

University of Chichester

Academic Regulations

2021/22

SECTION 1

**ACADEMIC REGULATIONS
(TAUGHT UNDERGRADUATE
AND TAUGHT POSTGRADUATE)**



UNIVERSITY OF
CHICHESTER

The Academic Regulations of the University of Chichester are reviewed annually. This version supersedes all previous versions of the Academic Regulations and takes effect from 1 September 2020.

The summary of revisions to the 2020/21 Academic Regulations versus the 2019/20 Academic Regulations are below:

- The introduction of self-certification (11)
- Clarification on eligibility for intermission (4A);
- Clarification of Change in Registration requirements (4B.2).

ACADEMIC REGULATIONS

Table of Contents

PART 1 INTRODUCTION	5
1A Scope of the Regulations	5
PART 2 REGISTRATION AND ATTENDANCE	5
2A Registration	7
2B Attendance	7
2C Full-time and Part-time Study	7
2D Visas	8
PART 3 PROGRESSION	8
PART 4 INTERMISSION AND INTERNAL TRANSFERS	9
4A Intermission	9
4B Transfer to Alternative Programmes	10
PART 5 CREDITS AND PROGRAMME STRUCTURE	10
5A Credit and Study Requirements for Programmes	10
5B Minimum Credit for an award to be made (Undergraduate)	10
5C Programme Structure Undergraduate	11
5D Award-specific regulations	11
PART 6 AWARDS AND PERIODS OF REGISTRATION	12
6A Maximum Period of Registration	12
6B Awards	13
6C Classification for Undergraduate Awards	16
6D Classification for Borderlines for Honours	17
6E Aegrotat and Posthumous Awards	18
PART 7 MARKING SCHEMES AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS	19
7A Module Assessments	19
7B Award of Credit (Undergraduate and Postgraduate)	19
7C Grading Scheme	20
PART 8 ASSESSMENT	37
8A Submission of Assessment	37
8B First Attempt at assessment	38
8C Undergraduate re-assessment	38
8D Undergraduate re-assessment - 'Trailing' Modules	39

8E Academic Malpractice (Undergraduate and Postgraduate)	40
PART 9 BOARDS OF EXAMINERS	45
PART 10 APPEALS	48
PART 11 MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES	52
PART 12 PROCEDURES FOR DISCIPLINARY ACTION AGAINST STUDENTS	53

PART 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 These Regulations apply to the University's undergraduate and taught postgraduate provision. Any departure from these regulations must have been considered through the University programme approval/re-approval process and formally approved by the Academic Board, and must be made available to students via the Student Programme Handbook.

1A Scope of the Regulations

1A.1 The Academic Regulations apply to all taught provision of the University of Chichester and to all students undertaking that provision unless specifically exempted by the Academic Board or Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies. Students are required to abide by any regulations or requirements set by these Bodies.

1A.2 Any revisions to the Academic Regulations for each year shall be approved annually by the Academic Board.

1A.3 The Regulations in force at any time shall be those for that academic year unless specified otherwise. When a student registers or re-registers, the student shall sign up for the Regulations for that academic year.

1A.4 When a student resumes study after a period of intermission the student shall normally undertake to abide by the Regulations, Terms and Conditions in force at the time of resumption.

PART 2 REGISTRATION AND ATTENDANCE

2.1 Students are reminded of their responsibility to notify the University, via the Deputy Vice-Chancellor or designate, if they have been convicted of a relevant criminal offence, either in the UK or in any other country, since completing their application form and / or becoming a student of the University of Chichester. Any student or trainee, who through their course or other University of Chichester related activity e.g. volunteering, comes into contact with children or vulnerable adults and who has been required to obtain a criminal record check (disclosure) from the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS), must declare any new conviction (including cautions / reprimands) to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor or designate. The University of Chichester reserves the right to terminate the registration of any student whose criminal record proves to be unsatisfactory. If a student is permanently excluded in particular circumstances (i.e. harm or potential harm) the University is required to report this to both the relevant Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body and to the DBS itself.

2.2 No student shall be admitted to a full-time or part-time programme unless he or she has registered for the programme as the University requires and agreed that they will pay the required fee within the timescale specified by the University.

2.3 Students on programmes lasting more than one year shall re-register at the beginning of each academic year. A student will not be permitted to re-register for the second or subsequent year of his or her programme unless he or she has satisfactorily fulfilled the requirements pertaining

to the previous year as prescribed by the Regulations, including assessment and examination requirements. Students in debt to the University may not be able to re-register.

- 2.4 At registration all students are required to sign a declaration, agreeing to abide by the Regulations and Rules of the University. The Rules of the University are deemed to include both these Regulations and also the Rules relating to the operation of programmes and that of individual services (i.e. on the use of IT facilities). Students who infringe this declaration shall be subject to the Disciplinary Procedures.

Proof of identity

- 2.5 All new students are required to provide original proof of identity when they first register on their modules/programme of study at the University. Normally, proof will be a Passport, UK Photo Driving Licence or Birth Certificate. For international students entering under the UKVI Student Route they will be required to provide their original Passport with Entry Clearance Visa and/or Biometric Card (where applicable) or equivalent electronic immigration status information.

Changes to Personal Details

- 2.6 Under the law in England, Wales and Northern Ireland, if you want to be known by a different name you can change your name at any time, provided you do not intend to deceive or defraud another person. There is no legal procedure to follow in order to change a name. You simply start using the new name. You can change your forename or surname, add names or rearrange your existing names.

Like other public organisations and financial institutions in the UK, however, universities have a duty to prevent fraud and so can exercise the right to make certain requirements mandatory. In order to reduce the risk of fraudulent applications and enrolments the University of Chichester requires every applicant to the University, to apply using the name shown on their passport, birth certificate, or marriage certificate. If the style of separate forename/given name(s) and surname/family name is not used by you, then you should insert your complete name on the surname line of any form.

This is the name that will be recorded on the University's student records database and must be used throughout your academic career at the University of Chichester, unless a change of name is formally requested. The recorded name will be used on any acceptance letter and visa documentation that the University issues before the completion of the enrolment process. Any discrepancy between your official documents and our correspondence to you is likely to cause delays in subsequent processes, therefore any misspelling that may have occurred, however minor, must be notified to us immediately so it can be corrected before any further correspondence is issued. You can check what is held on your record by looking at your ChiView account.

Your formally recorded name will be that which appears on your official University record and will appear on your academic transcript and your final award certificate if you are successful. If you need to have your name changed, the University will change all of your records to reflect

that new name, so your new name will replace your old name on all the University's records and will be used from that time on. The award certificate presented upon successful completion of the programme will bear that name.

2A Registration

2A.1 A student remains registered unless:

- a) they have advised the University of their withdrawal by completing the approved withdrawal form and submitting it to Academic Registry; or
- b) the University has terminated their registration.

A registered student of the University shall ensure that their online record, held by the University, always has their most up to date residential addresses and contact numbers, both permanent and local/term-time.

2B Attendance

2B.1 Students admitted to full-time or part time programmes shall keep to the semester dates in full as published in their student programme handbook and shall attend any additional periods of study required.

2B.2 Attendance at all timetabled sessions, including lectures, tutorials, seminars, practical classes, school or work experience or other activities prescribed by the student programme handbook is compulsory for all students. Students shall present themselves for all assessment and examination requirements in order to satisfy the requirements set out in their student programme handbook.

2B.3 It is the responsibility of the student to register for a sufficient number of modules to ensure both a full programme of study and progression between levels within the programme of study.

2B.4 Students who are absent e.g. through sickness shall report their absence in accordance with the Student Attendance and Absence Policy. Significant absences may result in the student being required to intermit from their studies (see Part 4 below).

2C Full-time and Part-time Study

Part-time Study

2C.1 A part-time registered student is defined as a student taking the equivalent of 6 (15 credit) modules or less in an academic year, unless they are temporarily part-time on a full-time programme to make up a credit shortfall or due to mitigating circumstances. In this particular situation a Board of Examiners might permit a student to undertake up to 7 (15 credit) modules or equivalent. All other regulations applying to full-time students apply to part-time students registered on the same programme.

2C.2 Students will be permitted to take individual modules as a part-time student without registering for a specific programme. There is no limit to the number of such 'stand alone' modules that can be taken. However, no award will be made unless registration for the award has taken place and the student has taken the specified diet of modules for the award.

2C.3 An auditing student is defined as one who is registered for a module or modules but not subject to the assessment requirements. No credit will be awarded where the student has registered as auditing the module, although a certificate of attendance may be provided by the academic department.

2D Visas

2D.1 International students requiring a student visa under the UKVI Student Route (or an extension to their student visa) in order to study at the University will be bound by the terms and any restrictions of that visa and this may impact on any options provided through application of the Academic Regulations in relation to their academic studies.

PART 3 PROGRESSION

Undergraduate students

3.1 To progress from Levels 4 to 5 of the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ) the student must be awarded 120 Level 4 credits. To achieve this, the student must attend and complete the required number of modules and achieve an overall average mark of 40% when the grades for the modules taken at this level are aggregated. No more than 45 credits (usually three modules) will be allowed to go forward at less than 40%.

Modules which are graded at less than 35% will be considered to be failed modules, irrespective of the average grade for all modules taken, and must be redeemed at 40% before progression may take place.

A 'provisional pass' is allowed for programmes only in up to 45 credits of failed modules, providing the fail mark is 35% or above, pending confirmation that the average across all Level 4 modules is at least 40%. So, if the average of the Level 4 profile is lower than 40% then the students will have to undertake re-assessment in the failed modules but if the average is 40% or above they will not and will be able to progress with confirmed passes in the failed modules.

3.2 To progress from FHEQ Levels 5 to 6 the student, having achieved 120 Level 4 credits, must be awarded 120 credits at FHEQ Level 5. To achieve this, the student must attend and complete the required number of modules at FHEQ Level 5 and achieve an overall grade across all FHEQ Level 5 modules of 40%. Modules which are graded at less than 40% will be considered fail modules and at the discretion of the Board of Examiners must be redeemed at 40% before progression may take place. Equally, to progress from a Foundation degree to an Honours degree, the student will be expected to have completed the Foundation degree successfully.

3.3 To qualify for the award of the Honours degree the student, will have achieved 120 Level 4 credits and 120 Level 5 credits, must be awarded 120 Level 6 credits. To achieve this the student must attend and complete the required number of modules at FHEQ Level 6.

Modules that are graded at less than 40% will be deemed to be fail modules and, at the discretion of the Board of Examiners, must be re-assessed. Students with an incomplete profile at the final Board of Examiners in their final year of study will be allowed up to two years to gain a full profile within the regulations. This provision will also be applied to part-time students.

A part-time student's final year is taken as that in which the student's credit count would amount to that needed for the award if all module assessments had been successful.

Suspension or termination of programme

3.4 A Board of Examiners is empowered to terminate the registration of any student who has not been awarded credit during the previous two years or earlier where the student has failed to respond to the University's repeated attempts to make contact.

3.5 With the exception of a Foundation Degree and a Higher National Certificate and Diploma (HNC/HND), intermediate awards will not be made where a student continues to a higher award.

3.6 In the case of a four-year degree programme (for example, BA (Hons) Outdoor Adventure Education) the degree with Honours is awarded at 480 credits.

3.7 In the case of all programmes, the Degree with Honours will only be awarded where the final aggregation of grades from FHEQ Levels 5 and 6 is 40% or above.

PART 4 INTERMISSION AND INTERNAL TRANSFERS

4A Intermission

Intermission from Study (Undergraduate)

4A.1 Students (on full-time and part-time programmes, or discrete programmes comprising just 1 or 2 modules) may apply to intermit from their programme of study on more than one occasion provided the overall period of intermission on the programme does not exceed two years in total. Unless a student on a programme is registered for at least one module per semester, they will need to apply for intermission. By intermitting, undergraduate students in effect 'stop the clock' of their period of registration. A student may only intermit from a complete block of study (i.e. a semester or year – or a term, where the programme is organised on a trimester basis) and recommence at the same point upon their return. If a student intermits during a term or semester, they must recommence at the start of that block of study. Students wishing to intermit must seek advice from their Head of Academic Department or Programme Coordinator and complete the appropriate form. Only exceptionally will retrospective* intermission (*where tuition fees are waived), accompanied by supporting evidence, be approved by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor or designate.

Intermission from Study (Postgraduate)

4A.2 Intermission is permitted for a maximum of two years in total – providing the overall six year period of registration is not exceeded. Unless a student is registered on a taught programme of study for at least one module per semester/term, they will need to apply for intermission unless they are a postgraduate taught student at the 'writing up' stage.

4B Transfer to Alternative Programmes

4B.1 A student may in certain circumstances be allowed to transfer from the programme for which he or she first registered to another programme. A student contemplating a transfer to another programme should discuss the issue with the Programme Co-ordinator of the existing programme and new programme before submitting a Change of Registration form. When a student fails an examination or assessment, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor or designate will consider the appropriateness of a transfer to another programme; and the student will be advised accordingly.

4B.2 A student or apprentice may be able to change to a different programme of study, however, any change will be dependent upon meeting admission requirements for the new programme, the availability of the programme including timetabling constraints, and the amount of credit achieved at the point of transfer. For continuing students, a Change in Registration request should be submitted by the end of their previous year's study (including the re-sit period) and for new students a Change in Registration request should be submitted within the first four weeks (not including induction) of the start of the academic year. Any exceptional requests outside of these timescales must be put in writing to the Academic Registrar by the relevant Head of Department/Director of Institute for approval or escalation to the DVC (Student Experience).

PART 5 CREDITS AND PROGRAMME STRUCTURE

5A Credit and Study Requirements for Programmes

Undergraduate

5A.1 Academic departments will publish a clear schedule of dates and times for the submission of individual assignments, and dates for the return of assessed work. At the discretion of the Programme Co-ordinator, students may be permitted an extension. A formal record of the extension and the reason it was agreed must be kept. Extensions will not be granted for the submission of assignments beyond the date of the next Board of Examiners for the programme. Extensions may not be granted for re-assessment unless this is deemed to be a first attempt by reason of valid mitigating circumstances. Again, such extensions will not go beyond the date of the next Board of Examiners.

5A.2 Module leaders are responsible for clarifying the nature of the assessment to students at the commencement of the module and establishing clear assessment criteria for students.

Postgraduate; Writing up

5A.3 Students on the dissertation stage who have not completed at the final Board of Examiners will be allowed up to two years 'writing up' period to complete, provided the maximum time to complete the full Masters' is not exceeded. An annual writing-up fee is payable.

