

# Assessment and Feedback Policy 2025-26

---

LCCA Governance

1.	Overview	2
2.	Principles of Assessment	2
3.	Assurance of Academic Standards	4
4.	Conduct of Assessment	6
5.	Submission and Marking	7
	Compensation	9
6.	Feedback	9
7.	Additional Assessment Processes	11
	Mitigating Circumstances	11
	Late Assessment Submission without Mitigating Circumstances	12
	Academic Misconduct	12
	Stage 1: Course Director Review and Determination	15
	Stage 2: Academic Misconduct Review Panel	19
	Stage 3: Appeal Review (Escalation to UCA)	24
	External Review - Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA)	26
	Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI and Large Language Models)	27
8.	Boards and Resits	27
	Internal Boards (including Module, Resit/Dissertation Boards)	27
	Board of Examiners	28
	Resits	28
9.	Academic Appeals	29
10.	Assessment Security	30
11.	Review of Assessment Policies and Procedures	30
12.	Summary of Timelines	31
	Appendix A: Key Definitions	34

## 1. Overview

1.1 This policy has been designed to provide staff and students an overview of the key principles which underpin LCCA and the College's (UCA) approach to assessment.

1.2 Details of basis for the approach can be found in several regulatory, policy and procedural documents from UCA including:

- UCA Quality Assurance Handbook (QAH)
- [UCA Common Credit Framework \(CCF\)](#)
- [UCA Academic Appeal Regulations and Procedure](#)
- [UCA Assessment](#) and [Feedback Policy](#)
- [UCA Mitigating Circumstances Regulations and Assessment Support Procedure](#)
- [UCA Academic Misconduct Regulations](#)
- UCA Policy on Internal Verification
- [UCA Procedure for making adjustments to assessment tasks for Students with a Disability/Specific Learning Difference](#)
- [UCA Policy for the Submission, Retention and Return of Student Work](#)

1.3 This document outlines the specific procedures for LCCA and has been developed in line with the regulations and policies set out by the validating partner, UCA. These should also be referenced when reviewing this policy.

1.4 The details in this policy apply to all courses at LCCA, including Extended degrees with Foundation years, Honours and Masters degrees.

## 2. Principles of Assessment

2.1 The purpose of assessment is to enable students to demonstrate achievement of stated learning outcomes and to quantify performance using percentage marks for feedback, processing assessment outcomes and calculation of awards.

2.2 Students' work is assessed against the assessment criteria published in each Unit Descriptor. These criteria are set in accordance with national standards, with reference to the Office for Students (OfS) Sector Standards and Higher Education subject benchmarks, ensuring students are tested for both subject-specific knowledge and transferable skills.

- 2.3 LCCA uses both formative and summative assessment. Only marks from summative assessment count towards unit grades. Feedback must be provided for both formative and summative assessment in various formats including written, verbal, individual or group.
- 2.4 LCCA and UCA are committed to implementing fair and equal access to assessments for all students, including those with Specific Learning Differences (SpLD) or disabilities. See the UCA Procedure for Making Adjustments to Assessment Tasks and Mitigating Circumstances Regulations for further details.
- 2.5 Students must be informed in advance of assessment requirements through Unit Descriptors and Assessment Briefs. Clear methods for recording and communicating assessment outcomes and feedback must be published, including expected deadlines.
- 2.6 Unit Handbooks issued at the start of each unit include:
- Unit information (assessment submission periods, unit descriptor, distinctive features)
  - Unit references (reading lists, website links, reference materials)
  - Unit materials (lecture notes, resources, student work examples)
  - Unit assessment (assessment descriptions, briefs, formative/summative processes, assessment criteria)
  - Unit staff (LCCA contact details, availability, support services)

This information must also be available on the VLE (Canvas).

- 2.7 Assessments must be reviewed and approved by the Internal Verifier (Link Tutor) annually before the start of the academic year (by September) to ensure assessments meet unit descriptor requirements, are fit for purpose, and are not overused.
- 2.8 Assessment arrangements for work placement and exchange must be clearly communicated to students prior to starting the relevant period of study and applied consistently.
- 2.9 UCA has procedures in place for maintaining standards and ensuring comparability within the College, between the College and its partners, and externally across the sector. LCCA participates in this process through the procedures detailed in this policy.

- 2.10 Assessment processes must be equitable, inclusive, transparent, reliable, and valid.
- 2.11 When designing and reviewing assessments, staff must consider the assessment load across the programme to ensure assessments are not clustered, and that assessment types are varied and relevant to learning outcomes.
- 2.12 When marking assessments, staff should avoid giving marks on grade boundaries. Assessment criteria and learning outcomes should be reviewed to provide students with a true reflection of grade achievement and supportive feedback to enable progression.

A Unit Handbook is issued at the start of each unit and includes:

- Unit information (assessment submission periods, unit descriptor, distinctive features)
- Unit references (reading lists, website links, reference materials)
- Unit materials (lecture notes, resources, student work examples)
- Unit assessment (assessment descriptions, briefs, formative/summative processes, assessment criteria)
- Unit staff (LCCA email and phone contact details, availability, support services)

This information must also be available on the VLE (Canvas).

### 3. Assurance of Academic Standards

#### Programmes (Courses)

- 3.1 All LCCA courses, including foundation, undergraduate and postgraduate are subject to a rigorous process of validation by UCA. Courses are validated for a period of a maximum of five years, after which time they are subject to review.
- 3.2 UCA's responsibility for validation and review (including the determination of procedures and regulations for the process, and confirmation of the outcome of events) is delegated by their Academic Board to the Academic Quality Committee. The approved procedures for validation and review are contained within UCA's Quality Assurance Handbook (Sections C and H).
- 3.3 All LCCA courses are subject to rigorous annual academic monitoring, which assures the College that the academic standards of its awards are secure. Annual academic

monitoring is a self-critical process that reviews all aspects of the course. Procedures for annual academic monitoring are approved by UCA's Academic Quality Committee and are published in their [Quality Assurance Handbook](#).

