the programme. External Examiners are members of those Examiners' Meetings responsible for making recommendations in respect of awards. Markers and personal tutors have the right to attend and to participate fully in the consideration of marks and results, and should be encouraged to do so.

- 4.4 A Programme Examiners' Meeting shall normally be deemed inquorate if fewer than half the nominated Internal Examiners are present. Exceptionally, with the agreement of the Chair, an alternate may attend in place of an Internal Examiner.
- 4.5 Advance notice of a Programme Examiners' Meeting should be given to those with a right to attend.
- 4.6 Information presented to the meeting and all discussion of candidates and results is strictly confidential to the meeting and to those officers of the University who have good reason to be provided with such information.
- 4.7 Appropriate documentation should be available to the meeting including marks lists, the recommendations of the Special Cases Sub-Committee, and a record of candidates, who, on account of specific learning difficulties (e.g. dyslexia), have been recommended to receive special consideration in marking, together with a note of those assessments in which the recommendation was applied.
- 4.8 The meeting should be advised of any changes to procedures, any particular circumstances affecting a specific assessment for a module, or any generic issue relevant to the consideration of results.
- 4.9 The meeting should receive confirmation that module marks have been moderated and approved by the External for all candidates in respect of whom a result is being considered.
- 4.10 The meeting should receive recommendations from the Programme Special Cases Sub-Committee in respect of candidates who have submitted evidence of medical or other circumstances which they believe have affected their performance. It should be noted that the Special Cases Sub-Committee is responsible for recommending an Aegrotat degree. The powers and procedures of the Special Cases Sub-Committee for Programme Examiners' Meetings can be found in Appendix 1.
- 4.11 The meeting should consider recommended results for all candidates under its purview, and should give very particular attention to borderline cases and to those for whom the result of fail is under consideration. The meeting should not decide a recommendation in respect of a candidate for whom a full set of moderated and confirmed marks is not available. In such circumstances, the Chair should normally be authorised to approve a result, on behalf of the Meeting, following appropriate consultation which must include consultation with the External Examiners.
- 4.12 In the case of any candidate for a Final Examination who has a debt of £50 or more, the meeting should decide a recommended result and submit the recommended result to the University's Examinations Office. The result will be considered by the Faculty Examiners, but no recommendation will be submitted to the Senate until the debt has been cleared or reduced to a sum less than £50. **The recommended result should not be disclosed to the candidate and should be recorded on any published Results List as No recommendation.** (In advance of Examiners' Meetings, Schools are notified of students who have debts to the University).
- 4.13 Decisions on recommended results in respect of all candidates should be recorded on a spreadsheet/list, which should be signed by the Chair of the Examiners' Meeting and the Internal and External Examiners, and which should be submitted to the Examinations Office. A copy should be attached to the Minutes of the meeting as an Annex.
- 4.14 The meeting should agree any subsequent action which may be required, for example in respect of recommendations for combined programmes. The meeting should make decisions on the award of any prizes for which it is responsible.
- 4.15 It is a requirement that appropriate arrangements are made to ensure that assessed work by students (including examination scripts and coursework) is available to Programme Examiners' Meetings.
- 4.16 Minutes must be kept of Programme Examiners' Meetings in accordance with the University Template for Programme Examiners' Meetings. The Minutes should be held in the School and a copy should be sent to the Examinations Officer.

Faculty Examiners' Meetings

- 4.17 The powers of Faculty Examiners' Meetings are
- (i) to recommend to the Senate results for awards and for progression to the next Part of a programme;
 - (ii) by means of a Special Cases Sub-Committee, to receive and consider recommendations in respect of aegrotat awards;
 - (iii) by means of a Special Cases Sub-Committee, to determine that a candidate be deemed not to have sat.
- 4.18 The membership of the Faculty Examiners' Meeting comprises the Dean of the Faculty (or a designated alternate) (Chair), all Internal Examiners for programmes within its purview, and Programme Directors. External Examiners have the right to attend and to participate in meetings responsible for making awards, but are not required to do so. The Examinations Officer and the Faculty Director of Administration shall attend the meeting.
- 4.19 A meeting of a Faculty Examiners' Meeting shall normally be deemed inquorate where a School responsible for a programme under consideration is not represented by an Internal Examiner. Exceptionally, with the agreement of the Chair, an alternate may attend in place of an Internal Examiner; or the Chair may act on behalf of a School.
- 4.20 The dates of Faculty Examiners' Meetings are published in the University Calendar. Information presented to the meeting and all discussion of candidates and results is strictly confidential to the meeting and to those officers of the University who have good reason to be provided with such information.
- 4.21 A list of recommended results will normally be circulated in advance to those with a right to attend the meeting. Internal Examiners should have available at the meeting such information as may be relevant to their recommendations, including the Minutes of the Programme Examiners' Meeting, information relating to special circumstances, and a record of candidates for whom marking recommendations had been taken into account.
- 4.22 The meeting should be advised of any changes to procedures, any major circumstances affecting a specific assessment for a module or programme, and any other generic issue relevant to the consideration of results.
- 4.23 The meeting should receive recommendations from the Faculty Special Cases Sub-Committee. It should be noted that the Special Cases Sub-Committee is responsible for recommending an Aegrotat degree.
- 4.24 The meeting should consider the Examiners' recommendations, and should give very particular attention to those candidates who are recommended to fail, and, in the case of decisions relating to progression, those candidates whose marks imply failure or failure to qualify.
- 4.25 The meeting will not forward to the Senate any recommendation in respect of a candidate for a Final Examination who has an outstanding debt to the University of £50 or more.
- 4.26 The Faculty Examiners' decisions should be recorded and Minutes of the meeting taken. The meeting should make decisions on the award of any prizes for which it is responsible.
- 4.27 The results list should be signed by the Chair of the meeting. The Meeting should agree any subsequent action which may be required, and, where appropriate authorise the Chair to take action in respect of outstanding results.