5B Minimum Credit for an award to be made (Undergraduate)

5B.1 At least one third of study must have been taken at the University (ie of a 360 credit programme, 120 credits must have been studied directly with the University of Chichester).

5C Programme Structure Undergraduate

5C.1 Degree programmes will be divided into the three levels. Normally, each level is the equivalent of a year's full time study. On four year degree programmes the final two years will comprise FHEQ Level 6. Students will normally take eight modules at each level (or equivalent). Integrated Master's programmes are regarded as undergraduate, other than for specific regulations.

5C.2 A student may request a change to their optional modules during the first two weeks of Semester 1 (or programme start date) and again during the first two weeks of in Semester 2 provided this fits within their timetable and the module has capacity. Any such requests will require authorisation from the relevant module tutor. A free choice module is a module which sits outside the programme that the student is registered on. If programme-specific regulations allow, students may take one free choice module per level of study to replace an optional module provided this can be accommodated within their timetable and is approved by their programme coordinator and relevant module leader.

5D Award-specific regulations

5D.1 Specific regulations for the Integrated Masters (MArts, MMus, MEng) award:

- The award would usually operate to standard semester dates;
- That the award would usually comprise 15 credit modules (or combinations thereof) to allow for synergy with extant provision;
- That the award comprise 480 credits;
- That Level 6 (usually Year 3) will include a 60 credit independent project to allow for students to complete their study with a Bachelors award if they choose not to continue to the Level 7 study;
- In terms of transferring from the three year full-time Bachelors award to the four year MEng award students would normally confirm such at the start of Level 6 provided students have met the academic criteria allowing them to transfer;
- That given a requirement for an independent project at Level 7 there would be no requirement for any formal unseen examinations at Level 7;
- Only two attempts at assessment would be permitted at Level 7,
- That a further project, usually comprising 60 credits at Level 7 be undertaken (and this may include an internship, for example);
- Students would need to successfully pass research methods modules to progress to Level 7;
- Students would also need to average 50% across all preceding modules to successfully progress to Level 7;
- Students would need to complete all 120 credits at Level 7 to be considered for the award; students who do not complete 120 credits at Level 7 will be offered a Bachelors award, with Honours, where appropriate;
- The maximum period of study allowable for the part-time route would normally be ten years from the initial period of registration for a programme which would normally take four years on a full-time basis;
- Admission to the award would be as for its undergraduate counterpart (with maximum entry with recognised prior learning agreed in accordance with the University's admissions policy);

- The award would be classified as First; Upper Class Second (2:1), Lower Class Second (2;2), Third, Ordinary, with the calculation 20% Level 5, 30% Level 6 and 50% Level 7.

5D.2 The MRes is a Level 7 research award, but as a named programme would operate within the University's regulations for taught postgraduate qualifications, other than for classification. The MRes comprises 180 credits, of which 90-120 credits would comprise a supervised research project (of between 20,000-25,000 words), to be assessed by an examiner through a 30 minute viva. The remaining 60-90 credits would comprise modules of 20 (or 30 credits). There would be no exit points. The pass mark would be 50%. The programme would operate one-year full-time or two-years part-time. Classification would be Pass (50-59), Merit (60-69), Distinction (70+).

5D.3 The BMus is located at Level 6 of the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications, comprising 480 credits of study over four years of study; 120 credits at Level 4, 120 credits at Level 5, 240 credits at Level 6 (undertaken during years 3 and 4 of the programme). The award is calculated on the basis of year 3/4 credit so all credit awarded at Level 6, usually on a 40/60 basis (so, 40% allocated on the Year 3 average, 60% on the Year 4 average). The exit qualification is a BMus (Ord) at the end of Year 3.

5D.4 The MBA is located at Level 7 of the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications. Award-specific requirements include a minimum three years of appropriate and relevant postgraduate experience upon entry; admission with credit limited to 20% of the course of study, and any prior learning must have been acquired no later than five years before enrolment; 180 credits at L7 of FHEQ; a pass mark of 50% to apply; and credits for independent project (minimum 40, but 60 credits for an independent project which includes a research/consultancy skills type component).

PART 6 AWARDS AND PERIODS OF REGISTRATION

6A Maximum Period of Registration

6A.1 The maximum period of registration for a full time undergraduate student would be two years longer than the length of the programme on which they are registered (ie five years for a student registered on a three-year programme of study). A part-time student would take the award within eight years of initial registration on a programme which would take three years on a full-time basis; or within ten years of initial registration on a programme which would take four years on a full time basis.

6A.2 The maximum period of registration for the Master's award is six years, irrespective of mode of study.

Re-admission

6A.3 Admission will not be granted for re-entry to the same programme if the student left the programme due to academic failure or if their previous programme registration was terminated on disciplinary grounds.

Student Debts: Registration and Awards

6A.4 Students are expected to be in good standing by the prompt payment of all monies due in

connection with their programme, residence or otherwise arising from their status as University students. In particular, tuition fees shall, unless the University agrees to the contrary in any particular case, be payable immediately on a demand being raised by the University. Charges for residential accommodation are payable on the dates stated in the Residential Agreement.

6A.5 A student who is in debt to the University will not be permitted to re-register at the beginning of an academic year. A student who has a debt from attendance on a previous programme at the University shall not be admitted to a postgraduate or second programme of any kind until the debt is cleared, or a payment plan agreed.

6A.6 If a candidate for the award of a degree, diploma or certificate is in significant debt to the University for tuition fees, they will not be permitted to attend the Graduation Ceremony and their award certificate will be withheld until the debt has been cleared, or a payment plan agreed.

Registration on more than one programme

6A.7 No student may be registered simultaneously on a full-time programme and any other taught higher education programme of studies, whether solely within the University or involving any other institution, without the explicit written permission of the Head of the Academic Department responsible for the full time programme. The discovery of any such dual registration could result in the suspension or termination of the student's programme of study at the University.

Advanced standing (Undergraduate and Postgraduate)

6A.9 Students who gain advanced standing to join a programme will have a shorter time limit, reduced in accordance with credit exemptions claimed. This device is to ensure that currency of awards is always taken into account and works in the interests of students. 'Double counting' is the use of the same allocation of credit in order to meet the requirements of more than one academic award at the same level. 'Double counting' is not permitted.

6B Awards

Conferment of University of Chichester Awards

6B.1 Awards of the University of Chichester may only be conferred by the Vice-Chancellor of the University.

Certificate of Attendance

6B.2 The University of Chichester offers the following certification for students who wish to follow programmes of study provided by the University, which may be existing modules, but which do not necessarily involve assessment. These certificates will not be credit rated, and are issued by the Department.

6B.3 The University offers the following awards to students who have completed programmes of study, and are issued by Academic Registry:

Undergraduate

Certificate (named)
Certificate of Higher Education (Cert HE) (qualified by subject area(s))
Certificate of Higher Education (Cert HE) (unnamed)
Higher National Certificate (HNC)
Diploma (Named)
Diploma of Higher Education (DipHE) (qualified by subject area(s))
Diploma of Higher Education (DipHE) (unnamed)
Higher National Diploma (HND)
Foundation Degree
Bachelor's Degree
The awards of Bachelor of Arts (BA), Bachelor of Music (BMus), Bachelor of Engineering (BEng), Bachelor of Science (BSc) and Bachelor of Education (BEd.) and Bachelor of Arts Professional Studies, are available as Degrees and Degrees with Honours.
Master in Arts (MArts) (Integrated Masters)
Master in Music (MMus) (Integrated Masters)
Master in Science (MSci) (Integrated Masters)
Master in Engineering (MEng) (Integrated Masters)

Postgraduate

Graduate Certificate
Graduate Diploma
Professional Graduate Certificate in Education
Postgraduate Certificate
Postgraduate Certificate in Education
Postgraduate Diploma
Master of Arts (MA)
Master of Arts (Education)
Master of Business Administration (MBA)
Master of Science (MSc)
Master of Fine Art (MFA)
Master of Research (MRes)
DProf/MProf Professional Doctorate/Professional Master's

6B.4 The University is able to offer the following awards to students who successfully complete an approved programme of research.

Postgraduate Awards (Research)

Master of Philosophy (MPhil)
Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

6B.5 The University of Chichester is able to confer Honorary Fellowships and Honorary degrees.

The Conferment of Awards

6B.6 Graduands will be invited to the next Graduation Ceremony following the achievement of their qualification (or End Point Assessment, in the case of Degree Apprentices); attendance cannot be deferred unless exceptional circumstances, such as international sports

representation, have been accepted not less than three months prior to the event by the Vice-Chancellor or designate, whose decision is final. It is expected that students on the final year of an undergraduate Honours programme will attend the next scheduled Graduation Ceremony provided they have attained the minimum threshold of 300 credits of which 60 credits are at Level 6, pending the ratification of any deferred or referred assessments. This is not applicable if the award of Ordinary Degree is not available for the programme e.g. Social Work. Students on the BA (Hons) Primary Teaching with Specialism (with QTS) who have gained 300 credits and who intend to continue their studies for the outstanding credit will be able to attend graduation with their cohort. These students will be eligible for the award of an ordinary degree in BA Primary Education Studies (non QTS), however, once they have successfully completed their outstanding credits they will receive the award of BA (Hons) Primary Teaching with Specialism (with QTS).

6B.7 Where a candidate is not eligible for an award because they have not undertaken one third of their study at the University but nonetheless has a profile of 300 credits or over, the Board of Examiners may exercise discretion and award the Ordinary Degree, providing at least three quarters of the performance at the University is good.

6B.8 The award has been made by the Board of Examiners acting under delegated authority from Academic Board with a pass list signed by external examiners.

6B.9 The University may publish award results but not classifications or grades (unless a First, in the case of a Bachelors, or Distinction in the case of a Masters award). However, students will be given the opportunity to request that their name is published when they are invited to the Awards Ceremony.

Conditions of Award

6B.10 The University of Chichester will make an award in accordance with the requirements published in the regulations of the programme to which it relates. Interim awards will not be made where such awards are listed as part of a longer programme of study. (Such an award will be made if a student has passed the requirements for such an award and fails a subsequent, later award stage or if a student chooses to withdraw voluntarily at this stage.)

6B.11 All major awards must be conferred at a properly constituted awards ceremony.

6B.12 Graduands will be invited to only one graduation ceremony, and that will be in the year in which they achieve their qualification.

Certificate of Award

6B.13 The certificate of each award conferred by the University of Chichester to all students shall record:

- (i) the name of the University;
- (ii) the full name of the student;
- (iii) the name of the academic award;
- (iv) the title of the programme;
- (v) any particular endorsement approved by the Academic Board, such as:

- a particular distinction (eg a spoken language);
 - any collaborating body (in the case of awards provided with an academic partner);
- (vi) the date of the award;
- (vii) the signature of the Vice-Chancellor

Record of achievement or transcript

6B.14 An on-line record of achievement or transcript will be made available to all students who have successfully completed element(s) of a programme of study of the University.

The transcript will record:

- (i) full name of the student;
- (ii) a list of modules indicating which academic year they were successfully completed;, with details of the length and level and grades achieved.
- (iii) title and classification of any final award, if applicable.

6B.15 Undergraduate students based at University campuses will be issued with award certificates and an electronic, University verified Higher Education Achievement Report (HEAR), which incorporates the European Diploma Supplement (which gives the name of the academic partner and location of study where the student has been registered on a partner programme).

6B.16 All other undergraduate, postgraduate taught and students on partner programmes receive an award certificate and European Diploma Supplement (formal transcript of results) upon successful completion of their programme of study.

6B.17 Any certificates of attendance required by students on bespoke packages of modules (e.g. employer engagement packages) that do not lead to an award, will be issued by the relevant Academic Department.

6B.18 Students who exit their programme of study will receive a certification of any module credit and marks received plus any award that they may be eligible to receive, e.g. Certificate of Higher Education.

Conferment of awards on behalf of other bodies

6B.19 Where awards are conferred by the University of Chichester on behalf of other bodies this will be undertaken in a manner that recognises the regulations of the other bodies.

6C Classification for Undergraduate Awards

An Honours' degree shall be awarded to a student who has passed modules equivalent to 360 credits minimum at levels 4, 5 and 6 (or 7 for Integrated Master's) within their approved programme of study; including a research assignment (dissertation, personal study or independent project) unless a variation waiving the requirement for a programme to include a dissertation has been approved by the Academic Board.

6C.1 In calculating the final award of the Honours degree all grades achieved at FHEQ Levels 5 and 6 will be aggregated, such that the 120 Level 5 credits will be weighted as 40% of the award

and the 120 Level 6 credits as 60% of the award. The classification of an Honours degree for students entering directly to Level 6 at Chichester will be calculated in accordance with programme requirements and will be based on an aggregate of the marks achieved at this level. If fewer than 60 Level 5 credits are studied at Chichester then the award calculation will be based solely on the Level 6 profile of marks but if 60 credits or more are studied at Chichester then the award calculation will be based upon the normal weighting. In the former scenario students would be required to pass the Level 5 credits but they would not be included in the award calculation.

6C.2 The Board of Examiners shall base the recommendation of the classification on the following schedules:

70% and above	First Class Honours
60-69%	Second Class, Upper Division, Honours
50-59%	Second Class, Lower Division, Honours
40-49%	Third Class Honours
Below 40%	Fail

Ordinary Degree

6C.3 An Ordinary Degree may be awarded where the student has achieved the intended learning outcomes and 300 credits, of which no more than 120 will be at FHEQ Level 4 and at least 60 must be at FHEQ Level 6.

6D Classification for Borderlines for Honours

6D.1 Where a student's overall final mark places them within 0.5% of the higher classification an automatic upgrade to the higher classification will apply.

Classification for Foundation degrees

6D.2 Students must have completed Levels 4 and 5 successfully, and have gained 240 credits. Students will receive a Distinction if they have an overall average of 70% across Level 5; students will receive a Merit if they have an overall average of 60% across Level 5; students will receive a Pass if they have an overall average of 40% across Level 5.

Classification for Higher Nationals

6D.3 To be awarded an Higher National Certificate, a student must achieve 120 credits at or above the level of the qualification. The classification is based upon the best 75 credits.

6D.4 To be awarded an Higher National Diploma, a student must achieve 240 credits at or above the level of the qualification. The classification is based upon the best 150 credits.

