

## Quick Guide to the Assessment Offence Regulations

1. The School expects that Departments set out clear information and guidance to ensure students are well informed about the School's academic integrity requirements.
2. The School's [Assessment Offence Regulations](#) set out how to deal with an allegation of assessment misconduct and it applies to all summative assessments submitted to the School regardless of format (e.g. online exams, coursework, essays, in-person exams).
3. If during the marking, an examiner has concerns about the content of an assessment, then it is open to them to flag their concerns to the Head of Department (HoD) for them or their delegate (referred to as "the Department" in the rest of this document) to carry out an investigation into this work. This investigation may involve interrogating the sources used by the candidate, any relevant Turnitin Report and/or any previous formative or summative assessment submitted by the candidate. This is to check for any similar issues with previously submitted work, and could be used as a point of comparison if there are concerns about third party involvement in writing the assessment e.g. suspicions of contract cheating or the use of Artificial Intelligence software.
4. As part of the investigation, the Department may [interview](#) the candidate about their assessment. The purpose of the interview is not to conduct a viva or test the candidate on the subject but to seek their input and an explanation about their approach and methodology for writing the assessment. Normally the lead examiner responsible for the assessment would conduct the interview but it could be the HoD or their delegate or both.
5. Once you have all of the evidence - of which the interview can form a part – the Department must determine whether or not to make a formal allegation.
6. Where the Department determine to make an allegation, there also needs to be a consideration regarding the type of appropriate penalty; for example:
  - 6.1 the extent to which assessment misconduct/plagiarism appears to be deliberate or not; and
  - 6.2 whether the candidate has made any attempt to reference the material; and
  - 6.3 are there problems with the central sections to their argument/conclusion; and
  - 6.4 could the candidate have been genuinely confused about the School's assessment rules; and
  - 6.5 are there any strong mitigating factors (corroborated by [acceptable evidence](#)).
7. If, after the interview and in light of all the evidence, it was felt the assessment misconduct likely occurred accidentally there might be scope for treating the matter as a "minor" offence which means it can be dealt with at Department level, without the need to refer to an Assessment Misconduct Panel, with the Department applying a relatively mild penalty such as a remark of the work but excluding any plagiarised material, a zero for the assessment in question with the right to resubmit, or capping the course at the pass mark.
8. For very minor infractions where it is felt an offence has occurred but this was accidental and unlikely to have resulted in any significant advantage to the student, the Department can treat the offence as a "disposal" which means the candidate is presented with the allegation and asked to accept that they have committed an assessment offence but no penalty is applied.

9. In all cases, where a penalty or disposal was applied, the School would keep a record of the offence and agreed outcome. However, there would be no indication the offence had occurred on the student transcript (other than any mark adjustment as a result of a penalty) or degree certificate and the School cannot release information about the allegation to a third party without the candidate's express consent.
10. If it was felt the application of such "minor" penalties was not appropriate or the allegation in question related to suspicions of third party involvement then the matter should normally proceed as a "major" allegation and be referred to an Assessment Misconduct Panel.
11. Where a Department determines to take action as outlined at paragraph 7, 8 or 10 above and before taking any further action, the Department should submit the following information and recommendation to the Student Regulations Team via [ssc.appeals@lse.ac.uk](mailto:ssc.appeals@lse.ac.uk):
  - 9.1 Whether you feel the allegation should be treated as major or minor;
  - 9.2 A brief overview of the main issues with the work;
  - 9.3 all evidence established at that point in time;
  - 9.4 the proposed penalty (from the list set out at Paragraph 26 of the regulations);
  - 9.5 a rationale for that penalty
12. The Student Regulations Team will then consider whether the proposed course of action is appropriate in light of the seriousness of the allegation itself and established School precedent for dealing with such cases.
13. The Student Regulations Team will provide you with further advice about taking the allegation forward.