### Assessment

- 3.4 Assessed work is subject to internal moderation by UCA Link Tutors (Internal Verification) to ensure marking consistency and appropriate standards. Internal moderation typically involves review of a sample of assessed work, in accordance with the UCA Policy on Internal Verification and CCF Section 4.3.
- 3.5 Link Tutors (Internal Verifiers) are responsible for ensuring there are no conflicts of interest during internal and external verification processes. Where conflicts are identified, Link Tutors must appoint appropriate alternate verifiers. Where the conflict involves the Link Tutor, they must inform the Global Partnerships Officer (GPO), who will appoint an appropriate alternate internal verifier.
- 3.6 For undergraduate and postgraduate provision, appropriately qualified and experienced External Examiners are appointed for each award to confirm that standards are appropriate for the discipline and level, and that assessment has been conducted competently and impartially. External Examiners also compare student achievement with other institutions across the sector.
- 3.7 The CCF specifies how assessment outcomes are aggregated to determine:
  - progression, award and classification
  - the conditions under which compensation may be applied
  - the type and nature of reassessment opportunities (including penalties to be applied)
  - penalties for late or non-submission; and
  - arrangements for deferred submission or examination

Full details are available in CCF Section 4, with Programme Specifications and Unit Descriptors providing course-specific requirements.

3.8 When designing courses and reviewing assessment, including both formative and summative, staff should consider the assessment load of students across the programme to ensure that there are not high levels of assessment clustering. Staff should also review the types of assessment provided to students across to programme to ensure sure assessment is varied and relevant to the learning outcomes.

3.9 When marking assessments, staff should avoid giving marks on the grade boundary, staff should ensure that the assessment criteria and learning outcomes are reviewed to provide students with a true reflection of the grade of the work and provide supportive feedback to enable students to progress and understand how to achieve additional marks.

#### 4. Conduct of Assessment

4.1 All courses of study delivered by LCCA are taught and assessed in English.

4.2 Where a course leads to, or forms part of the qualification for a professional or statutory body, a clear statement including requirements for this will be listed in the programme specifications and course documentation. The value of this qualification across the national sector will also be stated.

4.3 As outlined in section 3, the validated course documentation contains information on the aims, learning outcomes and assessment for each course. The unit descriptors detail the assessment requirements and give the specific component weightings for each assessment.

4.4 For HE, each unit passed allows for the award of credit proportional to the unit size.

4.5 Assessments should be marked anonymously wherever the nature of the work permits (e.g., written assignments, reports). Practical assessments, presentations, portfolios, and group work may be marked non-anonymously where required. Course Directors, in collaboration with Academic Deans and the Learning & Teaching Team, determine which assessments require non-anonymous marking. For auditing purposes, records must be kept with relevant assessment information and decision rationales.

4.6 Assessments cannot deviate from the approved unit specifications, and from the assessments approved by the Internal Verifier at the start of the academic year.

- 4.7 Specific assessment requirements are to be published in the assessment briefs at the start of the module, including the deadline.
- 4.8 All assessment should be uploaded through Turnitin.
- 4.9 Submission links should be opened no later than 2 weeks before the published deadline by the Administration team on the relevant VLE (Canvas) page. The link will be on the submission deadline (except in unforeseen circumstances where there may be technical issues). The link will only be re-opened for students with approved Mitigating Circumstances.
- 4.10 No deadlines can be amended after they dates have been published to students. Approval for extension of deadlines for whole cohorts must be discussed with and approved by the Registry Team.

## 5. Submission and Marking

- 5.1 The regulations for assessment submission and marking are contained within the CCF Section 4.
- 5.2 For the purposes of calculating unit and award outcomes, a mark between 0 and 100 is given for each assessment component, and assessment components will be averaged according to their weighting within each unit to determine the overall mark. Assessment components are weighted in terms of their contribution to the overall unit mark, as stated in the validated unit descriptor. The pass mark for all units is 40%. Students must achieve 40% or above in the unit overall to be awarded credit.
- 5.3 A mark of 0 is awarded, with a result of 'Fail' where the student has failed to present the assessment component before the deadline.
- 5.4 A mark of 0 with result 'Defer' is awarded where the student has been permitted, due to Mitigating circumstances, to present the assessment component later.

Where a student is deferred in one or more assessment components but has not failed any components, the student will be deferred in the unit with a mark of 0 pending completion of the deferred component.

A student may only be deferred due to Mitigating circumstances. Deferrals do not count as attempts, and students have the right to be assessed as if for the first time at the next available opportunity.

- 5.5 All assignments are first marked. Depending on cohort size, a sample is second marked (cohorts under 10 receive full second marking). A sample is sent to the Internal Verifier (IV – Link Tutor) for review, as agreed with the IV and Course Director.

Marking discrepancies are resolved through discussion between first and second markers, with final grades recorded on grade sheets and feedback forms.

Where discrepancy is 15% or greater, a third marker is assigned. Unresolved cases are reviewed by the Course Director. Staff should avoid splitting marks and must document resolution discussions.

Only marks may be changed on the original feedback form. The IV form must highlight discrepancies and resolution outcomes for External Examiner review.

- 5.6 All marks provided to students are provisional until ratified by the Board of Examiners.
- 5.7 Provisional results should be made available to students within four weeks of their assessment deadline, and eight weeks for dissertation or project modules..
- 5.8 No marks or feedback, including provisional marks, should be released to students until the Internal Board has confirmed due process has been followed, and this includes the completion of the IV process. All feedback and grades should be uploaded via Turnitin.
- 5.9 Provisional marks will be released to students by the Administration Team 48 hours after the Internal Board, no provisional marks are to be released by academic staff. The Internal Board will sign off the release of provisional grades. Final grades will be released after they have been confirmed by the UCA Board of Examiners.
- 5.10 All feedback should be completed on Turnitin, and the Assessment Feedback form provided by UCA. The UCA forms comments should be made available through Turnitin.
- 5.11 Where the average of a unit is 39 or less, the student will fail the unit. Where a student passes a unit, the student will be awarded the volume of credit assigned to that unit. The award of partial credit for a unit is not permitted under any circumstances.