6D.5 Students will receive a Distinction if they have an overall average of 70% or above across the best credits; students will receive a Merit if they have an overall average of 60% or above; students will receive a Pass if they have an overall average of 40% or above.

Classification for Postgraduate Awards

The Postgraduate Certificate

6D.6 The certificate will be awarded on a two-point scale – Pass, Fail determined by the grades for the modules that comprise the certificate.

Pass – any other combination of grades except failure.

The Postgraduate Diploma

6D.7 The diploma will be awarded on a two-point scale – Pass, Fail determined by the grades for the modules that comprise the diploma.

Pass – any other combination of grades except failure.

The Master's Degree

6D.8 Awards will be made on the basis of 'pass', 'merit' or 'distinction'.

6D.9 A Master's degree shall be awarded to a student who has passed modules equivalent to 180 credits at Masters Level within their approved programme of study; including a dissertation or equivalent (unless a variation waiving the requirement for a programme to include a dissertation has been approved by the Academic Board).

6D.10 To be awarded a Master's Degree with Distinction a student must (where the award in its entirety, ie 180 credits (or 240 credits for an MFA), has been taught and assessed at the University of Chichester):

- Achieve a grade of at least A in their Dissertation, AND
- Achieve a grade of at least A in the majority of modules (equivalent to at least 80 credits).

To be awarded a Master's Degree with Merit a student must (where the award in its entirety, ie 180 credits, or 240 credits for an MFA, has been taught and assessed at the University of Chichester):

- Achieve a grade of at least B in their Dissertation, AND
- Achieve a grade of at least B in the majority of modules (equivalent to at least 80 credits).

Where a Master's programme does not include a 60 credit dissertation the programme handbook shall identify the module(s) that may count towards an upgrade of classification. In regard to the MFA both the dissertation and independent project must fall into the higher category.

6D.11 Where a student has been admitted with RPL, the classification of the award will be calculated on the basis of credit achieved at the University of Chichester (although there may be exceptions laid down in programme-specific regulations). At least half the credits gained at Chichester (including the dissertation) need to be in the 'A' category for a Distinction to be awarded, and at least half the credits gained at Chichester need to be in the 'B' category for a Merit to be awarded.

6E Aegrotat and Posthumous Awards

Aegrotat Awards

6E.1 An award may be recommended exceptionally in aegrotat form to a student who satisfies the general conditions for the grant of the award (e.g. The independent project in the case of an undergraduate Honours degree) but was unable, for reasons of illness or good cause accepted by the Board of Examiners, to complete or be assessed for the award for which they were a candidate. Such awards are unclassified and without Honours.

Posthumous Awards

6E.2 An award may be conferred posthumously, either in aegrotat or normal form, to a deceased student who was a registered student at the time of death, who satisfied the remaining general conditions for the grant of the award in the regulations applicable to the Conferment of Awards as far as was practicable.

PART 7 MARKING SCHEMES AND GRADE DESCRIPTORS

7A Module Assessments

7A.1 For the purposes of undergraduate regulations the term 'assessment' is used to indicate any piece of work which is graded (either numerically on a 1-100 scale or on a 'pass-fail' basis in the case of some professional modules) and where the grade for the piece of work contributes to the final grade awarded for the module and thus the award of credit.

7B Award of Credit (Undergraduate)

7B.1 Each module will generate one final grade from all the component elements of assessment within the module. Total compensation of grades will be allowed within the module, which includes where an element has been non-submitted and the mark is zero. A fail grade is, therefore, when the overall result for the module is less than 40% and re-assessment must take place in the form of one piece of pass/fail coursework (which tests the achievement of the learning outcomes of the module), subject to the following exceptions:

- Professional Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs) requirements stipulate re-assessment must be in all module assessment components.
- There are mitigating circumstances in which case first sit module assessment components apply.

7B.2 Coursework in the context of a pass/fail re-assessment will include similar or equivalent assessments, other than examinations, e.g. essay, presentation, performance, report, portfolio.

7C Grading Scheme (Undergraduate)

The criteria below present a holistic overview of the level a graduate would be expected to have reached during their degree. Not all descriptors will apply to all courses to the same extent: for example, numeracy and digital skills may not be as applicable to some arts courses as creativity skills, while the reverse might be true of some STEM subjects. If some criteria are not applicable to a given course, they may not need to be referenced. The classification descriptors signpost student achievement generically - they are neither detailed nor exhaustive.

Class/mark	Knowledge and understanding, including relevance	Practical skills, including reasoning	Cognitive skills, including application of evidence	Transferable skills, including structure and presentation	Subject-specific criteria
Fail 1-9% Minimal Quality 0% non-submission	The student did not achieve the required intended learning outcomes Contains little of relevance to the objectives of the assessment task. Fails to answer and address the set topic Knowledge and understanding of the subject is inadequate, without the required breadth or depth, with deficiencies in key areas.	No practical, academic or intellectual application. Inadequate understanding of subject-specific theories, paradigms, concepts and principles, including their limitations and ambiguities. Arguments and explanations are weak and/or poorly constructed, and does not critically evaluate the arguments of others or consider alternative views. Has shown little or no ability to reflect on their work.	Based on little or no evidence. Lacks academic and intellectual integrity and quality. Use of non-academic sources limits intellectual understanding. Has not produced sufficient evidence of background investigation, analysis, research, enquiry and/or study. Over-reliance on set sources. Not demonstrated an adequate ability to select and evaluate reading and research. Lack of technical, creative and/or artistic skills in most, or key, areas.	Presentation is inappropriate, unclear and inaccessible. Work is not coherent or succinct. Serious errors of vocabulary, syntax, spelling and punctuation obscure the overall meaning. No logical development or organisation of the materials with few links between statements and sections. References are absent, incorrect or inaccurate. Limited ability to solve problems and/or make decisions. Shows little or no real creativity. Has attempted practical tasks/processes but	Determined by each programme as needed including not demonstrated sufficient evidence of discipline-specific skills development or application. Has made infrequent contributions to group discussions and/or project work. Has demonstrated little or no ability to manage their learning and/or work without supervision. Has not demonstrated adequate initiative or personal responsibility. Not demonstrated achievement of professional competence when assessed against the

				followed a limited, procedural or mechanistic formula, and they contain errors, with little or no independence. Have not presented research findings clearly or effectively, and their gathering, processing and interpretation of data is unsatisfactory. Not able to sufficiently express ideas and convey clear meaning verbally, electronically and/or in writing, uses inaccurate terminology, with many errors in spelling, vocabulary and syntax. Unable to demonstrate consistently basic numeracy and digital literacy skills.	requirements of a professional, statutory or regulatory body (PSRB). Has failed to adhere to the appropriate rules and/or conventions set by regulators or the industry.
Fail 10-19% Very Poor Quality	The student did not achieve the required intended learning outcomes Contains limited relevance to the objectives of the assessment task. May address the topic but not the assignment brief. May be scanty and brief. Knowledge and understanding of the subject is inadequate,	Work is descriptive and anecdotal. Minimal or no argument. May be entirely reliant on the work of others, with no practical and /or academic application to demonstrate understanding of the material. Inadequate understanding of subject-specific theories,	Irrelevant or minimal use of recommended sources, resulting in a lack of understanding and inadequate supporting evidence. Non-academic sources that lack intellectual integrity are relied upon. Has not produced sufficient evidence of background investigation, analysis,	Presentation is inappropriate, unclear and inaccessible. Points are not made coherently or succinctly. Compound errors of vocabulary, syntax, spelling and punctuation seriously detract from the overall meaning. Materials lack logical development. Relationship between	

	without the required breadth or depth, with deficiencies in key areas.	paradigms, concepts and principles, including their limitations and ambiguities. Arguments and explanations are weak and/or poorly constructed, and does not critically evaluate the arguments of others or consider alternative views. Has shown little or no ability to reflect on their work.	research, enquiry and/or study. Over-reliance on set sources. Not demonstrated an adequate ability to select and evaluate reading and research. Lack of technical, creative and/or artistic skills in most, or key, areas.	statements and sections are hard to recognise. References may be absent or incorrect. Limited ability to solve problems and/or make decisions. Shows little or no real creativity. Has attempted practical tasks/processes but followed a limited, procedural or mechanistic formula, and they contain errors, with little or no independence. Have not presented research findings clearly or effectively, and their gathering, processing and interpretation of data is unsatisfactory. Not able to sufficiently express ideas and convey clear meaning verbally, electronically and/or in writing, uses inaccurate terminology, with many errors in spelling, vocabulary and syntax. Unable to demonstrate consistently basic numeracy and digital literacy skills.	
Fail 20-34% Poor Quality	The student did not achieve the required intended learning outcomes Inconsistency of	Descriptive or anecdotal work with scanty or no argument. Reliant on the work of others and does	Minimal and inadequate knowledge of relevant and recommended sources. Their use as supporting	Poor visual and written presentation. The style may be inappropriate, unclear and inaccessible.	

	<p>relevance to the objectives of the assessment task. Addresses topic but not always the assignment brief. May be significantly short of required length/ time. Knowledge and understanding of the subject is inadequate, without the required breadth or depth, with deficiencies in key areas.</p>	<p>not use this to develop own arguments. No critical discussion or theoretical engagement. Little practical and intellectual application. Inadequate understanding of subject-specific theories, paradigms, concepts and principles, including their limitations and ambiguities. Arguments and explanations are weak and/or poorly constructed, and does not critically evaluate the arguments of others or consider alternative views. Has shown little or no ability to reflect on their work.</p>	<p>evidence may be inaccurate, inappropriate or negligible. Reliance on dated, unreliable or non-academic sources. Has not produced sufficient evidence of background investigation, analysis, research, enquiry and/or study. Over-reliance on set sources. Not demonstrated an adequate ability to select and evaluate reading and research. Lack of technical, creative and/or artistic skills in most, or key, areas.</p>	<p>Points may not be made coherently or succinctly. Errors of vocabulary, syntax, spelling and punctuation may seriously detract from the overall meaning. The materials may lack logical development and organisation. Relationship between statements and sections may be difficult to recognise. References may be absent, inaccurate or incorrect. Limited ability to solve problems and/or make decisions. Shows little or no real creativity. Has attempted practical tasks/processes but followed a limited, procedural or mechanistic formula, and they contain errors, with little or no independence. Have not presented research findings clearly or effectively, and their gathering, processing and interpretation of data is unsatisfactory. Not able to sufficiently express ideas and convey clear meaning verbally, electronically and/or in writing, uses</p>	
--	---	--	---	---	--

				inaccurate terminology, with many errors in spelling, vocabulary and syntax. Unable to demonstrate consistently basic numeracy and digital literacy skills.	
Fail/PP 35-39% Weak Quality	The student did not achieve the required intended learning outcomes May be some deviation from objectives of the assessment task. May not consistently address set question or assignment brief. May be short of required length/time. Knowledge and understanding of the subject is inadequate, without the required breadth or depth, with deficiencies in key areas.	Descriptive or anecdotal with little or no critical discussion and theoretical engagement. Unconvincing or minimal line of argument. Mostly reliant on the work of others, displaying little understanding or ability to apply the material. Inadequate understanding of subject-specific theories, paradigms, concepts and principles, including their limitations and ambiguities. Arguments and explanations are weak and/or poorly constructed, and does not critically evaluate the arguments of others or consider alternative views. Has shown little or no ability to reflect on their work.	Very limited range, use and application of relevant and recommended sources. Demonstrates lack of real understanding. Too much reliance may be placed on dated, unreliable or non-academic sources. Has not produced sufficient evidence of background investigation, analysis, research, enquiry and/or study. Over-reliance on set sources. Not demonstrated an adequate ability to select and evaluate reading and research. Lack of technical, creative and/or artistic skills in most, or key, areas.	Weak presentation. Some aspects of the style may be inappropriate, unclear and inaccessible. Some points will not be made coherently or succinctly. Errors of vocabulary, syntax, spelling and punctuation may seriously detract from the overall meaning. The materials may lack logical development and organisation. The relationship between some statements and sections may be difficult to recognise. Limited use of references and some may be inaccurate. Limited ability to solve problems and/or make decisions. Shows little or no real creativity. Has attempted practical tasks/processes but followed a limited, procedural or mechanistic formula, and they contain	

				errors, with little or no independence. Have not presented research findings clearly or effectively, and their gathering, processing and interpretation of data is unsatisfactory. Not able to sufficiently express ideas and convey clear meaning verbally, electronically and/or in writing, uses inaccurate terminology, with many errors in spelling, vocabulary and syntax. Unable to demonstrate consistently basic numeracy and digital literacy skills.	
3 rd 40-49% Acceptable Quality	Satisfactorily addresses most objectives of the assessment task Completed to acceptable tolerance, limits of time/length (plus/minus 10% of word count). Has produced some creative work. Has demonstrated technical, creative and/or artistic skills. Has shown an ability to manage their learning and work with minimal or no supervision. Has demonstrated the ability to reflect on their work.	Work is descriptive with minimal critical discussion and limited theoretical engagement. Too much reliance on the work of others rather than developing own understanding and application of the material. Has demonstrated a depth of knowledge and understanding in key aspects of their field of study, sufficient to deal with terminology, facts and concepts. has demonstrated an	Limited range of relevant and recommended sources are used, but with some inadequacies in their use and employment as supporting evidence. There may be some reliance on dated or unreliable sources. Has conducted general background investigation, analysis, research, enquiry and/or study using established techniques, with the ability to extract relevant points. Has demonstrated the ability	Acceptable presentation. Some aspects of the style may be unclear. Points may not be made coherently or succinctly. Some errors of vocabulary, syntax, spelling and punctuation but these are not serious distractions from the overall meaning. Some lack of logical development and organisation of the materials. The relationship between some statements and sections may be hard to	Has demonstrated evidence of developing and applying discipline-specific specialist skills. Has demonstrated a capability of making useful contributions to group discussions and/or project work. Has demonstrated initiative and/or personal responsibility. The student has demonstrated achievement of professional competence when assessed against the requirements of a PSRB.

		understanding of subject specific theories, paradigms, concepts and principles. Has consistently demonstrated an understanding of subject-specific theories, paradigms, concepts and principles as well as more specialised areas. Has shown the ability to devise and sustain an argument, with some consideration of alternative views, and can explain often complex matters and ideas.	to select, evaluate and comment on reading, research and primary sources. Can communicate information, ideas, problems and solutions verbally, electronically and in writing, with clear expression and style. They have also demonstrated numeracy and digital literacy skills.	follow. Work is referenced accurately with some errors. Has demonstrated an ability to solve problems, applying a range of methods to do so, and the ability to make decisions in complex and unpredictable circumstances. Has completed practical tasks and/or processes accurately and with a degree of independence. has presented their research findings, in several formats, and has gathered, processed and interpreted data effectively.	The student has adhered to the appropriate rules and/or conventions set by regulators or the industry.
2(ii) 50-59% Sound quality, competent with some limitations	Competently addresses objectives of the assessment task, but may contain minor errors or omissions at the lower end, where treatment of issues may be superficial. Completed to required time/length, etc. Has consistently demonstrated creativity. Has consistently demonstrated well-developed technical, creative and/or artistic skills. Has consistently shown an ability to	Some limited critical discussion, but argument is unconvincing, particularly at the lower end where the work is more descriptive. More reliance on work of others rather than developing own arguments. Limited theoretical and conceptual analysis. Has demonstrated a sound breadth and depth of subject knowledge and understanding, if sometimes balanced	Range of relevant and recommended sources are used, but this may be in an unimaginative or literal manner, particularly at the lower end of the range. Limited use of sources beyond the standard recommended materials. Has conducted background investigation, analysis, research, enquiry and/or study using established techniques accurately, and can critically appraise	Generally sound presentation. Style is largely clear and accessible. There may be minor errors of vocabulary, syntax, spelling and punctuation but these should not detract from the overall meaning. There may be inconsistencies in the organisation and development of materials. The relationship between some statements and sections may not be easy	Has consistently demonstrated the development and informed application of discipline-specific specialist skills. Has consistently demonstrated the capability to make coherent and constructive contributions to group discussions and/or project work.