Senate

- 4.28 The Senate is responsible for approving all results of failure and all results which lead to an award.

5. **Failure and Re-Assessment**

General Requirements

- 5.1 The number and nature of any re-assessment opportunities shall be specified in the Programme Specification and Scheme of Assessment.

Condonation

- 5.2 Provision may be made in the Programme Specification and Scheme of Assessment for a candidate's narrow failure in specified elements of a programme of study to be condoned.

6. **Candidates**

Information

- 6.1 Each programme member in a programme of study leading to an award of the University shall be informed at the commencement of the programme of the assessment requirements of the programme and award, as specified in the Programme Specification and in the Scheme of Assessment.

- 6.2 Each candidate shall also be informed of the requirements and procedures relating to the grounds for, and submission of, any appeal against a decision of an Examiners' Meeting.

Responsibilities

- 6.3 It is the responsibility of each candidate for any examination to ensure that he or she shall attend for examination at the appointed time and place.

- 6.4 It is also the responsibility of each programme member to ensure that all work to be assessed as part of the requirements of a programme of study, as specified in the Programme Specification and the Scheme of Assessment, shall be submitted for assessment on or before any date(s) stipulated and in the manner prescribed for the submission.

Non-Attendance through Good Cause

- 6.5 Any candidate who is unable, through disability, accident, illness or other good cause, to sit or complete at the appointed time the examination for which he or she has entered may, at the discretion of an Examiners' Meeting, be permitted:

- (i) to enter the examination(s) in any module(s) or other element(s) in which he or she was unable to be examined on the next scheduled occasion(s) for the examination(s) concerned, and thereby complete the assessment requirements for the programme of study; or
- (ii) be required to sit a special examination of any module(s) or other element(s) of the programme the examination for which he or she was unable to sit or complete as soon as possible and/or be permitted to submit any work prescribed, such as a dissertation or project report, at such date as an Examiners' Meeting shall stipulate.

- 6.6 The candidate concerned shall be required to provide an appropriate medical certificate and/or other relevant documentary evidence.

Extenuating circumstances

- 6.7 An appropriately adapted extract from the University's *Procedures for Consideration of Extenuating Circumstances* is set out in Appendix 1.

Disability

- 6.8 Any person with a particular disability, who requires special facilities to enable him or her to take an examination or undertake any other assessment, should ensure that the School of Management Assessment Office is advised of those needs at least six weeks before the examination or other assessment.
- 6.9 Special arrangements may be made for the assessment of candidates with disabilities, provided that the assessment requirements of the Programme Specification and the Scheme of Assessment are fulfilled, and that the person is not given any unfair advantage by those arrangements.

7. **Cheating, Plagiarism or other Academic Misconduct**

- 7.1 The University's procedures in relation to Academic Misconduct are set out in Appendix 2.

8. **Internal Examiners**

Appointment and Re-Appointment

- 8.1 Heads of School are responsible for nominating Internal Examiners for programmes and modules which lie within their purview. The relevant Faculty Board for Teaching and Learning is responsible for approving the nominations of Internal Examiners.
- 8.2 Internal examiners must be members of the part-time or full-time staff of the University.
- 8.3 Where any person appointed to act as an internal examiner has any family or personal relationship, other than in a professional capacity, with any person being assessed or examined, that relationship shall be declared by the internal examiner.

Chief Internal Examiner

- 8.4 The Board of Examiners shall appoint a Chief Internal Examiner who shall, inter alia,
- (i) determine which member(s) of staff involved in the delivery of the programme shall set examination questions and which topics shall be covered in those questions;
 - (ii) co-ordinate the assessment/examination process.

9. **External Examiners**

Appointment and Re-appointment

- 9.1 Heads of School are responsible for nominating External Examiners for programmes and modules which lie within their purview. The relevant Faculty Board for Teaching and Learning is responsible for approving the nominations of External Examiners and for submitting recommendations in respect of External Examiners to the University Board for Teaching and Learning. The University Board for Teaching and Learning is responsible for confirming the appointment of External Examiners.
- 9.2 Each external examiner shall normally be appointed for a period of three years. The period of appointment may be extended for one further year.
- 9.3 No person may be re-appointed as an external examiner until at least three years have elapsed since the termination of any previous appointment as an external examiner, whether extended or not.

- 9.4 The appointment of an External Examiner may be terminated where there is good cause, such as unsatisfactory performance of duties. A termination of appointment must be approved by the Chair of the University Board for Teaching and Learning.

Eligibility and Criteria for Appointment

- 9.5 Each external examiner shall satisfy the appointment criteria.
- 9.6 At least one external examiner shall be appointed for each programme of study leading to an award.
- 9.7 The number of people appointed as external examiners shall be such as to enable the full range of subject modules or other elements in the programme to be covered.
- 9.8 An external examiner should normally hold, or have recently held, a senior academic post in a university or recognised degree awarding institution in the United Kingdom.
- 9.9 Any person appointed to act as an external examiner shall have relevant experience of teaching and examining in the particular subject discipline being examined and at the level concerned.
- 9.10 A person with appropriate experience and expertise who holds a senior position in a research establishment, in commerce, in industry, in business or in the public services may be appointed as an external examiner.
- 9.11 An external examiner should not normally hold, concurrently, more than three major external examinerships.
- 9.12 Any person who is a member of the University's academic staff, or a member of staff of an Accredited Centre or an Associate Organisation shall be ineligible for appointment as an external examiner.
- 9.13 No person who has been a member of Henley Business School or Henley Management College, or a member of staff of an Accredited Centre or an Associate Organisation, shall be eligible for appointment as an external examiner until a period of three years has elapsed since the termination of the contract of employment with the School or College, or other institution or organisation, as the case may be.