## Compensation

5.12 Students may be awarded credit for a failed unit through compensation where:

- The unit mark is 30-39%
- The student has achieved the required overall credit for the level
- Compensation does not exceed the limits specified in the Programme Specification
- Learning outcomes have been sufficiently met across the level Compensation decisions are made by the Board of Examiners.

Full compensation regulations are detailed in CCF Section 4.5.3.

5.13 All marks are stored centrally by the Registry Team on the Student Records System (SYS).

## 6. Feedback

6.1 Constructive feedback is essential for successful learning. Feedback motivates and supports reflection, especially when valid criticism is accompanied by appropriate praise and commentary. As mentioned (see 2.6), feedback should be provided for both formative and summative assessment.

6.2 Feedback should be provided in a variety of formats, including group written or oral feedback relating to common themes emerging from assessment, individual oral feedback, individual written feedback, peer commentary, etc. In creative arts subjects, there is typically a substantial element of oral formative feedback on practical work contributing to students' learning.

6.3 Written feedback must be provided on all summatively assessed components and must address all relevant assessment criteria in relation to the unit learning outcomes. Feedback for formative assessment may be provided in various forms (written, verbal, etc.). All feedback for LCCA students must use the UCA Assessment Feedback form and be uploaded to Turnitin.

The UCA student assessment feedback form must be stored on SharePoint following correct nomenclature in the module and group folder.

6.4 Students must receive a separate Assessment Feedback form for each assessment component. Completed forms must be available within four weeks of the submission deadline, except:

- Dissertation units (Level 6 and above): within eight weeks
- Approved late submissions: adjusted to the new submission deadline

NB: Provisional marks and feedback are released via Turnitin by the Administration team 48 hours after the Internal Board.

6.5 Principles for providing written feedback:

- Provide honest, constructive feedback with positive comments on strengths
- Provide guidance on improvements and how to achieve them
- Evaluate ideas and techniques used, enabling students to improve their understanding
- Describe achievement with reference to clearly stated assessment criteria
- Use Mark Descriptors to frame achievement using discipline-relevant language
- Reference spelling, grammar, and use of English where appropriate

6.6 The commentary should be explained in straight-forward language consistent with that used for the learning outcomes and assessment criteria, contextualised by the nature of the assignment. It should not introduce confusion in the mind of the student about the basis for the assessment. Written feedback must be consistent with that given orally.

6.7 Where an assessment component comprises multiple assessment tasks, a single Assessment Feedback form for that component will be provided within three weeks of the final submission deadline for the component. In addition, it is good practice to provide informal (ungraded) feedback on the individual assessment tasks at the time that they are undertaken.

6.8 Summative assessment contributes to a unit outcome; whilst formative assessment is purely for the purposes of development learning and does not attract a mark. Formative assessment should be accompanied by informal feedback to develop students' learning in preparation for summative assessment.

- 6.9 The Assessment Feedback form must clearly state the names of all assessors involved in marking the component and indicate which assessor completed the form. The form shall be completed following agreement between assessors on the mark to be awarded, as determined by the unit/subject leader.
- 6.10 Following return of feedback to students, the assessor who completed the form should endeavour to be available to discuss the feedback with the student at an appropriate timetabled session.
7. Additional Assessment Processes

### Mitigating Circumstances

- 7.1 Students experiencing mitigating circumstances should submit their claim using the UCA Mitigating Circumstances Form to [extensions@lcca.ac.uk](mailto:extensions@lcca.ac.uk) within 5 working days of the assessment deadline.

Late claims (submitted after 5 working days) will only be accepted in exceptional circumstances where students can demonstrate inability to submit on time. Late submissions must be received within 10 working days after the assessment deadline and include evidence of exceptional circumstances preventing timely submission.

Students should refer to the UCA Mitigating Circumstances Regulations for full details including:

- What circumstances qualify as mitigating circumstances
  - Evidence requirements and self-certification options
  - How decisions are made
  - Appeals process
- 7.2 MC claims are reviewed by designated staff within the Registry Team who are independent of the student's teaching team. Decisions are made in accordance with UCA Mitigating Circumstances Regulations Section 5.
- 7.3 Where a claim is upheld, an extension will normally be granted for 10 working days from the original deadline. The student submits at the new deadline and is assessed as if for the first time (mark uncapped). In some cases, deferral to the next assessment opportunity may be granted instead.

Where a claim is not upheld, the original assessment deadline stands and normal late submission penalties apply (see Section 7.4).

Students will be notified of the outcome in writing, normally within 5 working days of submitting their claim. Students may appeal MC decisions in accordance with UCA Mitigating Circumstances Regulations Section 6.

#### Late Assessment Submission without Mitigating Circumstances

7.4 Where a student submits an assessment late without applying for mitigating circumstances, or fails to submit, a mark of 0 will be awarded, with the result of a fail as detailed in the CCF (section 4.2).

#### Academic Misconduct

7.5 LCCAs Academic Misconduct process aligns with the UCA's Regulations, please refer to this when considering academic misconduct alongside any LCCA training resources. Academic Misconduct is defined as 'where a student gains or seeks to gain, advantage in an assessment by unfair or improper means'.

7.6 Academic Misconduct can include, but is not limited to, the following:

- Plagiarism: Presenting another person's work, ideas, or expressions as one's own without proper acknowledgment. This includes:
  - Copying from textbooks or other sources without attribution
  - Incorporating online material without acknowledgment
  - Assembling sections of others' work without attribution
  - Obtaining work from essay banks or similar services
  - Paraphrasing or imitating others' work without acknowledgment
- Self-plagiarism: Submitting one's own previous work without appropriate referencing or justification.
- Collusion: Producing work with unauthorized assistance from others when independent work is required. Note: Collaboration explicitly permitted by assessment briefs (e.g., group projects) does not constitute collusion.