	<p>systematically manage their learning and work without supervision. Has consistently demonstrated initiative and/or personal responsibility. Has consistently demonstrated a well-developed ability to reflect on their work</p>	<p>towards the descriptive rather than the critical or analytical. Has demonstrated a thorough understanding of subject-specific theories, paradigms, concepts and principles, and a sound understanding of more specialised areas.</p>	<p>academic sources. has consistently solved complex problems, selecting and applying a range of appropriate methods, and can make decisions in complex and unpredictable circumstances. Has argued logically, with supporting evidence, and has demonstrated the ability to consider and evaluate a range of views and information. Has clearly and consistently explained complex matters and ideas. selected, evaluated and commented on reading, research and primary sources, sometimes beyond the set range. Has consistently presented their research findings effectively and appropriately in many formats, and has gathered, processed and interpreted data efficiently and effectively.</p>	<p>to follow. Some points may not be made coherently or succinctly. Work is referenced accurately with few errors. Has consistently solved complex problems, selecting and applying a range of appropriate methods, and can make decisions in complex and unpredictable circumstances. Has consistently completed practical tasks/processes mainly independently in an accurate, well-coordinated and proficient way. Can consistently and confidently communicate information, ideas, problems and solutions verbally, electronically and in writing. They show a clear, coherent, expressive style, with a range of vocabulary. They have consistently demonstrated strong numeracy and digital literacy skills.</p>	
<p>2 (i) 60-69% High quality, skilled work</p>	<p>Clearly addresses the objectives of the assessment task, especially those elements requiring critical analysis. At the higher end the work will</p>	<p>Generally clear line of critical and evaluative argument, with ability to develop own ideas from the work of others. Ability to engage in theoretical</p>	<p>Good range of relevant and recommended sources used in an imaginative and largely consistent way as supporting evidence. Use</p>	<p>Good visual and written presentation. Clear and accessible style. Generally good standards of vocabulary, syntax, spelling and punctuation.</p>	<p>Has demonstrated a capable and effective application of discipline-specific specialist skills. Has demonstrated the capability to make strong,</p>

	<p>not contain errors or omissions. The student has shown a high level of creativity and originality throughout their work. Has a thorough command of highly-developed relevant technical, creative and/or artistic skills. Has shown a strong ability to systematically manage their learning and work without supervision. Has consistently demonstrated well-developed initiative and/or personal responsibility</p>	<p>and conceptual analysis. Has demonstrated sophisticated breadth and depth of knowledge and understanding, showing a clear, critical insight. has demonstrated a thorough understanding of subject-specific theories, paradigms, concepts and principles, and a sound understanding of more specialised areas. Has demonstrated the ability to make coherent, substantiated arguments, as well as the ability to consider, critically evaluate and synthesise a range of views and information. They have demonstrated a thorough, perceptive and thoughtful interpretation of complex matters and ideas. Has demonstrated the ability to reflect critically on their work.</p>	<p>of some sources beyond recommended texts including more complex materials. Has conducted thorough background investigation, analysis, research, enquiry and/or study using established techniques accurately, and possesses a well-developed ability to critically appraise a wide range of sources. has thoroughly selected, critically evaluated and commented on reading, research and primary sources, usually beyond the set range. Has presented thorough research findings perceptively and appropriately in a wide range of formats, and has gathered, processed and interpreted a wide range of complex data efficiently and effectively.</p>	<p>Logical organisation and development of materials. Coherent. Relationship between statements and sections are easy to follow. Referencing is accurate and appropriate. Has demonstrated thorough problem-solving skills, selecting and justifying their use of a wide-range of methods, and can make decisions in complex and unpredictable circumstances. Has performed practical tasks and/or processes autonomously, with accuracy and coordination. Can communicate information, ideas, problems and solutions with a high-degree of proficiency verbally, electronically and in writing. They have a clear, fluent and expressive style with appropriate vocabulary. They have a high standard of numeracy and digital literacy skills</p>	<p>valuable contributions to group discussions and/or project work, with an understanding of team and leadership roles.</p>
<p>1st 70-79% Excellent Quality</p>	<p>Authoritatively addresses the objectives of the assessment task, especially those components requiring critical analysis,</p>	<p>A clear and consistent line of critical and evaluative argument, displaying the ability to develop one's own insightful ideas from</p>	<p>Wide range of relevant and recommended sources used in an insightful and consistent way as supporting</p>	<p>Excellent visual and written presentation. Very clear and accessible style. Good standards of vocabulary, syntax,</p>	<p>Has demonstrated an accomplished and innovative application of discipline-specific specialist skills. Has</p>

	<p>synthesis and evaluation. Has demonstrated exceptional creative flair and originality. Has a full range of exceptional technical, creative and/or artistic skills. Has shown an exceptional ability to manage their learning on their own initiative, and work without supervision. Has demonstrated exceptional initiative and/or personal responsibility.</p>	<p>the work of others. Excellent engagement in theoretical and conceptual analysis. Has shown exceptional knowledge and understanding, significantly beyond the threshold expectation of a graduate at this level and beyond what has been taught. Has conducted thorough background investigation, analysis, research, enquiry and/or study using established techniques accurately, and possesses a well-developed ability to critically appraise a wide range of sources. has made consistent, logical, coherently developed, and substantiated arguments, and demonstrated the ability to systematically consider, critically evaluate and synthesise a wide range of views and information. They have demonstrated sophisticated perception, critical insight and interpretation of complex matters and ideas. Has demonstrated an exceptional ability to</p>	<p>evidence. Some in depth use of sources beyond recommended texts, to demonstrate independent research. Has conducted independent, extensive and appropriate investigation, analysis, research, enquiry and/or study well beyond the usual range, together with critical evaluation, to advance work and/or direct arguments. has demonstrated an exceptional ability to select, consider, evaluate, comment on and synthesise a broad range of research, primary sources, views and information and integrate references. Has presented research findings perceptively, convincingly and appropriately in a wide range of formats, and has gathered, processed and interpreted a wide range of complex data efficiently and effectively.</p>	<p>spelling and punctuation. Logical and fluent organisation and development of materials. Coherent and succinct. Relationship between statements and sections are very clear. Referencing is accurate, appropriate and extensive. Has demonstrated a wide range of extremely well-developed problem-solving skills, as well as a strong aptitude for decision-making with a high degree of autonomy, in the most complex and unpredictable circumstances. Has autonomously completed practical tasks and/or processes with a high degree of accuracy, coordination and proficiency. Can communicate information, ideas, problems and solutions to an accomplished level verbally, electronically and in writing. They have shown an accurate, fluent, sophisticated style. They possess exceptional numeracy and digital</p>	<p>demonstrated the capability to make clear, authoritative and valuable contributions to group discussions and/or project work, with exceptional teamwork and leadership skills</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

		reflect critically and independently on their work.		literacy skills.	
1 st 80-89% Outstanding quality	Innovatively addresses objectives of the assessment task, especially those components requiring sophistication of critical analysis, synthesis and evaluation. Has demonstrated exceptional creative flair and originality. Has a full range of exceptional technical, creative and/or artistic skills. Has shown an exceptional ability to manage their learning on their own initiative, and work without supervision. Has demonstrated exceptional initiative and/or personal responsibility.	A clear and consistent line of highly critical and evaluative argument, displaying the ability to develop one's innovative ideas from the work of others. Creative flair in theoretical and conceptual analysis. Has shown exceptional knowledge and understanding, significantly beyond the threshold expectation of a graduate at this level and beyond what has been taught. has conducted thorough background investigation, analysis, research, enquiry and/or study using established techniques accurately, and possesses a well-developed ability to critically appraise a wide range of sources. has made consistent, logical, coherently developed, and substantiated arguments, and demonstrated the ability to systematically consider, critically evaluate and synthesise a wide range of views and	Wide range of recommended and relevant sources used in an innovative and consistent way to support arguments. In depth use of sources beyond recommended texts, demonstrates creative flair in independent research. Has conducted independent, extensive and appropriate investigation, analysis, research, enquiry and/or study well beyond the usual range, together with critical evaluation, to advance work and/or direct arguments. has demonstrated an exceptional ability to select, consider, evaluate, comment on and synthesise a broad range of research, primary sources, views and information and integrate references. Has presented research findings perceptively, convincingly and appropriately in a wide range of formats, and	Outstanding visual and written presentation. Sophisticated yet clear and accessible style. Very good standards of vocabulary, syntax, spelling and punctuation. Possibly innovative yet logical and fluent organisation and development of materials. Articulate, coherent and succinct. Relationships between statements and sections are clear and precise. Referencing is accurate and, appropriate. Has demonstrated a wide range of extremely well-developed problem-solving skills, as well as a strong aptitude for decision-making with a high degree of autonomy, in the most complex and unpredictable circumstances. Has autonomously completed practical tasks and/or processes with a high degree of accuracy, coordination and	Has demonstrated an accomplished and innovative application of discipline-specific specialist skills

		information. They have demonstrated sophisticated perception, critical insight and interpretation of complex matters and ideas. Has demonstrated an exceptional ability to reflect critically and independently on their work.	has gathered, processed and interpreted a wide range of complex data efficiently and effectively.	proficiency. Can communicate information, ideas, problems and solutions to an accomplished level verbally, electronically and in writing. They have shown an accurate, fluent, sophisticated style. They possess exceptional numeracy and digital literacy skills	
1 st 90-100% Exceptional or distinguished quality	Professionally addresses the objectives of the assessment task, especially those components requiring originality of critical analysis, synthesis and evaluation. Has demonstrated exceptional creative flair and originality. Has a full range of exceptional technical, creative and/or artistic skills. Has shown an exceptional ability to manage their learning on their own initiative, and work without supervision. Has demonstrated exceptional initiative and/or personal responsibility.	Consistent line of profound critical and evaluative argument, displaying the ability to develop original ideas from an innovative synthesis of the work of others. Creative flair in advanced theoretical and conceptual analysis. Creative flair in theoretical and conceptual analysis. Has shown exceptional knowledge and understanding, significantly beyond the threshold expectation of a graduate at this level and beyond what has been taught. has conducted thorough background investigation, analysis, research, enquiry and/or	Wide range of relevant and recommended sources used in a profound and consistent way as supporting evidence. Use of cutting-edge sources beyond the recommended texts, including in-depth use of complex material demonstrating advanced independent research. Has conducted independent, extensive and appropriate investigation, analysis, research, enquiry and/or study well beyond the usual range, together with critical evaluation, to advance work and/or direct arguments. has demonstrated an exceptional ability to select, consider, evaluate,	Distinguished visual and written presentation. Highly sophisticated yet clear and accessible style. Extremely good standards of vocabulary, syntax, spelling and punctuation. Innovative yet logical and fluent organisation and development of materials. Highly articulate, coherent and succinct. Relationships between statement and sections are precisely made with great clarity. Referencing is accurate and appropriate. Has demonstrated a wide range of extremely well-developed problem-solving skills, as well as a strong aptitude for	Has demonstrated an accomplished and innovative application of discipline-specific specialist skills.

		<p>study using established techniques accurately, and possesses a well-developed ability to critically appraise a wide range of sources. has made consistent, logical, coherently developed, and substantiated arguments, and demonstrated the ability to systematically consider, critically evaluate and synthesise a wide range of views and information. They have demonstrated sophisticated perception, critical insight and interpretation of complex matters and ideas. Has demonstrated an exceptional ability to reflect critically and independently on their work.</p>	<p>comment on and synthesise a broad range of research, primary sources, views and information and integrate references. Has presented research findings perceptively, convincingly and appropriately in a wide range of formats, and has gathered, processed and interpreted a wide range of complex data efficiently and effectively.</p>	<p>decision-making with a high degree of autonomy, in the most complex and unpredictable circumstances. Has autonomously completed practical tasks and/or processes with a high degree of accuracy, coordination and proficiency. Can communicate information, ideas, problems and solutions to an accomplished level verbally, electronically and in writing. They have shown an accurate, fluent, sophisticated style. They possess exceptional numeracy and digital literacy skills</p>	
--	--	--	---	--	--

Postgraduate Grading Criteria

7C.1 Grading criteria will be made available to students when an assessment is set. These criteria will be determined by the content, aims and objectives of the module and used to determine a grade between A and E. Grades A to D correspond to pass awards, while E constitutes a failure. (A would be equivalent to a Distinction, B to a Merit and C and D to a Pass). Students who obtain an E grade will be deemed to have failed the assessment, but may re-submit work in accordance with the Boards of Examiners' decisions. The grade for each module will be confirmed by consulting the overall framework/Programme descriptors to check for consistency. Programmes MUST indicate how they will use subject specific criteria to gain marks A-E, or to show how they will distinguish between pass and failure. Programmes MUST also indicate how work might be re-assessed if failed.