Powers, Rights, Responsibilities and Functions

- 9.14 An external examiner shall be a full member of the Programme Examiners' Meeting on which he or she serves, and shall normally be expected to be present at meetings of the Programme Examiners' Meeting.
- 9.15 An external examiner shall approve the drafts of all examination papers, consider a range of marked examination scripts and shall have the opportunity to see samples of all other assessed elements of work submitted by candidates.
- 9.16 An external examiner shall be responsible for:
- (i) ensuring that the standards of attainment and of the award to which the programme leads are consistent with the aims of the programme and comparable with those of similar awards in other universities and degree awarding institutions in the United Kingdom;
 - (ii) ascertaining that the assessment process is properly conducted;
 - (iii) ensuring that the assessment of each programme member is fair;
 - (iv) adjudicating when problems arise and, exceptionally, acting as an additional marker.

- 9.17 At least one external examiner present at the relevant Programme Examiners' Meeting must sign the list of recommendations for awards as evidence that he or she accepts the recommendations made and that the assessment process has been conducted in accordance with the appropriate conventions.
- 9.18 An external examiner shall have the right:
- (i) to see samples of all assessed elements completed by candidates and marked by internal examiners;
 - (ii) to attend all examiners' meetings at which significant decisions are taken concerning candidates in the programme for which the external examiner has been appointed.
- 9.19 An external examiner shall comment on and provide informal and formal advice on:
- (i) the content of the programme;
 - (ii) the structure and balance of the programme;
 - (iii) the assessment procedures.
- 9.20 An external examiner may submit written comments in confidence to the Vice-Chancellor, on any matter concerning his or her responsibilities as an external examiner.

Guidance on Involvement in Assessment

- 9.21 External Examiners should be given the relevant syllabus of each module and other elements of a programme of study on which candidates are to be assessed.
- 9.22 With regard to an External Examiner's right to approve the drafts of all examination papers, model answers and/or the scheme of marking should normally accompany those drafts.
- 9.23 With regard to an External Examiner's right to see samples of all marked assessments, the principles on which the selection of sample scripts will be made shall be agreed with the External Examiner. In determining the basis of selection, the following requirements should be satisfied:
- (i) an External Examiner should have enough evidence to enable him or her to be assured that the marking internally and the determination of any distinctions are consistent and that the standards are appropriate to the level of award to which the programme of study leads;
 - (ii) examination scripts and other assessed work representing a range of attainment and performance by candidates should be included;
 - (iii) the examination scripts of borderline candidates should be seen by an External Examiner;
 - (iv) a sample of examination scripts of candidates whom it is internally determined should fail should be submitted to an External Examiner.
- 9.24 In particular, full account should be taken of the assessment of a candidate's performance by an External Examiner where there has been disagreement internally about the mark(s) which should be given for any assessed element.

Reports

- 9.25 Each external examiner shall submit a report at least annually commenting upon:
- (i) the assessment process;

- (ii) the appropriateness of the standards set, by reference to published national frameworks and benchmarks;
- (iii) the standards of candidates' performance and comparability with those of other UK higher education institutions;
- (iv) the nature and rigour of the assessment and its appropriateness to the learning outcomes identified and the level being assessed.

Appendix 1

Procedures for Consideration of Extenuating Circumstances (Undergraduate And Postgraduate Taught Programmes)

Note: This document has been appropriately adapted from the University's document for relevance to Greenland-based programmes

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The University is committed to giving appropriate consideration to medical or personal circumstances which may have adversely affected a student's performance in examinations and assessment.
- 1.2 Information relating to medical and personal circumstances should be accorded a high level of confidentiality and its disclosure strictly limited. In consequence, responsibility for considering medical or personal circumstances should normally be delegated by the Faculty and Programme Examiners' Meeting to Special Cases Sub-Committees, which will be responsible for advising respectively the Faculty and Programme Examiners' Meeting on appropriate action in these cases.

2. Procedures for notification of special circumstances

- 2.1 Students who wish circumstances to be drawn to the attention of the Examiners are required to provide details of the special circumstances which they believe have affected their performance.
- 2.2 Students are invited to state whether they are willing for their Personal Tutor to be consulted about the information disclosed. In most cases the student will already have consulted his or her tutor.
- 2.3 Students are required, where appropriate, to submit relevant medical/counselling evidence (such as a doctor's or counsellor's note), except where they have consulted the University Medical Practice or the University Counselling Service. Where a student has consulted the University Medical Practice or the University Counselling Service, he or she is required to state the doctor/counsellor consulted and the date of the medical consultation, and is asked to give consent for the Practice to disclose information to the nominated person(s) in the School who should normally be the School Director of Teaching and Learning and for the information to be disclosed to the relevant Examiners and relevant officers of the University.
- 2.4 Where the circumstances warrant it, the nominated person should contact the University Medical Practice/Counselling Service and ask for a countersignature to confirm that there are no significant disparities between the account provided by the student and the medical/counselling record. The Medical Practice is concerned that its resources are used appropriately, and has therefore asked that confirmation of medical evidence is sought by Schools only in those cases where the circumstance is sufficiently serious to provide grounds for substantive action by the Special Cases Sub-Committee. Schools are therefore asked to indicate the nature of the action which would be recommended if the student's account is confirmed. The School's request should be signed by a member of academic staff who would normally be the School Director of Teaching and Learning. Schools should not seek confirmation of circumstances that are evident to all (e.g. a broken leg) or those where the medical practice simply accepts the patient's view (e.g. a cold or headache).