- Contact Cheating (Commissioning/Third-Party Misconduct): Obtaining work from third parties (essay mills, online services, individuals) and submitting it as one's own, whether through payment or other arrangement.
- Poor Academic Practice: Inadequate understanding or application of academic conventions (e.g., poor referencing, citation errors) that falls short of academic integrity standards without constituting deliberate misconduct. May result in educational intervention rather than formal penalty, particularly for first-time foundation-level instances.
- Dishonest or Unethical Conduct: Behaviour compromising academic or research integrity, including falsification of research data, unethical research practices, misrepresentation of findings, or conduct damaging the College's reputation or ethical standards.
- Fabrication: Presenting data or results that have not been undertaken, completed, or have been deliberately invented or falsified (wholly or partially).
- Impersonation: Assuming another person's identity to gain unfair advantage (e.g., taking an exam on their behalf). Both parties are considered guilty of misconduct.
- Unpermitted Possession: Possessing or using prohibited materials or items during assessment unless expressly permitted, including unauthorized access to exam papers or assessment materials in advance, or improperly annotating open-book materials.
- Bribery or Intimidation: Attempting to influence College staff through bribery or other unfair means to affect assessment results.
- Unauthorised use of Generative AI: Using AI applications (e.g., ChatGPT) with intent to present AI-generated work as one's own.
- Breach of Assessment Rules: Failing to follow formal assessment instructions (e.g., starting time-limited exams early, continuing after instructed to stop).

## Academic Misconduct: Point system and categories

7.7 Academic misconduct cases are assessed using a point-based system that considers:

- Offence history (whether the student has previous misconduct findings)
- Extent and impact of the offence (the proportion of work affected)
- Type of academic misconduct committed
- Additional penalties where applicable (e.g., major project units at Levels 6 & 7)

The total points determine the penalty category (A-F) as defined in the UCA Academic Misconduct Regulations and LCCA Academic Misconduct Reporting Form:

Category	Points Range	Penalty
A	12-125	Formal Warning - work marked on merit
B	126-150	Component accepted with sanction (mark capped at 40)
C	151-210	Component refused, retrieval permitted (capped at 40)
D	211-250	Unit voided, retrieval by Retake
E	251-299	Level voided, Retake offered
F	300+	Termination of Studies - all credit rescinded

Category F cases (300+ points, typically involving termination of studies) automatically proceed to Stage 2 for review by the Academic Misconduct Review Panel (AMRP), regardless of whether the student accepts or denies the allegation.

Full details of the point calculation system are available in the LCCA Academic Misconduct Reporting Form (Appendix III) and on the Academic Misconduct Teams area.

Example: A first-time offence involving poor academic practice affecting 40% of the work would total 61 points (1 + 10 + 50), resulting in a Category A outcome.

## Stage 1: Course Director Review and Determination

### 7.8 Identification and Initial Reporting

Where a lecturer, assessor, or marker suspects that a student has committed academic misconduct, they must inform the Course Director, complete Part A of the Academic Misconduct Reporting Form, and compile a case file containing the assessment submission and relevant supporting evidence.

When using Turnitin, lecturers should review scores over 30% for plagiarism. However, scores below 30% may warrant review if the lecturer deems misconduct has occurred. Turnitin scores are indicative only; academic judgment is essential in determining whether academic misconduct has actually occurred. No mark should be assigned until the matter is resolved, although work may be marked on merit pending the outcome.

NB: Staff should use academic judgement in determining whether an actual misconduct case exists. This includes reviewing Turnitin scores and where issues are highlighted. For Foundation Course students facing a first offence, staff should consider whether the work reflects poor scholarship requiring additional support rather than formal proceedings.

### 7.9 Course Director Review Process

Once the allegation and Part A are received, the Course Director will review the work and complete Part B1 of the Academic Misconduct Reporting Form, aiming to provide an outcome within 2-7 working days.

### 7.10 Academic Integrity Meeting (if appropriate):

Where appropriate, particularly for first offences or cases where further discussion would be beneficial, the Course Director may arrange an Academic Integrity Meeting (AIM) with the student before determining the outcome. The AIM provides an opportunity to:

- Discuss concerns about the submitted work
- Explore the student's understanding of academic integrity requirements
- Give the student an opportunity to explain their work and respond to concerns
- Determine whether an educational approach or formal proceedings are appropriate

The student may be accompanied by a fellow student, friend, family member, or Student Association representative. The student should be given at least 5 working days' notice of the AIM. If the student is unable to attend, they should complete the written response form (Appendix II of the Academic Misconduct Reporting Form) provided with the invitation.

Outcomes of the AIM will inform the Course Director's decision. Notes from the meeting will be recorded on Part B2 of the Academic Misconduct Reporting Form.

#### 7.11 Course Director Determination:

Following the review (with or without an AIM), the Course Director will record their determination on Part C of the Academic Misconduct Reporting Form. The Course Director will determine one of the following outcomes:

1. No case to answer - the work will be returned for marking
- 2a. Poor academic practice - an educational approach is appropriate. The student will be offered academic skills support and guidance on proper academic practice through Student Success Tutors or Library services. The work may be remarked, or the student may be offered an opportunity to resubmit, at the Course Director's discretion. A record of the educational intervention will be maintained but will not constitute a formal academic misconduct finding
- 2b. Poor scholarship - (e.g., inappropriate or excessive use of sources and/or inappropriate referencing) but falls short of misconduct. The work will be returned for marking on its merits, and the student may be offered support from Student Success Tutors
3. Formal proceedings warranted - the piece of work contains plagiarism, collusion, or other academic misconduct and formal proceedings are required

The Course Director will record their determination on Part C of the Academic Misconduct Reporting Form.