Grade	Classification	Range of Mark	Equivalent % mark
A*	Distinction	90 – 100	95
A+		84 – 89	87
A		78 – 83	80
A-		70 – 77	74
B+	Merit	67 – 69	68
B		64 – 66	65
B-		60 – 63	62
C+	Pass	57 – 59	58
C		54 – 56	55
C-		50 – 53	52
D+	Pass	47 – 49	48
D		44 – 46	45
D-		40 – 43	42
E	Fail	35 – 39	37
F	Fail	30 – 34	33
F		10 – 29	20
F		1 – 9	5
F		0	0

7C.2 Postgraduate Grading Descriptors

80+ (Distinction)

A mark of 80+ will fulfil the following criteria:

- All learning outcomes/assessment criteria have been achieved to an exceptionally high level
- The work demonstrates most or all of the following characteristics beyond that expected for work at the given level of study within the discipline:
 - Exceptional display of understanding, exploration, insight and/or research
 - Potential for publication/exhibition and/or ability to undertake further research
- All specifications for the assessment task, including word limit where appropriate, have been adhered to
- The organisation, structure and standard of presentation of the work, including any subject-specific conventions where appropriate, are exemplary throughout
- Evidence of effective communication of work to specialist and non-specialist audiences

- Stimulating and rigorous arguments that are likely to be at the limits of what may be expected at this level
- The work has been approached and/or executed/performed in an original way
- Inspirational, innovative and authoritative - evidence of intellectual rigour, independence of judgement and insightful contextualisation, including relevant theory/literature/artefacts/performance
- Clear evidence of extensive study and demonstration of ability to reach appropriate decisions based on incomplete or complex evidence
- Evidence of very high quality analysis, synthesis, evaluation and critical appraisal
- Outstanding problem solving skills – suggests alternative approaches
- Ability to address complex issues both systematically and creatively - challenges established knowledge

70-79 (Distinction)

A mark in the range 70-79 will fulfil the following criteria:

- In-depth understanding, exploration, insight and/or research
- Potential for publication/exhibition and/or ability to undertake further research
- All specifications for the assessment task, including word limit where appropriate, have been adhered to
- The organisation, structure and standard of presentation of the work, including any subject-specific conventions where appropriate, are excellent throughout
- Evidence of effective communication of work to specialist and non-specialist audiences
- Convincing arguments that are likely to be at the limits of what may be expected at this level
- The work has been approached and/or executed/ performed in an original way
- Insightful contextualisation, including relevant theory/literature/artefacts/performance
- Clear evidence of extensive study and demonstration of ability to reach appropriate decisions based on incomplete or complex evidence
- Evidence of high to very high quality analysis, synthesis, evaluation and critical appraisal
- Excellent problem solving skills – suggests alternative approaches
- Ability to address complex issues effectively – challenges established knowledge

60-69 (Merit)

A mark in the 60-69 range will fulfil the following criteria:

- Good to very good understanding and exploration, some insight and/or thorough research
- Some capacity to undertake further research
- No significant inaccuracies, misunderstandings or errors
- The specifications for the assessment task, including word limit where appropriate, have been adhered to
- The work is well organised, coherent and the standard of presentation including any subject-specific conventions where appropriate, is at least good
- Evidence of effective communication of work
- Ability to present structured, clear and concise arguments

- The work has been approached and/or executed/performed in a comprehensive way with some degree of originality
- Appropriate contextualisation, including relevant theory/literature/artefacts/performance
- Evidence of extensive study and demonstration of ability to reach appropriate decisions based on incomplete or complex evidence
- Evidence of high quality analysis, synthesis, evaluation and critical appraisal
- Good or at least competent problem solving skills – suggests alternative approaches
- Ability to address complex issues competently – explores established knowledge

40-59 (Pass)

A mark in the range 40-59 will fulfil the following criteria:

- The student has demonstrated that the intended learning outcomes have been acquired at a threshold level
- A systematic understanding of knowledge, and a critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, much of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of their academic discipline, field of study or area of professional practice
- A comprehensive understanding of techniques applicable to their own research or advanced scholarship
- Originality in the application of knowledge, together with a practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline
- Conceptual understanding that enables the student: - to evaluate critically current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline - to evaluate methodologies and develop critiques of them and, where appropriate, to propose new hypotheses
- Some minor inaccuracies and/or misunderstandings – small but not significant errors
- Some minor aberrations from the specifications for the assessment task, including word limit where appropriate
- The work is suitably organised and the standard of presentation, including any subject-specific conventions where appropriate, is at least sound
- Ability to develop an argument but can lack fluency
- The work has been approached and/or executed/performed in a standard way with limited evidence of originality
- Some contextualisation but with a heavy reliance on a limited number of sources and, in general, the breadth and depth of sources and research are lacking
- Evidence of study and demonstration of ability to reach appropriate decisions based on incomplete or complex evidence
- Some, but limited evidence of analysis, synthesis, evaluation and critical appraisal
- Some evidence of problem solving skills
- Some evidence of ability to address complex issues adequately

0-39 (Fail)

A Fail will be awarded in cases in which there is:

- Very limited understanding and/or exploration of major ideas with very little insight and/or minimal research

- Some significant inaccuracies and/or misunderstandings – gaps in understanding and/or knowledge
- Insufficient attention paid to some of the assessment criteria and some significant aberrations from the specifications for the assessment task
- The work is too descriptive, somewhat disorganised and unclear and the standard of presentation, including any subject-specific conventions where appropriate, is inadequate
- Development of an argument is limited and often flawed
- The work has been approached and/or executed/performed inadequately
- The context provided takes the form of description lacking any breadth, depth and accuracy
- Limited or inappropriate research and demonstrated ability to reach decisions
- Insufficient evidence of analysis, synthesis, evaluation and critical appraisal
- Little evidence of problem solving skills
- Barely addresses complex issues

Translation of Marks from Non-UK HEIs (Undergraduate and Postgraduate)

7C.3 Translating marks is an academic responsibility and all marks require ratification by the relevant Board of Examiners. Advice should be given to outgoing students before they participate in study abroad in order that students study an appropriate level, volume and subject during their time away from the University. It should also be made clear to students whether or not they will bring back marks for the credit awarded.

7C.4 Where study abroad has a direct contribution to a final award, the number and proportion of marks awarded during a period of study abroad should be translated and adjusted to accommodate the University's credit model. Decisions concerning the award of credit and conversion of marks rest with the student's home institution.

Period of Study

7C.5 Study abroad (including exchanges and Erasmus+) cannot exceed one academic year within the programme of study.

7C.6 Guidance: Translation of Marks from Non-UK HEIs (for programmes that include study abroad opportunities)

The primary principle is fairness to students, whether they study abroad or at home, whilst encouraging mobility.

Programme coordinators should obtain as much information as possible about the programme content and assessment processes in the host institution, before students go there, to judge comparability of their marks, grades or credits with those awarded by Chichester.

There should be clarity and transparency about how an assessment during a period of study abroad is treated.

Students should be informed, in advance of choosing a programme of study abroad, how their marks, grades or credits will be treated when they return to the University. (We would also encourage students

to find out for themselves as much as they can about study and assessment in a host institution they intend to visit).

No assessments undertaken abroad will be marked again by assessors in the University of Chichester.

Students should receive full recognition at the appropriate level for an assessment undertaken during a period of study abroad.

Boards of Examiners will continue to exercise their judgment in discretionary cases.

ECTS	NORTH AMERICA	GPA RANGE	CHICHESTER EQUIVALENT MARK
A	A / A +	3.7 – 4.0	70 +
B	B / A -	3.2 – 3.6	61 – 70
C	B - / B	2.5 – 3.1	55 – 60
D	C / C +	1.9 – 2.4	50 – 54
E	D / C -	0.9 – 1.8	40 – 49
F	D -	0.5 – 0.8	25 – 39
F	F	0.0 – 0.4	< 38

PART 8 ASSESSMENT

8A Submission of Assessment

Information provided for all students

8A.1 The University will make available to students the necessary information for them to understand the assessment and examination requirements of their particular programme. In addition to the information provided in the student programme handbook, the University will also make available:

- (i) timetables for examination and submission of other assessed work;
- (ii) procedures for the release of marks or grades;
- (iii) rules for Conduct in Examinations approved by the Academic Board;
- (iv) grounds on which students may request that Boards of Examiners may be asked to review their decisions.

Responsibilities of all Students

Submission of Coursework

8A.2 Coursework must be submitted for marking by the times and dates published by the programme co-ordinator (the 'due date'). Coursework is deemed to have been submitted once it is lodged in accordance with the assessment requirements for the module.

Coursework may be accepted after the deadline, but 5 percentage points will be deducted from the face value mark for work submitted before the end of the day of submission, and 10 percentage points for course work submitted up to one week after the due date. For example, if a piece of work deserves a mark of 48%, 43% will be recorded if the work is submitted before the end of the day, and 38% - fail – if the

work is submitted up to a week late. If the imposition of the penalty deduction results in a fail mark, the student will be deemed to have failed the assessment. Assessments which take the form of presentation, performance or exhibition may not be submitted late. Submission of coursework arising from reassessment may not be submitted late.

Prior to the date of submission you may use Turnitin to review your own work. This you may do as many times as you wish through the links in your module page, and an automatic review is undertaken when you submit your final copy through the electronic submission process.

Written assessments must be submitted electronically through your module page in Moodle. The electronic submission records the date and time of submission to determine that your written work was submitted on time. The module Moodle page will set out if there is a further requirement to submit a hard copy of the written work to your academic department's administration office. Where a hard copy is required, you should include within the cover page the ID number of the UQOS (Turnitin) report from when you undertook the electronic submission.

Please note, if you fail to submit an electronic version of your work, your mark will normally be recorded as a non-submission. If there are any technical problems with the submission systems, you will be advised of these, and how the hand-in dates may be revised accordingly, and without any risks of penalty for late submission.

8A.3 A student who finds that he or she is unable to complete the work by the published date through sickness, family or other difficulties may seek an extension by applying in writing to the programme co-ordinator. The grounds for seeking an extension must be stated. If an extension is allowed, a revised date for the submission of the piece of coursework will be confirmed. Extensions will not be granted by the programme co-ordinator beyond the date of the next Board of Examiners for the programme. The Board of Examiners will then agree any deferment that is appropriate and wherever possible this will be within thirteen months of the normal, annual registration date for the programme – or for students on 'standalone' modules, prior to the next academic year. Extensions may not be granted for re-assessment unless this is deemed to be a first attempt by reason of valid mitigating circumstances. Again, such extensions will not go beyond the date of the next Board of Examiners.

Postgraduate – conditions for re-submission

8A.4 Students have the right to re-submit an assignment that has not obtained a pass grade in order to recover a failure. Moreover, re-submission must occur within a period set by the Board of Examiners, and the maximum grade obtainable for such re-submitted work shall be D.

8B First Attempt at assessment

8B.1 All students registered for a module will be deemed to have made a first attempt at each element of assessment when due, unless an extension or deferral has been approved in accordance with these Regulations.

8B.2 All students who fail to submit coursework or sit a practical assessment or examination will be deemed to have made a first attempt and have failed through non-submission with a mark of zero.

8C Undergraduate re-assessment

8C.1 The maximum number of modules that may be attempted by any student at each level of their

programme is 12 (15 credit modules or equivalent) of which eight must be passed. Students are able to substitute two irrevocably failed modules, assuming a reasonable attempt¹ at the assessment tasks has been made, at each level, with an appropriate 'make-up' module, where such a module is available within the rules for the programme in question. This practice is referred to as 'trailing' a module(s) into the next level. At the discretion of the Board of Examiners, a student may exceptionally be permitted to re-take a module if it is core to the programme. Programmes may, at their discretion, allow students to take suitable 'make-up' modules from other programmes.

¹ A 'reasonable attempt' is usually defined as the work being in the form required by the assessment brief and the content addressing the specified topic.

8C.2 Students will be credited on their profile with their merit mark for a 'make-up' module unless: the 'make up' module is being taken because a reasonable attempt at the re-assessment task has not been made, in which case students may achieve the maximum of the bare pass mark of 40% for the make-up module, or the 'make up' module is being taken in compensation due to failure as a result of non-submission at both the first sit and reassessment opportunities, in which case, students may achieve the maximum of the bare pass mark of 40% for the 'make up' module and an administration charge per module will be charged.

8D Undergraduate re-assessment - 'Trailing' Modules

8D.1 Students may complete up to two modules (normally totalling 30 credits) from the previous level during study at the next level, though their progression to the higher level will be provisional, pending the completion of the lower level. Where insufficient modules are available at the lower level, to be taken on a 'make-up' basis, candidates may be permitted to undertake a module from the higher level. The credit would be downgraded to the lower level and where contributing to the Award, the weighting of the mark would be adjusted accordingly. Normally, students will be allowed to take only one 'make-up' module per semester.

8D.2 Students taking 'make-up' modules in their final year of full-time study may be required to complete their studies as part-time students in order to complete their profile of credit (but the restriction of 12 modules at any one level will apply).

8D.3 Full-time students 'trailing' more than two modules (normally totalling more than 30 credits) in any one academic year will be required to change their registration to part-time until the credit gap has been made good.

8D.4 In the case of failure at re-assessment on any programme where an alternative module is not available, and where substitution is not possible students will be required to withdraw from the programme or change their programme or route of study.

8D.5 Students will be permitted to take modules from two levels during the same year of study where such an arrangement can be facilitated within the rules of the programme for the sequencing of modules. This is referred to as 'straddling' two levels of study.

8D.6 A module or assessment item which has been passed may not be re-taken in order to achieve a higher mark. Students are not normally permitted to take additional modules, beyond the number

required for an award, in order to improve their classification.

8D.7 At the discretion of the Award Board (or its Interim Board), a student may be permitted to re-take the modules in a complete level of study. This will only be permitted in cases where the student has exhausted all other means to progress through re-assessment and the Board of Examiners is convinced that the student is likely to succeed. Repetition of a level is only permitted to retrieve failure and not to improve a grade profile. In such a case, any credit previously achieved at that level will be removed from the student's transcript (including malpractice). The opportunity to repeat a complete level of study on the student's programme will be limited to one level during an individual student's undergraduate study at the University.

8D.8 Where a student's failure is deemed to be serious, the Board of Examiners, or where appropriate, the Interim Board, may require that the student withdraw from the programme on academic grounds without the offer of re-assessment.

8D.9 Students who fail to meet assessment requirements may be re-assessed in the modules they have failed at the discretion of the Board of Examiners for their programme.