Students should not be advised to attend the Medical Practice to seek confirmation of trivial complaints.

- 2.5 When evidence has been received from the student and, where appropriate, sent to and returned by the Medical Practice/Counselling Service, it should be forwarded to the School Director of Teaching and Learning. Due regard should be given at all stages to safeguarding sensitive information.
- 2.6 Where a student has given authorisation for the Personal Tutor to be consulted, the nominated person should forward to the Personal Tutor, inviting the Personal Tutor to comment, if appropriate. Any comments should be forwarded to the School Director of Teaching and Learning.

- 2.7 Students are encouraged to discuss their circumstances with their Personal Tutor. Members of staff should remind students of this advice when the opportunity arises.
- 2.8 Extenuating circumstances are treated in strictest confidence. Exceptionally, in a case where a student has highly sensitive circumstances which they are reluctant to disclose to staff within the School, the student may submit a statement directly to the Faculty Director of Administration. The fact that the student has submitted extenuating circumstances to the Faculty Director of Administration will be disclosed to the School; the specific nature of the extenuating circumstances will not be disclosed to the School without the prior permission of the student.

3. **Special Cases Sub-Committee**

- 3.1 Each Programme Examiners' Meeting and Faculty Examiners' Meeting should establish a Special Cases Sub-Committee. It is expected that Programme Examiners' Meetings, and therefore the Special Cases Sub-Committees, will normally be constituted to consider a number of programmes within a School.

3.2 Programme Examiners' Meeting Special Cases Sub-Committee

The membership of the Programme Examiners' Meeting Special Cases Sub-Committee will normally comprise:

School Director of Teaching and Learning (or a nominee),
Chair of the Programme Examiners' Meeting (in the Chair)
Secretary of the Programme Examiners' Meeting
External Examiners.

Other members may be appointed by the Programme Examiners' Meeting (for example, the Senior Tutor for the School), but the membership should remain small to restrict the disclosure of sensitive information. External Examiners, although members of the Sub-Committee, would not normally be expected to attend the meeting. The Chair of the Programme Examiners' Meeting would be responsible for providing the External Examiners with a full report on the cases considered and for consulting them on the recommendations.

3.3 Faculty Examiners' Meeting Special Cases Sub-Committee

The membership of the Faculty Examiners' Meeting Special Cases Sub-Committee will normally comprise:

The Dean
Faculty Director of Teaching and Learning of the Faculty
A Faculty Director of Teaching and Learning of another Faculty (*alternate: a Sub-Dean from another Faculty*)
Faculty Director of Administration
University Examinations Officer
Faculty External Examiner (in respect of Parts 1 and 2 only)
University Medical Adviser.

The selection of the Faculty Director of Teaching and Learning of another Faculty is based upon availability.

The Director of the University Counselling Service will have a standing invitation to meetings of the Faculty Examiners' Special Cases Sub-Committees.

- 3.4 The Sub-Committees' terms of reference will be to consider medical and personal circumstances which have been notified as possibly affecting a candidate's performance in examinations, assessed

coursework, or dissertations, and to advise the Examiners' Meeting on how these circumstances should be taken into account in determining the student's result.

4. Procedures of the Programme Examiners' Special Cases Sub-Committee

- 4.1 In exercising its judgement in relation to personal circumstances, the Sub-Committee is required to take account of the severity of the problem, its duration, and its coincidence with a critical point in the assessment procedure. The Sub-Committee is required to treat each case on its merits while endeavouring to ensure that its decisions are equitable and that there is consistency of treatment across cohorts and over a period of years.
- 4.2 The Chair of the Programme Special Cases Sub-Committee is responsible for reporting the cases fully to the Programme External Examiners and consulting them on the Sub-Committee's recommendations, if the External Examiners have not been present at the meeting of the Sub-Committee, and for reporting summary recommendations to the Programme Examiners' Meeting.
- 4.3 It is required that Minutes are taken of the Sub-Committee's meetings and are held within the School. Details of medical or personal circumstances should not be included in the Minutes, and supporting documentation, such as the forms submitted by students and medical certificates, should be held separately.
- 4.4 The recommendation of the Sub-Committee, subject to the endorsement of the External Examiners, where appropriate, should normally be approved by the Programme Examiners' Meeting without detailed discussion.
- 4.5 Following its endorsement by the Programme Examiners' Meeting, a recommendation that a candidate on a postgraduate programme be deemed not to have sat or that a candidate be awarded an Aegrotat degree should be referred to the Faculty Examiners' Meeting.
- 4.6 The Chair of the Special Cases Sub-Committee may act on its behalf.

5. Procedures of the Faculty Examiners' Special Cases Sub-Committee

- 5.1 In exercising its judgement in relation to personal circumstances, the Sub-Committee is required to take account of the severity of the problem, its duration, and its coincidence with a critical point in the assessment procedure. The Sub-Committee is required to treat each case on its merits while endeavouring to ensure that its decisions are equitable and that there is consistency of treatment across cohorts and over a period of years.
- 5.2 In respect of candidates on postgraduate programmes, the Faculty Special Cases Sub-Committee is responsible for considering fully the Programme Examiners' recommendations that a candidate be deemed not to have sat or that a candidate be awarded an Aegrotat. The Chair is responsible for reporting summary recommendations to the Faculty Examiners' Meeting. Other decisions in respect of special cases will not normally be considered by the Faculty Special Cases Sub-Committee. The External Examiners will not normally be consulted further at the stage of the Faculty Examiners' Meeting.
- 5.3 It is required that Minutes are taken of the Sub-Committee's meetings and held in the Examinations Office. Details of medical or personal circumstances should not be included in the Minutes, and supporting documentation, such as the forms submitted by students and medical certificates, should be held separately.
- 5.4 The recommendation of the Sub-Committee, subject to the endorsement of the External Examiners, where appropriate, should normally be approved by the Examiners' Meeting without detailed discussion.
- 5.5 The Chair of the Special Cases Sub-Committee may act on its behalf.