## Factors in determining severity

The Course Director should consider:

Primary Factors:

- Premeditation - advance planning to gain unfair advantage
- Intention - deliberate attempt to gain unfair advantage
- Recklessness - disregard for consequences while gaining unfair advantage
- Circumstances - potential damage to College reputation

Aggravating Factors:

- Previous misconduct findings or patterns
- Group coordination for unfair advantage
- Financial gain
- Evidence concealment or destruction
- Ignoring warnings about behaviour
- Conduct while impaired by alcohol or drugs
- Abuse of position of trust

## Student Acknowledgement and Response Process

7.12 Where the Course Director determines that academic misconduct has occurred (outcome 3 in section 7.9), students can accept or deny the allegation of academic misconduct and accept or reject the penalty applied. The following procedure applies:

i. Course Director Notification to Student

The Course Director will write to the student:

- to present the allegation(s) of academic misconduct.
- to confirm that it is the Course Director's judgement that the work contains plagiarism or is the result of collusion (or other form of academic misconduct).

- to inform the student of the provisional penalty to be applied (based on the point calculation as outlined in section 7.6a).
- to invite the student to either:
  - admit the allegation and accept the penalty, OR
  - admit the allegation but not accept the penalty (appeal the sanction), OR
  - deny the allegation
- to inform the student that:
  - Accepting the allegation and penalty, or failing to respond within the timeframe, results in penalty application with no further right of appeal
  - Appealing the penalty or denying the allegation escalates the matter to Stage 2 (AMRP review)

#### ii. Student Response Timeline

The student should be given 7 working days (by midday) within which to respond.

#### iii. Case Logging

The Course Director/academic team will:

- Log the case on the Academic Misconduct Tracker
- Ensure appropriate grade status is applied based on the penalty category (if determined)
- Maintain the case file

#### iv. Student Accepts Allegation and Penalty

Where the student either fails to respond within 7 working days or responds and admits the allegation and accepts the penalty, the penalty will be applied. This outcome will be notified to the Quality Team, who will log the outcome for monitoring purposes and implement the penalty.

In this instance, there will be no right of appeal and LCCA's Stage 1 procedures are completed.

iv. Student Appeals Sanction or Denies Allegation

Where the student either:

- admits the allegation but does not accept the penalty (appeals the sanction), OR
- denies the allegation outright

the matter will proceed to Stage 2 and be referred to the Academic Misconduct Review Panel (AMRP) for consideration (see section 7.15).

The Course Director must submit the complete case file (including the Academic Misconduct Reporting Form Parts A, B, C and all supporting evidence) to the Quality Team within 5 working days of receiving the student's response.

### Stage 2: Academic Misconduct Review Panel

7.13 Cases proceed to Stage 2 review by an Academic Misconduct Review Panel (AMRP) in the following circumstances:

- i. Category F penalties: Where the Course Director determines that academic misconduct warrants a Category F penalty (300+ points, typically termination of studies), the case automatically proceeds to the AMRP for review, regardless of whether the student accepts or denies the allegation. The Course Director will complete the Academic Misconduct Reporting Form (Parts A, B, and C) and submit the full case file to the Quality Team.
- ii. Appeals of Stage 1 outcomes: Where a student is dissatisfied with a Stage 1 outcome (either the finding of misconduct and/or the penalty applied), they may request escalation to the AMRP within 7 working days of receiving the Stage 1 decision.

To request an appeal, the student must submit a written statement to the Quality Team at [quality@lcca.ac.uk](mailto:quality@lcca.ac.uk) explaining:

- The grounds for their appeal
- Any additional evidence not previously considered
- Why they believe the Stage 1 decision or penalty was inappropriate

The Quality Team will review the request to determine whether there are valid grounds for an AMRP review. If the request does not meet the grounds for appeal, it will be rejected, and the student will be informed of this decision.

### Academic Misconduct Review Panel and Procedure

#### 7.14 Case Review Process:

When a case is escalated to Stage 2, the Quality Team will:

- Assign a Case Officer to review the case file
- Ensure all documentation is complete (Parts A, B, C, and student response)
- Submit a case report to the AMRP reviewers
- Convene the Academic Misconduct Review Panel

#### 7.15 Panel Composition:

The Academic Misconduct Review Panel (AMRP) will be convened by the Quality Team and consist of:

- At least two members of academic staff, one of whom must be a senior member of staff (such as a Course Director, Associate Dean, or Academic Dean) who will act as Chair
- A senior member of the Quality Team or a senior member of Registry

#### 7.16 Conflicts of Interest:

The panel must not include:

- The person who reported the potential misconduct (the marker/assessor)
- The Course Director who conducted the Stage 1 review (if applicable)
- Any person with a personal connection to the student or case

If required to avoid conflicts of interest, a senior member of academic staff from a different course discipline may be nominated to the panel.

The panel will only be quorate when all required members, including the Chair, are present. Meetings may be held in person or virtually.

#### 7.17 Student Attendance and Representation:

Students should be given at 10 working days' notice of the AMRP hearing and may choose to:

- Attend the hearing in person or virtually
- Submit a written statement for consideration instead of attending
- Both attend and submit a written statement

Students who attend may be accompanied by a fellow student, friend, family member, or Student Voice representative. The Quality Team must be notified of the student's chosen representative at least 5 working days before the hearing.

Students who do not wish to attend must notify the Quality Team and may submit a written statement explaining their position, which will be considered by the panel in the student's absence.

#### 7.18 Evidence Submission:

All documentary evidence and witness names must be provided to the Quality Team no later than 5 working days before the hearing.

#### Academic Misconduct Review Hearing process and decision-making

7.19 When the AMRP convenes to consider a case, the hearing follows a structured process to ensure fairness and transparency for all parties.

Hearing Procedure:

The AMRP hearing will follow this procedure:

1. The Chair will introduce the panel members and explain the procedure
2. The case will be presented, including evidence from the Academic Misconduct Reporting Form and any supporting documentation
3. The student (or their representative) will have the opportunity to present their response and any additional evidence
4. Panel members may ask questions of the student and/or case presenter
5. The panel will deliberate in private to reach a decision

#### 7.20 Standard of Proof:

The panel decision will be made using the balance of probabilities standard of proof (i.e., whether it is more likely than not that academic misconduct occurred).