8D.10 Re-assessment must not be a replication of the original assessment requirements, unless this is not possible due to the nature of the assessment component e.g. dissertation.

8D.11 Where re-assessment is required in all components of assessment of the module (as described in para 7B.1), they may differ from the original assessment requirements if it is not possible/practicable for students to undertake the original assessments e.g. group presentations or performances.

8D.12 The maximum mark achievable at re-assessment is 40%. Only one re-assessment of a module will be allowed. Unless exceptionally approved at programme level, students who fail on re-assessment will be deemed to have irrevocably failed the module.

8D.13 Students who are deferred or referred at the June Board will be assumed to present for reassessment in August of that year. Any exceptions to this must be approved by the Chair of the Board of Examiners. (Note: there will be no opportunity for reassessment later than August for students on professional programmes (eg. Teacher Training or Social Work) since students are required to pass in all relevant theoretical modules before progressing to practice- or work-based learning).

8D.14 Students who are referred or deferred by the Board in February must present for reassessment in May so that their candidature may be discussed in June. However, if they have three or more modules of reassessment, the Board may approve spreading the reassessment load across May and August.

8E Academic Malpractice (Undergraduate and Postgraduate)

8E.1 All assessable items must be the candidate's own work. Where this is not so, the Board of Examiners will deal with the case as one of academic malpractice.

Viva Voce Examination

Viva voce examination for undergraduate or postgraduate will not be used to resolve borderline cases. It may, however, be used where commissioning is suspected.

8E.2 Academic malpractice can result from when a person, or people, trick, defraud or deceive others or may be committed unintentionally. Whether intended or not, all incidents of academic malpractice will be treated seriously by the University. Malpractice includes:

(i) Collusion: where a student works in a fraudulent manner with another (or others) being assessed independently (either wholly or in part) in the same module.

(ii) Plagiarism: to 'take and use another person's thoughts, writings, inventions as one's own' with intent or otherwise.

(iii) Commissioning: getting another person(s) to complete work which is subsequently submitted as the student's own work (reasonable grounds in regard to commissioning may include a difference in the execution of the work compared with other work, stylistic differences, work of a higher level. A request to see earlier drafts, notes on references and sources may be made).

(iv) Impersonation: where somebody undertakes an examination or assessment posing as another person.

(v) Duplication: the replication of element(s) of material in more than one assessment within the same institution or elsewhere, simultaneously or at some other time.

(vi) Syndication: the submission of substantially similar piece(s) of work by two or more students, either in the same institution or in a number of institutions, either at the same time, or at different times.

(vii) Falsification of data: where data have been invented, altered, copied or obtained by unfair means.

(viii) Aiding and abetting: where a student assists another student in any form of dishonest academic practice.

(ix) Professional misconduct: where, in the course of their assessed work, students on professional courses act in a manner which breaches the relevant professional Code of Conduct.

(x) Cheating in Examinations: where a student is found to have contravened the arrangements for the examination, for instance bringing in notes where none are permitted, or secreting electronic devices on their person.

8E.3 In all cases of academic malpractice or any other form of attempting to secure unfair advantage, the University confirms:

(i) the right of the Board of Examiners to delay reaching a decision on a candidate's results until the facts have been established;

(ii) the ability of the Board of Examiners to judge the seriousness of the academic misdemeanour and to exercise its discretion;

(iii) the ability to re-open a matter when evidence becomes available after a Board of Examiners has reached its decisions.

8E.4 When academic malpractice is suspected beyond Level 4 the tutor shall inform the Programme Coordinator, the Head of Academic Department, the Assessment Tutor, and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor or designate of their suspicions in writing and should cite or copy what evidence there is to support their suspicions. (Suspected malpractice at Level 4 will normally be addressed within the Department using these following procedures). The student should have opportunity to discuss the academic malpractice on any concerns that may have arisen during the assessment process.

All such cases are to be dealt with consistently, with the department ensuring impartiality by involving a scrutineer from another academic department. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor or designate will receive outcomes of all such cases and will make a judgement on whether they have been addressed appropriately and consistently. All cases will be logged and recommendations made to Boards of Examiners in the normal way).

The burden of proof lies with the University to prove that malpractice has occurred, rather than with the student to prove that it has not. The standard of proof is that applied in civil cases i.e. the balance of probabilities, rather than that applied in criminal cases i.e. beyond all reasonable doubt.

8E.5 The Head of Academic Department or, where appropriate, the Programme Coordinator, will seek a second opinion from another member of staff. Turnitin Originality Reports - generated by the student or a member of staff - may be used to assist in the identification of plagiarised work submitted for assessment. An Originality Report will never be advanced as the sole reason for suspecting that a piece of work is plagiarised, nor may an Originality Report be advanced as the sole defence against an accusation of plagiarism.

8E.6 Having gained the second opinion the Head of Academic Department (or Programme Coordinator) shall notify the Deputy Vice-Chancellor or designate of the suspicions and indicate whether they consider the suspicions should be investigated further or whether the suspicions are unsubstantiated. If the suspicions are unsubstantiated the Head of Academic Department and/or Programme Co-ordinator may wish to advise the student regarding better study skills or work practices to avoid further suspicions being raised.

8E.7 If, however, further investigation is deemed necessary, the Academic Quality and Standards Service shall be asked to convene a panel to hold an 'Assessment Enquiry'. The student shall be invited to attend the 'Assessment Enquiry' to explain the context in which their assessment was conducted and to answer any questions about their work.

8E.8 The Assessment Enquiry Panel will comprise at least two people appointed by the Director of Quality and Standards who will meet to review the evidence presented both by the tutor and that presented by the student who is suspected of malpractice. The student may be accompanied by a friend.¹ Members of the Assessment Enquiry Panel may be drawn from Heads of Academic Department or other senior members of academic staff. Students might attend via alternative means, such as a video call; but the hearing would proceed in the absence of the student, if they choose not to attend.

8E.9 The Assessment Enquiry shall be in two parts, the first, a desk-based review of the evidence to support the claim of malpractice and the second, a meeting with the student, which seeks to ascertain how the student conducted the work and the reasons for malpractice being suspected. This second part shall allow full opportunity for the student to respond to the suspicions. The tutor shall present her/his evidence in writing (with, where appropriate, the Turnitin report), as can the student, but the student

¹ 'friend' may include a representative from the Students' Union, other personal friend or family member, but excludes any form of legal representation.

can also put their case in person if they so choose.

8E.10 The Assessment Enquiry Panel shall forward a report to the Chair of the Board of Examiners to include the following: a summary of the evidence considered by the panel and the panel's conclusions with regard to whether malpractice has occurred and if it has, the seriousness of the case.

8E.11 Each case is different, and panels are expected to use their judgement in deciding the seriousness of an offence and deciding on whether there are aggravating circumstances that might affect the severity of the penalty. *Penalties that are proportionate and allow for the consideration of mitigating circumstances will be applied.* Panels must attempt to ensure consistency of treatment between cases, making a judgment about what is a proportionate penalty and ensuring that the penalty chosen does not have consequences for academic progression which are disproportionate in impact.

8E.12 Factors to take into account when determining the penalty and its proportionality include the following:

- The student's level of study: the more advanced and experienced the student, the more serious the offence
- The proportion of the piece of work that was subject to malpractice: the higher the proportion, the more serious the offence
- The credit rating of the piece of work: the higher the rating, the more serious the offence
- Whether the student would have failed the work, regardless
- The student's previous history (including information available under 'additional requirements'): a second offence, occurring after a student has already received a warning or a penalty for academic malpractice, is more serious than a first offence.

8E.13 Following the Assessment Enquiry the Chair of the Board of Examiners will notify the student of the Panel's conclusion. If malpractice has been found to have occurred, the Board of Examiners has the discretion to impose a range of stepped penalties from re-assessment of an assignment to termination of the student's registration on the programme. The Board of Examiners may choose not to award credit for a module where academic malpractice has been proven or to not make the award. For undergraduate programmes, in all cases where credit is to be awarded, normally the student shall resubmit the work for a maximum achievable grade which will be determined and stipulated by the Assessment Enquiry Panel, and confirmed by the Board of Examiners, taking account of the severity of the case.

8E.14 For postgraduate programmes, the Board of Examiners will exercise discretion according to the individual case. In both undergraduate and postgraduate programmes there will be a recognition that the seriousness of academic malpractice increases in relation to the level of study. The Board of Examiners will also implement harsher penalties where a student has a previous record of malpractice. Mitigating circumstances will not be considered in cases of academic malpractice, but may in relation to the penalty applied.

8E.15 Candidates may not evade the consequences of proven academic malpractice. Thus a candidate, who declines to represent for assessment when first requested in a module in which they have been found guilty of academic malpractice, will be required, on one further occasion only, to present again for

reassessment in that module – for the penalty mark originally decided by the Board. Failure to represent on this final occasion will lead to automatic termination of registration on the programme.

8E.16 If a student disagrees with the outcome of an Assessment Enquiry Panel the route of appeal is through the normal appeals procedure, (see Part 10). Investigations undertaken should be completed within 60 days.

Academic Malpractice - Penalty Tariff (Undergraduate/Postgraduate)

8E.17 The University strives to ensure fairness and consistency in the application of penalties to students across the Faculty and has adopted a tariff to be used in all cases of proven academic malpractice. The principle behind the tariff is simple and serves to ensure that all students are aware of the penalties that they will receive if they are found guilty of academic malpractice. The Board of Examiners will consider the recommendation of the assessment enquiry panel and may accept or modify the decision. Where former students are implicated in academic malpractice, the University reserves the right to action as appropriate, including the withdrawal of awards made.

8E.18 These points are allocated after the Assessment Enquiry Panel has agreed that the misconduct is proven and the points will be assigned based on the following criteria:

Malpractice – extent (% of the assessment)	
Up to 25%	10 points
Between 25% and 50%	20 points
Above 50%	30 points
Commissioning	50 points
Cheating in an examination	50 points
Falsification of data	50 points
Programme level	
Level 4	0 points
Level 5	10 points
Level 6	20 points
Level 7	30 points
Weighting of the assignment/examination	
Standard (50% or less)	10 points
Large (51% or more)	20 points
Dissertation	50 points
History (previous incidences of malpractice)	
1 st offence	10 points
2 nd offence	20 points
3 rd offence	30 points

Penalty (total scores, 1 from each of the 4 areas)

POINTS TOTAL	PENALTY
>30 points	Written warning
40-50	Assessment item capped at 40%
60-70	Module capped at 40%
80-90	Assessment item capped at 0%
100-110	Module capped at 0%
120-130	Recommend expulsion with award as appropriate
140+	Recommend expulsion with any award withheld

PART 9 BOARDS OF EXAMINERS

Glossary

Board of Examiners decision of *Deferral* – where a first sit is re-scheduled due to matters such as mitigating circumstances

Board of Examiners decision of *Referral* – where a re-sit has to be scheduled where a student has failed (or was not present for the first assessment)

First sit – to take an assessment task/s, without attendance, as if for the first time for the merit (actual mark achieved) mark

Re-sit – to re-take the assessments task/s without attendance for a capped mark of 40%

Re-take modules – to repeat core module(s) with attendance, for the merit (actual mark achieved) mark with previous marks expunged from the student's result profile.

Re-take year – to repeat all modules, with attendance, for the merit (actual mark achieved) mark with all previous marks expunged from the student's results profile

The two-tiered undergraduate Boards of Examiner system

The University operates two-tiered Boards of Examiners where each tier has a defined purpose. The lower tier (Tier 1) is responsible for the ratification of module marks on taught programmes and they are concerned purely with the assessment of students within the modules they have taken. The upper tier, the Awards, Progression, Referrals and Deferrals, and Interim Boards of Examiners (Tier 2), is responsible for making decisions on progression and the award of qualifications, and is concerned with student profiles, mitigating circumstances, and academic malpractice.

Tier 1 Boards of Examiners

The Tier 1 Boards are responsible for ensuring that marks awarded are accurately recorded and ratified. Such Boards only consider marks for modules (the consideration of marks for students is the responsibility of the upper tier board).

The Tier 1 Boards shall ensure that due consideration is given to the profile of overall module marks; pass rates; percentage of marks falling in each grade band.

If concerns are raised with regard to any aspect of module assessment, neither the Tier 1 Board nor external examiner are empowered to amend any individual grades. Any recommendations to adjust grades for all students in that category for a particular module, programme or run of marks (i.e. all 2:1s) is allowable. These Boards do not consider the overall performance of students.

Its terms of reference are:

(a) taking an overview of the assessment processes that operate for the programmes and modules (including noting compensation, and noting non-submission of work by students), with a particular view to ensuring fairness and impartiality

(b) to identify any missing information and agree the results of module marks.

Each Department will be responsible for the preparation and reporting of Tier 1 Boards.

Membership

- Chair (Head of Academic Department/Director of Institute)
- Internal examiners for the programmes (i.e. all those programme staff involved with marking/moderation)
- External Examiners for the programmes
- Departmental Administrator

The External Examiner

The role of the External Examiner is to provide informative comment and recommendations upon whether or not:

- an institution is maintaining the threshold academic standards set for its awards in accordance with the frameworks for higher education qualifications and applicable subject benchmark statements
- the assessment process measures student achievement rigorously and fairly against the intended outcomes of the programme(s) and is conducted in line with the institution's policies and regulations
- the academic standards and the achievements of students are comparable with those in other UK higher education institutions of which the external examiners have experience.

Award/Progression/Referrals and Deferrals/ Interim (Tier 2) Boards of Examiners

These Boards are responsible for decisions regarding progression and the award of qualifications on a named programme or suite of programmes.

Undergraduate Programmes Progression and Award Boards of Examiners

These Boards (currently divided into four Boards across subject areas) will meet annually (normally in June), after all the Tier 1 Boards, to receive recommendations for awards endorsed by the External Examiners. Any areas of unresolved difficulty in the work of the Tier 1 Board of Examiners may be passed to this Board for resolution. The Undergraduate Programmes Awards Boards will make awards on behalf of the Academic Board, within the provisions of the Academic Regulations. They will also review standards and levels of achievement across the programmes and monitor the application of the assessment regulations for undergraduate programmes.