6. **Procedures for consideration of extenuating circumstances in relation to module marks**

Where extenuating circumstances are notified in respect of a minor piece of work, the Programme Special Cases Sub-Committee which has responsibility for the module may take account of the circumstances in determining the mark for the module. In such cases, the mark for the module may be calculated by a variant of the normal method. Where a student has missed or otherwise performed poorly in an assessment on account of significant extenuating circumstances, the student should, wherever possible, be granted an extension for coursework or be set an alternative assessment. However, where such arrangements are not feasible or would cause further adverse effects to the candidate, consideration should be given to excluding the assessment affected from the calculation of the module mark, to substituting a relevant coursework mark for the assessment affected, or to deriving a mark by another method which is based on evidence of the student's performance. It is not permitted for 'compensatory' marks to be assigned to a student in respect of extenuating circumstances.

Where a mark has been derived by any of the arrangements specified above, a record should be kept and the information passed for endorsement to the Special Cases Sub-Committee with responsibility for the student's overall result.

7. **Recommendations available to the Programme Special Cases Sub-Committee: Taught postgraduate programmes**

7.1 The Programme Special Cases Sub-Committee will have primary responsibility for considering special cases in respect of candidates in examinations for postgraduate programmes. The Sub-Committee, having considered the candidate's performance in the light of the circumstances notified, may recommend that:

- (i) a candidate be awarded an Aegrotat degree;
- (ii) a candidate be deemed not to have sat in one or more modules;
- (iii) a candidate be given a higher result than that implied by the set of marks achieved, in which case the recommended result should be specified;
- (iv) a mark for a module be referred for review to the relevant Examiners and, in consequence, a recommendation in respect of the result may be deferred.

In considering (iii) above, the Programme Special Cases Sub-Committee should consider carefully the evidence of a candidate's performance and the basis for a recommendation, which might include: deriving a result from a reduced number of modules, excluding a limited number of modules affected by adverse circumstances; attaching greater weight to exit velocity; or deeming criteria to have been met where the shortfall is marginal.

7.2 Viva voce examinations may not be held to assist in the resolution of special cases. (This provision does not affect the practice of holding vivas as an element of the normal assessment process.)

7.3 Following the Programme Examiners' Meeting, recommendations that a candidate be awarded an Aegrotat degree or be deemed not to have sat will also be considered by the Special Cases Sub-Committee for the Faculty Examiners' Meeting.

8. **Feedback to students**

It is good practice for the School Director of Teaching and Learning (or his or her representative) to inform a student whether the circumstances notified:

- (a) were considered to be substantial and appropriate action was taken;
- (b) were considered to be substantial but no action was appropriate given the result; or

(c) were not considered substantial and no action was taken.

Appendix 2 Academic Misconduct

Statement on academic misconduct

The University's statement on academic misconduct is as follows:

Cheating, which is the attempt to gain an advantage for oneself or another by deceit, and other misconduct are breaches of discipline under the University's Regulations for Conduct 33(b), and are punishable by a range of sanctions.

- (a) Cheating in assessed coursework (for example, dissertations, long essays or projects) and open book examinations includes:
 - (i) Plagiarism

Plagiarism is the fraudulent representation of another's work as one's own. This applies whatever the source of the material (for example, a published source, the web, or the work of another student), whether the material is copied word for word or paraphrased, and whatever the extent of the material used.
 - (ii) Falsifying data, evidence, or experimental results.
 - (iii) Providing assistance to another student in an act of plagiarism or falsification.
- (b) Cheating and other academic misconduct in written examinations (including tests and examinations administered by a School/Department) include, but are not restricted to:
 - (i) Taking into the examination hall, or possessing while in the examination hall, any books, memoranda, notes or other similar material (including material held electronically) except that students are permitted to deposit such material in an area designated by the invigilator prior to the start of the examination. Material which has been supplied by the invigilator or authorised by the Examiners is exempt from this proscription.*
 - (ii) Taking into the examination hall or possessing while in the examination hall any device which permits communication with others or receipt of communication from others or receipt of information;*
 - (iii) Copying from, consulting or otherwise making use of another candidate's script; or attempting to copy from, consult or otherwise make use of another candidate's script;
 - (iv) Improperly aiding or attempting to aid another candidate, or improperly obtaining or attempting to obtain aid from any person;
 - (v) Consulting or attempting to consult, any books, memoranda, notes or any other similar material (including material held electronically) while present in the examination hall during the period of the examination;*
 - (vi) Impersonating or attempting to impersonate another candidate or being impersonated.

* Note: For the purposes of these regulations, 'examination hall' includes the examination room, the toilets and any other areas to which candidates have access during the examination.

- (c) Other misconduct in written examinations

Candidates are not allowed under any circumstances to talk to each other or to behave in a manner likely to disturb or distract other candidates during an examination. Candidates are not permitted to smoke or eat in the examination room, and are permitted to drink still water only. Candidates are not permitted to have a pencil case or other container in the vicinity of their examination desk, unless the

pencil case or container is transparent. It is forbidden to remove an examination script or a part of an examination script from the examination room.