#### 7.21 Panel Powers and Outcomes:

The AMRP may determine one of the following outcomes:

- Uphold the decision and penalty (Category F cases or Stage 1 appeals)
- Amend the penalty to a different category (higher or lower as appropriate)
- Dismiss the allegation if evidence is insufficient
- Refer back to the Course Director for further investigation

#### 7.22 Application of Penalties:

Where the panel determines that academic misconduct has been committed, penalties will be applied in accordance with the UCA Academic Misconduct Regulations penalty tariff (Categories A-F as detailed in section 7.3).

For cases involving serious misconduct, the following additional sanctions may also be applied:

- i. Formal Warning: A record will be logged on the student's file. Any work in question will be marked according to its merits, but the offence will be considered when deciding the penalty for any subsequent offence.

- ii. Recommendation for Award Revocation: LCCA may recommend to UCA the revocation of an award, with all credits withdrawn. This applies where academic misconduct is discovered after an award has been conferred, in accordance with UCA Academic Misconduct Regulations.

The panel's decision, including the rationale, will be recorded on the Academic Misconduct Reporting Form (Part D).

### Factors in determining penalties

7.23 When considering sanctions and penalties, the AMRP will consider:

- Severity of the offence
- Previous offences (recorded on Academic Misconduct Tracker)
- Extent and impact on work validity
- Type of misconduct committed
- Impact on other students and academic integrity
- Mitigating factors (do not excuse misconduct but may inform penalties)
- Student engagement with academic integrity support
- Level of study (foundation, undergraduate, postgraduate)
- Major project unit status (additional 50 points may apply)

The point calculation system (section 7.7) provides a framework for determining appropriate penalties, ensuring consistency and proportionality.

7.24 Decision Timeline:

The panel will aim to reach its decision within 2 working days of the hearing and notify the student of the outcome in writing.

### Notification of Academic Misconduct Review Panel decision

7.25 The Panel will aim to notify the student in writing of the decision within 7 working days of the hearing, providing a detailed outcome letter that includes:

- The finding (type of misconduct, if any)
- The penalty applied (category and point calculation)
- The rationale for the decision

- Practical implications (progression, reassessment, academic record)
- Right to appeal to Stage 3 (UCA review)
- Grounds for Stage 3 appeal
- How to submit a Stage 3 appeal (deadline: 10 working days)

Where the Chair cannot meet this deadline, the student will be informed within the 7-day period with reasons for delay and expected decision date.

#### 7.26 Student Response to Stage 2 Decision

Following notification of the Stage 2 decision, the student has 7 working days (by midday) to either:

- Accept the decision - the case will be closed and outcome implemented
- Appeal to Stage 3 (UCA Review) on the grounds specified below

If the student does not respond within 7 working days, the Stage 2 decision will be implemented.

#### Stage 3: Appeal Review (Escalation to UCA)

7.27 Where a student is dissatisfied with the outcome of the Stage 2 Academic Misconduct Review Panel hearing, they may appeal the decision to UCA within 10 working days of receiving the Stage 2 outcome notification.

#### 7.28 Grounds for Stage 3 Appeal:

A Stage 3 appeal may only be made on one or more of the following grounds:

- Procedural irregularity: Significant procedural error in Stage 1 or Stage 2 that materially affected the outcome (e.g., failure to follow policy procedures, improper panel composition, inadequate notice or opportunity to respond, improper consideration of evidence).
- New evidence: New material evidence that could not reasonably have been presented at Stage 1 or Stage 2 and would have materially affected the outcome.

- iii. Decision unreasonable: The decision or penalty was unreasonable or disproportionate given the evidence - meaning no reasonable panel could have reached this decision based on available evidence.

Note: Disagreement with the panel's decision alone does not constitute grounds for appeal.

#### 7.29 Appeal Submission:

To submit a Stage 3 appeal, the student must:

1. Complete the UCA Academic Misconduct Appeal Form (available from the Quality Team)
2. Provide a detailed written statement explaining:
  - o Which ground(s) for appeal they are relying on
  - o Why they believe the ground(s) apply to their case
  - o What specific procedural error occurred, or what new evidence they have, or why the decision was unreasonable
  - o What outcome they are seeking
3. Provide any supporting evidence (particularly if appealing on grounds of new evidence)
4. Submit all documentation to the Quality Team at [quality@lcca.ac.uk](mailto:quality@lcca.ac.uk) within 10 working days (by midday) of receiving the Stage 2 outcome letter

Late appeals will only be accepted in exceptional circumstances where the student can demonstrate they were unable to submit the appeal on time for reasons beyond their control.

#### 7.30 Appeal Review Process:

Upon receipt of a Stage 3 appeal, LCCA will:

1. Review the appeal submission to ensure it meets the grounds for appeal
2. If the appeal does not meet the grounds, inform the student that the appeal cannot proceed
3. If the appeal meets the grounds, escalate the full case file and appeal documentation to UCA for review

UCA will review (not re-investigate or re-hear) whether:

- Stages 1 and 2 followed proper procedures
- The decision and penalty were reasonable
- New evidence materially affects the outcome
- Procedural irregularities materially affected the outcome

The review normally completes within 5 working days (complex cases may require longer with student notification of delays).

### 7.31 Stage 3 Outcomes:

Following their review, UCA may:

- Uphold decision: No change to Stage 2 finding or penalty
- Refer back to LCCA: Return to LCCA for reconsideration (new AMRP panel or additional investigation) if significant procedural errors identified
- Amend penalty: Adjust to more appropriate category if disproportionate (finding of misconduct upheld)
- Overturn: Dismiss finding entirely if insufficient evidence

The student will be notified in writing of UCA's decision, including the rationale for the outcome.

UCA's decision is final within the institution's internal procedures. If the student remains dissatisfied following Stage 3, they may refer the matter to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA) (see section 7.14).

### External Review - Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA)

7.32 Where a student is dissatisfied with the outcome of LCCA's academic misconduct procedure following completion of all internal stages (including Stage 3 UCA review), they may refer the matter to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA).