The membership of the Undergraduate Programmes Award Board will be:

- Chair – Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Student Experience);
- Heads of Academic Department/Director of Institute or their nominee representing all undergraduate programmes;
- Chief External Examiner for Undergraduate Programmes;

- Officer from Academic Quality and Standards Service;
- Officer from Academic Registry;
- Academic Registry Assessment Manager or nominee
- Director of Quality and Standards or nominee

Undergraduate Programmes Awards/Progression/Referrals and Deferrals Board of Examiners

A Progression Board of Examiners will be convened in late August/early September to agree the progression of students between FHEQ Levels 4, 5 and 6 where they have been referred or deferred by the Undergraduate Programmes Award Board. The membership of this Board will be:

- Chair – Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Student Experience);
- Chief External Examiner;
- Heads of Academic Department/Director of Institute or their nominee representing all undergraduate programmes;
- Officer from Academic Quality and Standards Service;
- Officer from Academic Registry;
- Academic Registry Assessment Manager or nominee
- Director of Quality and Standards or nominee

Undergraduate Programmes Interim Board of Examiners

The Interim Board will meet at the start of the second semester (normally in February) to deal with referred and deferred candidates. It will award credit to students wishing to transfer out of the institution and make Awards where appropriate. This Board will also consider those cases where failure in modules requires re-assessment or termination of registration. Where this applies the Interim Board will have the discretion to allow re-assessment of a candidate in failed modules and to determine the nature and timing of any re-assessment. The membership of this Board will be:

- Chair – Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Student Experience);
- Heads of Academic Department/Director of Institute or their nominee representing all undergraduate programmes;
- Chief External Examiner for Undergraduate Programmes;
- Officer from Academic Quality and Standards Service;
- Officer from Academic Registry;
- Academic Registry Assessment Manager or nominee
- Director of Quality and Standards or nominee

These Boards of Examiners' terms of reference as set out below are to:

- a) ensure current institutional regulations on progression and award are operated correctly;
- b) ensure the guiding principle of fairness for the whole group of students, not just particular individuals, is operated;
- c) ensure marks and awards confirmed in the name of the University are appropriate for qualifications at the level and in the subject under consideration;
- d) ensure compensation, if any, is correctly awarded;
- e) approve claims of mitigating circumstances and, where valid, to approve any proposed actions to be taken;
- f) approve the progression of students to alternative programmes, if applicable;
- g) agree the exclusion of students due to failure;
- h) agree award and classification;
- i) agree actions in the event of failure of a module by a student, including resit provisions;
- j) determine the results of any allegation of academic malpractice.

The Academic Quality and Standards Service will service all Tier 2 Boards of Examiners. Documentation will be generated and provided by the Academic Registry, who will also act as officers to these Boards, to advise on the Academic Regulations. Reporting is by exception.

Role of the Chief External Examiner for Undergraduate Programmes

Chief External Examiners are members of the Awards Boards of Examiners operated by the University (which have responsibility for the final recommendations made to the Academic Board) and they utilise their knowledge and experience of academic standards and student performance elsewhere to give advice on particular issues emerging from their participation.

Chief External Examiners are required to submit an annual report to the University. This report makes an important contribution to the monitoring and evaluation of taught provision and to the University's quality management processes.

REGULATIONS ON EXTERNAL EXAMINERS

All programmes will appoint an external examiner in keeping with the "External examining at the University of Chichester" requirements.

PART 10 APPEALS

Early Resolution: Undergraduate and Postgraduate

10.1 Querying of a grade can only occur prior to the Board of Examiners for the student's programme. Beyond that point the student's only redress is to consider whether they have grounds for appeal. However, it should be noted that appeals cannot be made against academic judgement.

10.2 Stage One: Students who query their grade should in the first instance be encouraged to review their work in the light of the assessment criteria and the marker's comments. The student should also be made aware of the rigorous internal and external moderation processes of which their work has formed a part (whether it was second marked or not). If they still feel there is a mismatch they should be encouraged to meet with the marker in order to develop a better understanding of their performance as it relates to the assessment criteria. If in reviewing the students' work and the grade awarded in relation to the assessment criteria the marker feels that he/she has overlooked or mis-read/misinterpreted some element of the work which would have an impact on the grade, he/she could recommend a change of grade to the module coordinator (if the marks have not already been considered by the Board of Examiners).

10.3 Stage Two: If Stage One does not resolve the query then the marker can refer the issue to the Module Coordinator or Head of Academic Department (if the student has already seen the Module Coordinator as part of Stage One). At this stage the Module Coordinator or Head of Academic Department may either confirm the grade or, if they felt an error had been made in the marking process, arrange for the work to be re-marked by a second (or third marker, if it has already been subject to second marking). A revised mark would then be submitted to the Board of Examiners via the Assessment Office. The revised mark may be higher or lower than the original mark. It is hoped that by the end of this stage the student will have had their queries addressed in a satisfactory manner and has either come to accept the original grade or accepted a new grade as result of a re-marking process. Under the

Regulations there are no grounds for an appeal based on academic judgement, and therefore any student who remains particularly aggrieved about a grade would have no further scope for redress within the University.

Appeal against the decision of a Board of Examiners by undergraduate (and all postgraduate students)

10.4 Students aggrieved by a decision of a Board of Examiners shall have a right of appeal if they produce evidence of one or more of the following:

- a. that procedures were not followed properly;
- b. that the decision reached, or the outcome, was unreasonable;
- c. That the University did not consider the request properly, for example, it overlooked information that the student had included;
- d. That the provider did not give reasons for its decision;
- e. That the student has new material evidence that they were unable, for good reason, to provide earlier in the process;
- f. That there was a reasonable perception of bias during the process;
- g. mitigating circumstances where, for good reason, the academic body was not made aware of a significant factor relating to the assessment of a student when it made its original decision. If the appeal is based on mitigating circumstances, evidence must be produced; if the appeal is based on evidence that the student had been previously unwilling to divulge to the Board of Examiners, the letter should set out the reasons why the student was unwilling to produce such evidence at an earlier stage and provide any appropriate supporting documentary or medical evidence.
- h. in reaching its decision, the Board of Examiners had erroneously concluded that they had cheated or plagiarised or attempted to gain an unfair advantage in an element of work submitted for a degree;
- i. in the case of academic malpractice, that the penalty applied was disproportionate.

Appeals will be resolved without prejudice to the appellant.

10.5 The following are not considered to be legitimate grounds for an academic appeal:

- where a student questions the exercise of academic judgment, that is, the decision made by academic staff on the quality of the work itself or the criteria being applied to mark the work (rather than the administrative marking process);
- where there is disagreement about the way mitigating circumstances were considered, unless there is clear evidence that the defined procedures were not followed by the mitigating circumstances panel and/or the mitigating circumstances panel's recommendation was not properly considered by the board of examiners.

10.6 If a group of students wishes to appeal, a spokesperson should be identified to act on behalf of the group. One appeal should be submitted but agreement indicated by the signature of all students included within the collective action.

10.7 Students may not question the academic judgement of the examiners and any request based on such grounds will be dismissed.

10.8 Students wishing to make an appeal and who have evidence of mitigating circumstances unknown to the Board of Examiners when it made its recommendation, or allegations of error or irregularity, should in the first instance discuss the matter with the Director of Quality and Standards (or his or her nominee). At this stage the matter can be referred to the DVC by the Director, who may advise the student that the Board of Examiners will re-consider its decision, taking into account the new evidence, and that the appeal is not necessary.

10.9 If the discussions referred to fail to resolve the issue, students should write to the Director of Quality and Standards (or nominee) setting out the grounds for the appeal and the revised decision they seek. A request for an appeal should reach the Director of Quality and Standards or nominee within 14 calendar days of either on-line release of confirmed marks (including degree classification if applicable) following a Board of Examiners meeting and/or receipt of a communication of a decision of the Board of Examiners, which relates to progression and/or award. Provided that the procedural grounds for an appeal (including but not limited to applicable time limits, provision of evidence, and suitable grounds for reconsideration) are met, the Director of Quality and Standards will refer the matter to an Appeals Panel. If a student believes that the Director of Quality and Standards has refused to refer based on an error in his or her interpretation of these Regulations, the matter should be referred for review, in accordance with the Regulations. If appropriate, the Director of Quality and Standards will refer the written appeal to the department concerned for a written response to be provided alongside the student's appeal to the Appeals Panel. A copy of the department's written response will be provided to the student, who should raise any matters of factual inaccuracy immediately with the Director of Quality and Standards.

10.10 The Director of Quality and Standards will refer the matter to an Appeals Panel. The Panel will be chaired by the Vice-Chancellor or designate and will consist of one other member of the Academic Board and one member from Boards of Examiners other than the Board against which the Appeal is lodged. It will also include a representative of the Students' Union. The composition of the Panel will be in line with the University's Equality and Diversity Policy. The Director of Quality and Standards (or nominee) will usually be in attendance.

10.11 The Panel may:

- (i) dismiss the Appeal if the grounds are unsubstantiated or if in the case of alleged mitigating circumstances these would not have affected the recommendation of the Board of Examiners;
- (ii) uphold the student's case and advise a new outcome;
- (iv) dismiss the case but request a change in the procedures of the Programme or of the Board of Examiners.

10.12 Appeals Panels will not strike out appeals solely because of minor procedural deficiencies in the application.

10.13 The Panel shall instruct the Chair of the Appeals Panel (or nominee) to convey its decision in writing to the student as soon as possible after the conclusion of the hearing and not later than 14 calendar days after the hearing.

10.14 The registered status of any student who lodges an appeal under the provisions above may be reinstated (providing this is possible within the constraints of the programme) on a provisional basis. In the event of an appeal being rejected, the provisional registration will no longer be valid and will be terminated.

10.15 If a student is dissatisfied with the outcome of the formal stage, he or she may be able to request a review within two weeks of the notification of the outcome of the Panel. Guidance may be sought from the Students' Union. A request for a review may be on limited grounds, including but not confined to:

- a review of the procedures followed at the formal stage
- a consideration of whether the outcome was reasonable in all the circumstances
- new material evidence which the student was unable, for valid reasons, to provide earlier in the process.

10.16 The university will allocate the request for review to a designated member of staff not involved at any previous stage. This allocation will clarify exactly what is being reviewed, and to ensure that both the reviewer and the student understand the purpose and scope of the review. The reviewer will ascertain whether the matter needs to be referred back to the Chair of the Appeals Panel for reconsideration.

10.17 Appellants who have exhausted the internal appeals procedures will be issued with a formal Completion of Procedures letter within 28 calendar days and may then consider applying to pursue their cause through the Office of the Independent Adjudicator, within 12 months of the issue of the Completion of Procedures letter.


10.18 Acceptance of an award, for example by attendance at an awards ceremony to receive the award, will be taken as agreement to the decision of the Board of Examiners by the student concerned. In such circumstances, no further appeal will be allowed.

10.19 These procedures are operated without prejudice to a student's right to pursue legal remedies outside the University, but excludes any form of legal representation within the University's procedures.

10.20 The University is part of the Scheme provided by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (<https://www.oiahe.org.uk/students/>). The OIA will provide a final level of opportunity for students whose complaints or appeals may not have been resolved to their satisfaction, through the University's regulatory procedures. Once all internal avenues have been exhausted, such students would be issued with a Completion of Procedures Letter by the University. They may then seek advice on the range and remit of services provided by the OIA and should make their application to the OIA within 12 months of the date of issue of the Completion of Procedures Letter.

10.21 The Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA) runs an independent scheme to review student complaints. The University is a member of this scheme. Students may be able to ask the OIA to review you're the matter. You normally need to have completed all internal procedures before you complain to the OIA. We will send a "Completion of Procedures Letter" when there are no further steps to be taken internally. If the matter is not upheld, we will issue a Completion of Procedures Letter automatically. If the matter is upheld or partly upheld you may ask for a Completion of Procedures Letter. There is more information about Completion of Procedures Letters

here: <https://www.oiahe.org.uk/providers/completion-of-procedures-letters>.



PART 11 MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES

11.1 Any undergraduate or postgraduate student who believes that there are circumstances which might have led them to be unable to submit or have seriously affected his or her performance in an assessment and which he or she wishes a Board of Examiners to take into consideration, shall, before the point of assessment, complete the declaration form on mitigating circumstances and submit it with appropriate independent corroborating documentary evidence, e.g. a medical certificate, hospital discharge letter, midwife report, coroner's report or correspondence from a court or tribunal, to the Academic Quality and Standards Service. Students who feel they have good cause for failing to meet workload requirements, for example, due to short-term personal or medical circumstances may apply for such to be taken into account.

11.2 The mitigating circumstances will be considered by a Board of Examiners' Chair who will accept or reject the application and report the outcome to the relevant Board of Examiners. Fraudulent claims for mitigating circumstances or breaches of ethics procedures, including relying on forged or falsified documentation to gain an advantage will be dealt with through the University's disciplinary procedure.

11.3 Where an application is accepted it will be taken by the Board of Examiners as mitigation against failure in that module only, resulting in a waiving of the assessment undertaken and provision being made for the student to take the assessment as a first attempt. Students will usually only be permitted a maximum of four attempts (including the original first sit and the re-sit) at an assessment.

11.4 All work submitted for examination, for which an application for mitigating circumstances has been made, shall be marked at face value and the marks shall be submitted to the Board of Examiners in the normal way. Marks are not altered as a result of a student's claim for mitigation.

11.5 Evidence of mitigating circumstances cannot usually be taken into account retrospectively (unless such circumstances have been revealed through the Appeals process and the applicant's Appeal has been upheld and referred back to the Board of Examiners for reconsideration of the original

candidature, in the light of the mitigating circumstances).

Students may self-certificate absence from an examination(s) for a maximum of seven consecutive calendar days in an assessment period, this includes online exams, and other scheduled activities such as performances, and for a maximum of once per semester. Self-certification does not apply to coursework as it is possible to arrange and agree an extension to deadlines. In exceptional circumstances, where a student is prevented from attending an examination due to short-term, acute circumstances e.g. a migraine or sickness and diarrhoea, and who are unable to obtain medical evidence of this, they may wish to self-certify. Students may then use self-certification if they are unable to provide any other form of evidence. The circumstances must be out of the student's control – the student could not have prevented them.

Self-certification as evidence for mitigating circumstances is only available for individual examinations and will not be accepted for:

- absence from a group assessment
- 'in-class' assessments, including presentations, whether held within or without the University's assessment periods
- an extension/adjustment to a coursework deadline
- absence from a practice placement
- an examination that the student attended (self-certification is only applicable to non-attendance of assessments)

Students may self-certificate absence from an examination(s) for a maximum of seven consecutive calendar days in an examination period, using the self-certification form. For absence of more than seven consecutive calendar days, or for a further mitigating circumstances claim in the same examination period, medical or other evidence is required.