Candidates are not allowed to leave the examination before it has finished without the permission of the invigilator or to leave the examination room temporarily for any purpose without the permission of the invigilator. Invigilators are authorised to instruct candidates who are talking or behaving in a disruptive manner to leave the room. Invigilators will report candidates whose conduct appears to constitute cheating.

(d) Penalties

It must be emphasised that the most serious view is taken within the University of cheating and other academic misconduct, whether in written examinations or coursework. Any such case will be treated as a disciplinary matter and will be referred to the Head of School who may impose a penalty or refer the matter to the relevant Faculty Director of Teaching and Learning, who has powers to impose more severe penalties. In the most serious cases, the Faculty Director of Teaching and Learning will refer the matter to the Senate Standing Committee on Academic Misconduct, which may lead to a student being failed in all assessments for the relevant Part of their programme or removal from membership of the University.

Procedures in relation to academic misconduct

Procedures in cases of suspected plagiarism

At its meeting on 1 July 2004, the Senate agreed that the following procedures should be followed in cases of alleged plagiarism [*In the following procedure, the Head of School may delegate responsibility to the School Director of Teaching and Learning (or other designated alternate)*];

The marker of a student's work has a responsibility to be vigilant for instances of plagiarism. Where a marker considers work to be excessively derivative and poorly referenced but not to be a fraudulent representation by the student of another's work as his or her own, the work should be treated as an instance of poor academic practice and **not** academic misconduct. It is not subject to disciplinary procedures. The student should be given an appropriately low mark and appropriate advice, and a note that such advice has been given should be entered on the student's record.

Where a student persists in reproducing the work of another without adequate acknowledgement, the record that the student had been advised about poor academic practice may provide prima facie grounds for construing any subsequent reproduction of another's work as intentional.

Where a marker believes plagiarism to have been committed (i.e. that a student has fraudulently represented the work of another as his or her own), he or she is required to report the case to the Head of the School which 'owns' the module or, in the case of a research student, the Head of the School to which the student is attached.

At all stages in the process due regard should be paid *inter alia* to mitigating circumstances, evidence of intent, the extent of the material plagiarised, and whether the student has previously committed plagiarism. The response to a case of plagiarism should be proportionate, with minor offences receiving smaller penalties than more serious cases.

The Head of School is required to investigate the allegation and then at his or her discretion:

- (i) to determine that no case has been established and that no further action be taken; or
- (ii) to determine that a case has been established, and to pursue one of the following procedures, as appropriate:
 - (a) If the work concerned is purely formative (i.e. it does not contribute to classification or progression), the student should be warned that the practice is unacceptable, and a record be

kept of this warning. Should the offence be repeated in formative work, the School may refuse to mark an appropriate amount of further formative work from the student concerned.

- (b) Where the work concerned does contribute to classification or progression:
- (i) If the plagiarism is minor the work may be marked as if the offending passages had been omitted and a corresponding mark awarded. The student should be clearly advised that plagiarism has been found in the work and be given guidance on acceptable academic practice. A record should be kept of such cases.
 - (ii) If the case is more substantial, or is an offence subsequent to a previous warning, the Head of School has the power to award a mark lower than that obtained by simply ignoring the offending passages. The mark for the piece of work may be set at an appropriate level within a range from zero to the mark available for the un-plagiarised passages. It should be noted that in cases where the entire module mark is based on a single piece of assessed work this gives the School the power to award a mark of zero for the module.
 - (iii) If the plagiarism is substantial, or is an offence subsequent to a previous warning, the Head of School may:
 - (a) propose to the relevant Faculty Director of Teaching and Learning that the student's mark in the *module* be reduced below that which would result if the plagiarised work were simply awarded a mark of zero; or
 - (b) propose to the relevant Faculty Director of Teaching and Learning that the case be referred to the Standing Committee on Academic Misconduct.

In cases where a student is given a specific warning about, or is found to have committed, plagiarism and poor academic practice has been a contributory factor, Schools should, as a matter of routine, advise the student to contact the Study Advisor for appropriate advice.

The relevant Faculty Director of Teaching and Learning shall be the Faculty Director responsible for the module provider or, in the case of research students, the Faculty Director responsible for the student. The Head of School, in considering cases of alleged plagiarism, should normally interview the student against whom the allegation of plagiarism has been made. The student has the right to be accompanied in any such interview by a 'friend' who must be a currently registered student of the University, a member of staff of the University, a sabbatical officer of the Students' Union or a student adviser working within the Students' Union.

Where the School responsible for the module is not the School responsible for the student's programme, the Head of School responsible for the module should inform the Head of School responsible for the student's programme once the case of plagiarism has been established but prior to the determination of the penalty or referral of the case to the Standing Committee on Academic Misconduct. Relevant documentation should be copied to the Head of School responsible for the student's programme.

Where a Head of School decides to proceed under (ii)(b)(iii)(b) above, the relevant Faculty Director of Teaching and Learning shall at his or her discretion:

- (i) determine that the case be referred back to the Head of School; or
- (ii) determine an appropriately reduced mark for the module, which may be zero; or
- (iii) determine that the case be referred through the Examinations Officer to the Standing Committee on Academic Misconduct, in which case the Faculty Director of Teaching and Learning would be encouraged to comment on appropriate penalties in the event that the student is found guilty of academic misconduct, and in so doing to distinguish between the implications of a range of possible

penalties in the case in question. Where the student is registered on a programme which falls within the domain of another Faculty Director of Teaching and Learning, the Faculty Director responsible for the module provider should consult the Faculty Director of Teaching and Learning responsible for the student. The relevant Faculty Director of Teaching and Learning, in considering cases of alleged plagiarism, may interview the student against whom the allegation of plagiarism has been made. The student has the right to be accompanied in any such interview by a 'friend' who must be a currently registered student of the University, a member of staff of the University or a sabbatical officer of the Students' Union or a student adviser working within the Students' Union.