The OIA provides an independent review service for students in higher education who have a complaint about their university or college. Students can only submit a complaint to the OIA after they have exhausted their institution's internal complaints procedures.

### 7.33 Eligibility and Timeline:

Students must normally submit their complaint to the OIA within 12 months of receiving the Completion of Procedures Letter (issued after Stage 3 UCA review is complete).

### 7.34 Further Information:

Further information about the OIA, including eligibility criteria and how to submit a complaint, is available at: [www.oiahe.org.uk](http://www.oiahe.org.uk)

Students may also contact the Quality Team for guidance on the OIA process and to request their Completion of Procedures Letter.

### Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI and Large Language Models)

7.35 With reference to generative AI technologies, UCA's Academic Misconduct Policy defines plagiarism as including "material obtained from third parties including online essay mills and AI applications."

7.36 LCCA supports the appropriate use of generative AI technologies to enhance student learning. Students must follow the College's Policy for the Responsible Use of AI when using such technologies in assessments. Unauthorized use of GenAI with intent to present AI-generated work as one's own constitutes academic misconduct under UCA Academic Misconduct Regulations.

7.37 Grades are determined by evidence of meeting learning outcomes at the appropriate level of competency, not on repetition of AI-generated content. Where AI use is suspected, LCCA may invite the student to a viva voce (oral examination) to verify understanding of submitted work.

## 8. Boards and Resits

### Internal Boards (including Module, Resit/Dissertation Boards)

8.1 Internal Boards, Module Boards and Internal Resit/Dissertation Boards are held after each term to verify due process and confirm provisional marks can be released.

Boards typically occur 4 weeks after term assessment deadlines, with Resit/Dissertation Boards occurring 8-10 weeks after term assessment deadlines.

- 8.2 The Board composition can be found in the relevant terms of reference (see LCCA Academic Committees in SharePoint).
- 8.3 The Internal Boards are managed by the Registry Team. Academic staff are required to ensure all marks have been uploaded on the VLE (Canvas) before the marking deadline.

#### Board of Examiners

- 8.4 For all College taught awards, the Boards of Examiners are charged with confirming the outcomes of assessment and ensuring that the standard of student achievement is commensurate with the agreed learning outcomes for the units and courses for which they are responsible. The Boards of Examiners are responsible for making decisions about progression, award and classification.
- 8.5 The IV (Link Tutor) is responsible for liaising with the External Verifier (External Examiner) to confirm that marks are appropriate and due process followed. Academic staff are required to support the IV in providing the requested sample as outlined in the CCF.
- 8.6 Students who fail component(s) will be offered a resit. The resit period is after the Board of Examiners at the end of the academic year for the relevant intake. The duration of the resit period is normally 3 weeks after the Board. Once submitted, the assessment will be marked within the given deadlines and submitted to the Resit Board for consideration. Students will be informed of the outcome after the boards are complete.

#### Resits

- 8.7 Students who fail a unit may be permitted further attempts, subject to the following:
- i. Postgraduate students: maximum of two attempts at any unit
  - ii. Undergraduate students: maximum of four attempts at any unit (including retakes)
- 8.8 Full resit requirements are outlined in the CCF (section 4.6). Resits enable students to retrieve failed assessment components before the next academic year begins. Resits are offered where further attempts are permitted and reassessment can be completed before the next academic year.

- 8.9 The maximum mark available for any unit reassessed by Resit will normally be 40. However, the component score should be marked on merit and not capped.
- 8.10 Students undertaking Resits must complete appropriate Resit task(s). The Course Director determines the task(s) under delegated authority from the Board of Examiners, with IV agreement at the start of the academic year.
- 8.11 Foundation year (Year 0/Level 3) students receive resits in-year following internal mark confirmation at unit end. The resit period follows the Internal Board. Provisional resit marks are confirmed at the Internal Resit/Dissertation Board. All marks remain provisional until Board of Examiners ratification.

## 9. Academic Appeals

- 9.1 For guidance on Academic Appeals, please consult LCCA's Academic Appeals Policy.
- 9.2 A Board of Examiners decision may only be modified where one or both grounds have been demonstrated:
1. Significant administrative or procedural error by the College that materially disadvantaged the student.
  2. Assessment performance was affected by circumstances beyond the student's control (Mitigating circumstances) that the student was unable, or for justifiable reasons unwilling, to divulge before the Board decision, such that the student was materially disadvantaged and performance would have been significantly better otherwise.
- 9.3 Students submitting or presenting for assessment declare themselves fit to be assessed. When appealing based on mitigating circumstances for already submitted work, the appeal body must be satisfied that the alleged circumstances had potential to affect the student's ability to engage with the mitigating circumstances process before the original deadline.
- 9.4 Matters of academic judgement will not be accepted as grounds for appeal and academic appeals which seek to challenge the academic judgement of the Board of Examiners will therefore not be considered.

- 9.5 Students who wish to raise concerns about assessment outcomes before formal notification of results (Stage 1) confirmed by a Board of Examiners can do so with their Course Director before proceeding to formal appeal at Stage 2. Stage 1 addresses concerns about provisional assessment outcomes and enables early resolution before marks are ratified.
- 9.6 Students wishing to make an Academic Appeal following Board of Examiners ratification (Stage 2) must submit the AAF3 form to [quality@lcca.ac.uk](mailto:quality@lcca.ac.uk) within 10 working days of the release date. Late submissions will not be considered.
- 9.7 The Quality Team will review all applications and determine whether there is a case for an appeal. If there are grounds the case will be reviewed by the Quality Team (this may include a panel of reviewers for complex cases). If there is not a case (does not meet grounds or eligibility), the appeal will be rejected.
- 9.8 Where a student is dissatisfied with this decision, the student can request a review (Stage 3) by UCA who will determine whether there is a case.
- 9.9 If the student is still dissatisfied with the decision, they can request a review by the Chair of the Board of Examiners. At this stage, the review and appeal will either be withheld or rejected, and the student will be informed of the outcome. After this stage, if the student is still dissatisfied, they can request a review by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA).
10. Assessment Security
- 10.1 All assessment information which has been entered into the student record system is backed up regularly by IT Services.
- 10.2 Access to assessment information is governed by the College Data Protection Policy and LCCA Data Protection Policies and is restricted to those with the appropriate privileges.
11. Review of Assessment Policies and Procedures
- 11.1 Assessment regulations, policies and procedures are kept under review by UCA's Academic Quality Committee, which makes recommendations to their Academic Board. LCCA will review and implement local policies and procedures (where appropriate) in line with this process to ensure they are meeting requirements and to maintain quality and integrity across institutional procedures.

## 12. Summary of Timelines

12.1 This timeline sets out the deadline for the various stages of the assessment cycle and is applicable per intake. The key requirements for assessment deadlines include:

- All assessment must be approved by an IV (Usually the link tutor) before the module starts annually.
- All provisional feedback should be provided to students within 4 weeks of the published assessment deadline (does not include vacation weeks).

12.2 Specific deadlines will be co-ordinated by the GPO, in collaboration with the Provost, Executive Deans, Quality and Registry Teams. These are available in the Academic Calendar.

Activity	Activity Period/Deadline	Responsibility	Additional Information
Development of Assessment for modules	Summer – To be submitted to the IV for review and approval by March	Course Team/Course Director	Assessments should be developed based on the approved Unit Descriptors. Includes re-sit assessment.
Approval of Assessment by the Internal Verifier (Link Tutor)	2 weeks before the module starts – June	Link Tutor (IV)	
Assessment Links	Open links to assessment on THE VLE (CANVAS) (2 weeks before deadline)	Administration Team	Academic staff to provide dates in advance.
Assessment Deadline	End of the teaching period for each term	Students	Dates to be published at the start of term in the unit guide.
Marking	This should be completed within 1-	Course Team/Course Director	

	2 weeks of the assessment deadline.		
Second Marking	As above.	Course Team	
Internal Board	Boards are checked and internally verified.	Course Team/Course Director	
Provisional Marks Released	Provisional marks for assessments are made available to students.		No later than 4 weeks after the published assessment deadline.
Marks are sent to UCA	Marks for all modules are sent to UCA for review by EEs and the BoE.		
IV/EV Review of Assessment	A sample of assessments are sent to the IV for review.	Link Tutor (IV)	IV forms to be saved on SharePoint
Board of Examiners	3 times per year depending on intake		Marks are ratified at this point.
Re-sit Period*	3-week period after Board of Examiners		
Re-sit Board of Examiners	3 times a year depending on intake		
Review of Unit Descriptors	Annually – for approval for June cohort.	Course Team/Course Director/Link Tutor	

- Or the next assessment period.

Key Information	
Version	2.1
Approved By	SMT
Author (s)	Head of Quality
QA Matrix	UCA Common Credit Framework UCA Assessment and Feedback Policy UCA Mitigating Circumstances Policy UCA Academic Appeals Policy
Owner	QA Team, L&T Team
Date Approved	01 Aug 2023
Effective Date	01 Sept 2023
Review Date	Annually
Readership	All

Version Control			
Version	Author	Date	Summary of Changes
V1.0	Head of Quality	01-08-2023	First version approved
V2.0	Head of Quality	01-09-2023	Published approved version
V 2.1	QA Manager	19-10-2025	Updated with new brand assets, updated academic misconduct sections to reflect UCA AM regulations, updated roles and teams across document where changes have occurred, updated references and links to new/updated policies and regulations throughout document, added definitions section, updated mitigating circumstances wording to reflect updated UCA regulations.

## Appendix A: Key Definitions

**Academic Integrity Meeting (AIM):** A meeting between the Course Director and student to discuss concerns about academic misconduct, explore understanding of academic integrity, and determine whether an educational or formal approach is appropriate.

**Academic Misconduct Review Panel (AMRP):** A panel convened to review Stage 2 academic misconduct cases, consisting of at least two academic staff members and a senior member of the Quality Team or Registry.

**Assessment Component:** An individual piece of assessed work within a unit (e.g., essay, presentation, portfolio). Units may have multiple components.

**Board of Examiners:** The body charged with confirming assessment outcomes and making decisions about student progression, award, and classification. Includes External Examiners.

**Compensation:** The award of credit for a failed unit where the unit mark is 30-39%, the student has achieved the required overall credit for the level, and learning outcomes have been sufficiently met across the level. Compensation decisions are made by the Board of Examiners in accordance with CCF Section 4.5.3.

**Deferral:** Permission granted (usually due to Mitigating Circumstances) for a student to submit an assessment component at a later date without it counting as a failed attempt.

**External Examiner (External Verifier):** An independent expert appointed to confirm that standards are appropriate, and assessment has been conducted fairly and competently.

**Formative Assessment:** Assessment with a developmental purpose, designed to help learners learn more effectively by giving them feedback on their performance and how it can be improved and/or maintained. Reflective practice by students sometimes contributes to formative assessment. Formative assessment does not contribute to unit grades.

**Internal Board:** A board held after each term to verify due process and confirm provisional marks can be released to students.

**Internal Verifier (IV/Link Tutor):** A UCA-appointed tutor responsible for internal verification of assessments and liaison between LCCA and UCA.

Provisional Marks: Marks released to students following Internal Board approval but subject to ratification by the Board of Examiners.

Resit: An opportunity to retrieve a failed assessment component before the start of the next academic year, usually capped at 40%.

Retake: Re-enrolment on a unit following failure, counting as an additional attempt.

Summative Assessment: Assessment used to indicate the extent of a learner's success in meeting the assessment criteria to gauge the intended learning outcomes of a unit or course. Marks from summative assessment count towards the final mark of the unit/course/award.

Unit: A discrete element of a course with defined learning outcomes, assessment criteria, and credit value (interchangeable with 'module').

VLE (Virtual Learning Environment): The online platform (Canvas) used for delivering course materials and assessments.