Where a case has been referred to the Standing Committee on Academic Misconduct, the Committee shall normally hold a meeting with the student (or, where this is not possible, receive a written submission) and with the Head of School (or a designated alternate), and shall at its discretion:

- (i) determine that no further action be taken;
- (ii) determine that a penalty be imposed, which may include:
 - (a) referral to the Standing Disciplinary Committee with a recommendation that the student be removed from membership of the University;
 - (b) failure in the Year or Part;
 - (c) failure in the module (or equivalent) in which academic misconduct has been committed without the normal right to re-examination;
 - (d) failure in the module (or equivalent) in which academic misconduct has been committed with the normal right to re-examination.

The Standing Disciplinary Committee has the power to remove a student from the University. If the Standing Disciplinary Committee does not approve a recommendation of the Standing Committee on Academic Misconduct that a student be removed from the University, it has the power to substitute an alternative penalty, including (ii)(b)-(d) above.

Appeals

- (i) Appeals against the decision of a Head of School would be considered by the Faculty Director of Teaching and Learning; and, in these cases, the decision of the Faculty Director of Teaching and Learning would be final.
- (ii) Appeals against the decision of the Faculty Director of Teaching and Learning, where the decision is not in respect of an appeal against the decision of a School, would be considered by the Standing Committee on Academic Misconduct; and, in these cases, the decision of the Standing Committee on Academic Misconduct would be final.
- (iii) Appeals against the decision of the Standing Committee on Academic Misconduct, where the decision is not in respect of an appeal against the decision of a Faculty Director of Teaching and Learning, would be considered by the Standing Disciplinary Committee.
- (iv) Appeals against the decision of the Standing Disciplinary Committee, where the decision is not in respect of an appeal against the decision of the Standing Committee on Academic Misconduct, would be considered by the Standing Disciplinary Appeals Committee.

Procedures in cases of suspected cheating in a written examination

At its meeting on 1 July 2004, the Senate agreed that the following procedures should be followed in cases of alleged plagiarism [*In the following procedure, the Head of School may delegate responsibility to the School Director of Teaching and Learning (or other designated alternate)*];

If an Invigilator believes that a student is cheating in a written examination, he or she is required to report the case immediately to the Chief Invigilator. If a marker believes that a student has been cheating in a written examination, he or she is required to report the case immediately to the Head of School, who should contact the University Examinations Officer.

At all stages in the process due regard should be paid to mitigating circumstances, evidence of intent, the severity of the alleged offence, and whether the student has previously committed a similar offence.

- (a) The Chief Invigilator is required to investigate any reported suspicion of cheating and then at his or her discretion:
 - (i) to determine that there are not prima facie grounds for believing an offence to have been committed and that no further action be taken;
 - (ii) to determine that there are prima facie grounds for believing an offence to have been committed, and, in consultation with the University Examinations Officer, refer the case to the Head of School responsible for the module.

The Chief Invigilator, in considering a case of suspected cheating, should normally interview the student about whom the suspicion has been raised.

- (b) Where a Chief Invigilator decides to proceed under (a)(ii) above, the Head of School shall at his or her discretion:
 - (i) determine that no case has been established and that no further action be taken; or
 - (ii) determine that a case has been established, and propose to the relevant Faculty Director of Teaching and Learning that the case be referred to the Standing Committee on Academic Misconduct.

The relevant Faculty Director of Teaching and Learning shall be the Faculty Director responsible for the module provider.

The Head of School, in considering cases of alleged academic misconduct, should normally interview the student against whom the allegation has been made. The student has the right to be accompanied in any such interview by a 'friend' who must be a currently registered student of the University, a member of staff of the University or a sabbatical officer of the Students' Union or a student adviser working within the Students' Union.

Where the School responsible for the module is not the School responsible for the student's programme, the Head of School responsible for the module should inform the Head of School responsible for the student's programme prior to referral of the case to the Standing Committee on Academic Misconduct.

Relevant documentation should be copied to the Head of School responsible for the student's programme.

- (c) Where a Head of School decides to proceed under (b)(ii) above, the relevant Faculty Director of Teaching and Learning shall at his or her discretion:
 - (i) determine that the case be referred back to the Head of School; or

- (ii) determine that the case be referred through the Examinations Officer to the Standing Committee on Academic Misconduct, in which case the Faculty Director of Teaching and Learning would be encouraged to comment on appropriate penalties in the event that the student is found guilty of academic misconduct, and in so doing to distinguish between the implications of a range of possible penalties in the case in question.

Where the student is registered on a programme which falls within the domain of another Faculty Director of Teaching and Learning, the Faculty Director responsible for the module provider should consult the Faculty Director of Teaching and Learning responsible for the student.

The relevant Faculty Director of Teaching and Learning, in considering cases of alleged academic misconduct, may interview the student against whom the allegation of plagiarism has been made. The student has the right to be accompanied in any such interview by a 'friend' who must be a currently registered student of the University, a member of staff of the University or a sabbatical officer of the Students' Union or a student adviser working within the Students' Union.

- (d) Where a case has been referred to the Standing Committee on Academic Misconduct, the Committee shall normally hold a meeting with the student (or, where this is not possible, receive a written submission) and with the Head of School and shall at its discretion:
 - (i) determine that no further action be taken;
 - (ii) determine that a penalty be imposed, which may include:
 - (a) referral to the Standing Disciplinary Committee with a recommendation that the student be removed from membership of the University;
 - (b) failure in the Year or Part;
 - (c) failure in the module (or equivalent) in which academic misconduct has been committed without the normal right to re-examination;
 - (d) failure in the module (or equivalent) in which academic misconduct has been committed with the normal right to re-examination.

The procedures of the Standing Committee on Academic Misconduct are described below.

- (e) The Standing Disciplinary Committee has the power to remove a student from the University. If the Standing Disciplinary Committee does not approve a recommendation of the Standing Committee on Academic Misconduct that a student be removed from the University, it has the power to substitute an alternative penalty, including (d) (ii)(b)-(d) above.
- (f) Appeals
 - (i) Appeals against the decision of the Standing Committee on Academic Misconduct, where the decision is not in respect of an appeal against the decision of a Faculty Director of Teaching and Learning, are considered by the Standing Disciplinary Committee.
 - (ii) Appeals against the decision of the Standing Disciplinary Committee, where the decision is not in respect of an appeal against the decision of the Standing Committee on Academic Misconduct are considered by the Standing Disciplinary Appeals Committee.

Procedures of the Senate Standing Committee on Academic Misconduct

1. The Head of the School or other module provider which 'owns' the module in which academic misconduct is alleged or, in the case of research students, the Head of the School(s) to which the student is attached, (hereafter referred to as 'the Head of School') is responsible for referring the allegation to the relevant Faculty Director of Teaching and Learning and, where the allegation is

referred to the Standing Committee on Academic Misconduct, for submitting a written statement detailing the allegation to the Secretary of the Committee. Where the student against whom the allegation is made is registered for a programme in a School which does not 'own' the module in which misconduct is alleged, the Head of the School which 'owns' the module should consult at an early stage the Head of the School which 'owns' the student's programme.

2. The Committee is responsible for considering cases of alleged misconduct and for imposing appropriate sanctions on those students found to have committed offences of academic misconduct. The membership of the Committee comprises a Pro-Vice-Chancellor, with other Pro-Vice-Chancellors serving as alternates, the Deans of the Faculties and the Directors of Teaching and Learning of the Faculties, with the University Examinations Officer serving as Secretary. The membership is stated in the Calendar (www.reading.ac.uk/calendar).
3. The Committee normally delegates to a panel its powers and responsibilities for considering and determining cases of alleged misconduct. The panel shall be drawn from the membership of the Committee and shall normally comprise the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Chair) and any other two members to be selected by the Chair, with the University Examinations Officer as Secretary. Where a member of the Committee has previously been involved in consideration of the allegation as Head of School or Faculty Director of Teaching and Learning or in any other capacity, he or she shall not serve on the panel considering the allegation.
4. On receiving from the Head of School a written statement on the alleged misconduct, the Secretary shall write to the student stating the allegation, enclosing the written statement provided by the Head of School, and informing the student of the procedure to be followed and the time and date at which the hearing of the allegation will be held. The Secretary shall also write to the Head of School informing him or her of the procedure to be followed and the time and date at which the hearing of the allegation will be held.
5. The Secretary shall keep a record of the proceedings of and evidence given to the Committee. The Committee's hearings shall be held in private.
6. The student shall have the right to attend the hearing of the case on the specified date, and to be accompanied by a "friend" who should normally be a currently registered student of the University or a member of staff of the University or a sabbatical officer of the Students' Union or a student adviser working within the Students' Union.
7. The Head of School (or the member of staff to whom the responsibility has been delegated) shall be required to attend the hearing of the allegation.
8. In the case where a student does not attend the meeting, the Committee shall not normally take further evidence except for clarification of points of fact.
9. The student and his or her "friend" and the Head of School shall have the right to be present throughout the Committee's hearing of evidence save that they shall withdraw at any stage at the Chair's direction if the Committee wishes to consider privately any matter or point. If any person obstructs the proceedings, the Chair may require all or any of those present to leave the meeting.
10. The proceedings of the Committee shall not be invalidated by the failure of the student or his or her "friend" or the Head of School to attend the meeting or by the exclusion of the student or his or her "friend" or the Head of School from the meeting.
11. The Committee shall consider the written statement of the allegation, together with supporting evidence, submitted by the Head of School. The student and the Head of School have the right to give oral evidence and to call witnesses. The Committee may at its discretion permit evidence to be given other than orally.
12. In the case where a student or Head of School wishes to call a witness, reasonable advance notice, as specified by the Secretary, must be given in writing to the Secretary.

13. The Committee has the power to call any witnesses it wishes, whether requested by the student or the Head of School or not.
14. The Secretary shall notify the student and the Head of School of any witnesses who have been called.
15. The student and Head of School may speak, comment or ask questions at any time with the permission of the Chair, provided that the content is relevant to the case.
16. The “friend” may speak, comment or ask questions at any time with the permission of the Chair, provided that the content is relevant to the case.
17. The Committee has the power to question the student, his or her “friend”, the Head of School or any witness at any time during the hearing of a case.
18. The Committee has the power to adjourn a hearing for a reasonable period.
19. The findings of the hearing shall be communicated in writing to the student and to the Head of School following the hearing and shall be reported to the Senate.
20. The Committee has the powers to impose at its discretion and on the merits of each case appropriate sanctions on a student found to have committed an offence of academic misconduct which may include any of the following singly or in combination. The sanctions available are not restricted to those specified below:
 - (a) referral to the Standing Disciplinary Committee with a recommendation that the student be removed from membership of the University;
 - (b) failure in the Year or Part;
 - (c) failure in the module (or equivalent) in which academic misconduct has been committed without the normal right to re-examination;
 - (d) failure in the module (or equivalent) in which academic misconduct has been committed with the normal right to re-examination.