Students who are absent from an examination and who self-certificate will be required to undertake the examination at the next scheduled time the examination is run, normally in the 're-sit' period. The student will be offered a further attempt on the same basis as the missed assessment i.e. if a first sit attempt assessment was missed, a further first attempt will be offered, if a reassessment was missed, a further reassessment attempt will be offered. Normally, the further attempt will be in the format of an examination, however, a different form of re-assessment to assess whether the learning outcomes are achieved, as determined by the Institute/Department, may be recommended if the same or equivalent of the original is no longer possible. The only potential outcome of a self-certificated absence claim is a further attempt at the assessment.

Students should be aware that if they self-certify their absence from a reassessment examination, they may be prevented from progressing to the next stage of study, if the progression requirements of the programme have not been met. Subject to the progression requirements of the programme, some students may be able to proceed to the next stage of study, carrying the outstanding assessment.

Claims which are believed to give fraudulent reasons for absence from the assessment will be investigated and if the claim is found to be fraudulent, disciplinary action may be taken. Additionally, the mark of 0 for the missed assessment will be recorded as the final mark for that assessment for the purposes of progression and classification. This means that a further reassessment opportunity will only be offered if required or permitted by regulations.

PART 12 PROCEDURES FOR DISCIPLINARY ACTION AGAINST STUDENTS

12.1 Under the provisions of Clause 26 of the Articles of Association a student may be suspended or his or her registration on a programme of study terminated for misconduct.

Misconduct is here defined as:

- i. An action militating against the welfare or well-being of the University or its staff or students.
- ii. Obstruction or improper interference with the functions, duties or activities of any student, member of staff or other employee (direct or indirect) of the University or any authorised visitor to the University.
- iii. Conduct which disrupts or is likely to disrupt teaching, study, examining, research or administration in the University, or which obstructs or is likely to obstruct any student in pursuit of his/her studies or the duties of any employee of the University in the performance of his/her duties.
- iv. Conduct considered to be in breach of the accepted standards of the profession for which the student is being prepared.
- v. Violent, indecent, disorderly, threatening or offensive behaviour or language whilst on University premises or engaged in any University activity.
- vi. Fraud, deceit, deception or dishonesty in relation to the University, its staff, or students whether in connection with holding any office in the University or in relation to being a student of the University.
- vii. Action likely to cause injury or impair the safety of oneself or others on University premises or engaged in any University activity.
- viii. Breach of the provisions of the University's Equality and Diversity Policy or harassment.
- ix. Breach of the provisions of any Code or University rule or regulation which provides for breaches to constitute misconduct under this Code.
- x. Damage to or defacement of University property or of the property of the members of the University community caused intentionally or recklessly; misappropriation of such property.
- xi. Misuse or unauthorised use of University premises or items of property.
- xii. Misuse or unauthorised use of University IT equipment and systems.
- xiii. Conduct which constitutes a criminal offence² where that conduct took place on University premises; or affected or concerned other members of the University community; or damages the good name of the University; or itself constitutes misconduct within the terms of this Code; or is an offence of dishonesty where the student holds an office of responsibility within the University.
- xiv. Behaviour which brings the University into disrepute.
- xv. Failure to disclose name and other relevant details to an officer or employee of the University in circumstances when it is reasonable to require that such information be given.
- xvi. Failure to comply with a previously imposed penalty under these procedures.
- xvii. Failure to leave any of the University premises when reasonably requested to do so by an officer or employee of the University or other person duly authorised.

12.2 The definition of misconduct applies to University premises and to conduct outside the University likely to bring the University into disrepute. Misconduct in privately managed accommodation may result in disciplinary action being taken by the Head of Academic Department (or in their absence their line manager) based on the outcome of an investigation carried out under the direction of the Director of Estate Management or nominee. In cases where the alleged perpetrator and victim are students, the Accommodation Office would draw upon the Student Support and Well-Being team to support a satisfactory resolution through informal means, if possible, without the necessity for recourse to the formal stages of this policy.

12.3 In respect of damage, defacement or unauthorised removal of library property, the Director of Learning and Information Services shall have the power, where s/he deems it to be necessary and

² This includes the handling, possession or use of any illegal drug.

appropriate, to suspend access to library resources for a specified period.

12.4 Students are required to pay for damage to or the loss of University property for which they are held responsible.

12.5 The student will be advised in writing at his or her last known address of any charge to be raised. Prompt payment is required. Any dispute concerning such a charge will be referred forthwith to the Financial Controller for determination. If liability is disputed, the matter may be referred to a Disciplinary Panel; or the University may seek to recover the cost of damage through legal action.

12.6 Students retain full responsibility for any action involving the consumption of alcohol or the misuse of substances.

12.7 An allegation of misconduct not as above will first be investigated by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor or designate. In cases of major student misconduct, the Vice-Chancellor, the Deputy Vice-Chancellors or Pro Vice-Chancellor shall each have the power, where s/he deems it to be necessary and appropriate, to suspend a student from a programme of study and/or from entering University premises for a maximum of 14 calendar days, whilst the procedures detailed below are operated. This suspension may take immediate effect and precede the application of Stage One or Stage Two of these procedures detailed below.

12.8 In respect of estate, safety and security related matters, the Director of Estate Management or nominee shall have the power, where s/he deems it to be necessary and appropriate, to exclude a student from entering University premises/land or part thereof, other than for academic purposes, for a maximum of 14 calendar days, whilst the procedures detailed below are operated. This exclusion may take immediate effect and precede the application of Stage One or Two of the procedures detailed in Section 4. The student has a right to elect for an investigation to be conducted by a Disciplinary Panel.

12.9 Minor offences may be dealt with by the relevant service or the programme by an agreed scale of penalties, for example, library fines for books or resources returned late, withdrawal of access to the Learning Resource facilities for disruptive behaviour or misuse of a computer, mark penalties for late submission of coursework etc.

12.10 Where a resident student is deemed to be acting in breach of the Residential Agreement which they have signed with the University, the matter will normally fall outside the procedures detailed here. In such cases, the Director of Estates or nominee will decide, on the evidence available, whether or not the student should be allowed to continue in residence or notice be given that they are temporarily or permanently excluded from their residence. Any student excluded temporarily or permanently would be expected to vacate their room as soon as practicable under legislation protecting tenants in rented accommodation. Following their temporary or permanent exclusion, the student(s) involved will be entitled to appeal to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, as nominee of the Vice-Chancellor, against the decision.

Procedures

This document details the procedures that have been agreed by the Board of Governors to be followed for the investigation and resolution of cases of student misconduct. It is based on the principle that good conduct by students is essential to the maintenance of a high quality learning environment for all. Where appropriate, reasonable adjustments will be made to the procedure to enable all students to participate fully.

12.11 Paragraph 11.7 of the Articles of Association of the University empowers the Board of Governors of the University to make regulations for the conduct of students, including provision for the discipline of students on the grounds of misconduct and for the suspension and expulsion of students for misconduct.

12.12 Paragraph 16.6.8 of the Articles of Association of the University empowers the Vice-Chancellor, reporting to the Board of Governors and within the regulations as published, to be responsible for the maintenance of student discipline, for the suspension or expulsion of students on disciplinary grounds and for implementing decisions to expel students for academic reasons. Paragraph 16.7 of Articles of Association of the University empowers the Vice-Chancellor to delegate authority. This Procedure specifies where designated staff may act with the authority of the Vice-Chancellor to maintain student discipline. Only the Vice-Chancellor may expel a student permanently from the University.

12.13 The Disciplinary Code and procedure for students in University residences should be read along with these procedures by students resident in halls. That Disciplinary Code and procedures relate to students in Halls of Residence and are specific to the accommodation provision. They underpin the Academic Regulations, and the Academic Regulations take precedence over the residential disciplinary procedures, where applicable.

12.14 This procedure deals with cases where the University takes disciplinary action against one of its registered students, through an investigation and, where appropriate, a hearing before a Disciplinary Panel. Cases where a student brings an allegation of misconduct against another student are dealt with under the Complaints Procedure. The relevant member of the senior management team involved in Stage Two or Stage Three of the Complaints Procedure may however decide that, having investigated a complaint under the Complaints Procedure, disciplinary action should then be taken against a student. Thus, the Complaints Procedures may trigger the Disciplinary Procedures. Similarly, if the Harassment Procedures have been applied, resulting in a substantiated accusation, this may trigger the application of these Disciplinary Procedures.

12.15 Students are able to seek advice offered by the Executive Officers of the Students' Union, who are also able to act as the student's 'friend'.

Minor misconduct

12.16 It is expected that cases of minor misconduct will be dealt with informally by the Programme Coordinator. The Director of Estate Management or nominee is empowered to deal with minor misconduct in relation to University residences as set out in the Disciplinary Code and Procedure for students in University residences and managed properties. The Director of Estate Management or nominee is empowered to deal with more serious cases of misconduct as set out in the Disciplinary Code and Procedure for Students in University Residences and Managed Properties. This shall include the recovery of actual costs of damage, where proven.

12.17 The Director of Estate Management or nominee is empowered to deal with minor misconduct in relation to the University estate and the University's bus. This shall include the recovery of the actual costs of damage where proven.

12.18 The procedure detailed below is intended for use in cases of misconduct where such informal procedures are deemed to be inappropriate. However, any staff member dealing with any disciplinary matter, including the most minor misdemeanour, should keep a written record. This should be placed on the student's file and the student provided with a copy of the record. Normally, minor misdemeanours would not be referred to in references to employers.

Misconduct which is, or may be, a criminal offence

12.19 Where a student is the subject of prosecution the University recognises the precedence of such legal processes over the application of this Disciplinary Procedure. In such cases, it is for the Vice-Chancellor or a Deputy Vice-Chancellor to decide whether, and when, action should be taken under these procedures in cases where alleged criminal conduct has been reported to the police and is being investigated, or is being prosecuted or a decision not to prosecute has been taken.

12.20 Where any staff member has reason to believe that any student has committed a criminal offence, the staff member should not attempt to deal with the issue but should refer it immediately to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor. Such matters will be considered under the University's 'Policy on Referral to Police or other relevant authorities of alleged criminal offences'.

12.21 The following procedures will apply where the alleged misconduct constitutes an offence under the criminal law if proved in a court of law.

12.22 Where the offence under criminal law is considered not to be serious, action under these procedures may continue, but such action may be deferred, at the discretion of the Vice-Chancellor, pending any police investigation or prosecution.

12.23 In the case of serious offences under the criminal law, no action will be taken under these procedures unless the matter has been reported to the police and either prosecuted or a decision not to prosecute has been taken, at which time the Deputy Vice-Chancellor shall decide whether disciplinary action under this procedure should continue. A serious offence is deemed to be one in respect of which a custodial sentence could be given in the event that the student is found guilty of the offence.

12.24 Where a finding of misconduct is made and the student has also been sentenced by a criminal court in respect of the same facts, the court's penalty shall be taken into consideration in determining any penalty under these procedures.

12.25 If the police or the Crown Prosecution Service decides not to prosecute, the University may, exceptionally, proceed with action under these procedures depending on the reasons for the non-prosecution.

12.26 The University will refer to the police all offences relating to controlled drugs³.

12.27 The Vice-Chancellor, or in his/her absence the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, may decide to suspend a student where their conduct is under police investigation or the subject of prosecutions, pending the outcome of the matter. This suspension may exceed the 14 days specified above. In such cases, the suspension will be reviewed on a monthly basis and any fresh evidence will be considered at that point. The student involved shall be informed of the review process.

Procedures

Stage One

12.28 When an allegation of misconduct is made against a student, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor or designate will come to a judgement on whether investigation is necessary. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor or designate will appoint a member of staff (usually the Head of Department / Institute Director) to carry out a formal investigation and draw up a written report. The investigating officer will interview the complainant and any other interested parties. The investigating officer will produce a written report, summarising the evidence and making a recommendation as to whether or not there is a case to answer.

³ See *Policy on referral to Police* or other relevant authorities of alleged criminal offences.

This investigation will be conducted as soon as possible and normally be completed within 21 calendar days of the allegation being made. On completion of the investigation the Deputy Vice-Chancellor or designate will decide whether further action is necessary. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor or designate may decide that:

- there is no case to be answered, the student will be informed that the issue is closed and no record of the allegation will be made in the student's record; or
 - disciplinary action is justified and;
- (i) the case should be dealt with summarily by means of a verbal reprimand, not recorded on the student's file; or
- (ii) the case should be dealt with summarily by means of a verbal reprimand, a record of which will be kept on the student's file for two years (normally such cases will not be referred to in references to employers); or
- (iii) the case should be referred to a Disciplinary Panel through the Director of Quality and Standards; the Deputy Vice-Chancellor or designate may also recommend to the Vice-Chancellor that the student be suspended until the Disciplinary Panel meets;
- (iv) in clauses (i) and (ii) above, the student can be required to pay for damage caused, make an apology or other form of reparation.

12.29 The student, against whom the allegation has been made, has the right to opt for a hearing before a Disciplinary Panel if dissatisfied with the outcome under (i) or (ii) above.

Stage Two: Disciplinary Panel

12.30 Following the Investigating Officer's recommendation, as a result of Stage One of the procedure, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor or designate will appoint a Disciplinary Panel to hear the case. In cases where the Deputy Vice-Chancellor or designate has been involved in events that have led to a meeting of the Disciplinary Panel, a member (or officer) of the Chief Executive's Team or designate (including the Director of Quality and Standards) with no previous involvement in the case will act to appoint the Panel. This Panel will meet normally within 14 calendar days of receipt of the Investigating Officer's recommendation to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor or designate.

12.31 A Disciplinary Panel will normally comprise:
The Chair of the Panel and two disinterested members (drawn from the senior management team)
President or Vice President of the Students' Union

12.32 No person who has been involved in the events that have led to a meeting of a Disciplinary Panel, or who are deemed by the Chair of the Panel to have an involvement in the case, will be eligible to serve. In appointing a Disciplinary Panel due regard will be given to the balance of the Panel.

Procedure Prior to the Hearing

12.33 Once the decision has been made to refer an allegation of misconduct to a Disciplinary Panel, the Director of Quality and Standards will:

12.34 Receive from the Investigating Officer (the Investigating Officer may be a representative of the Students' Union) a written statement on the case, detailing the specific charges to be answered and the outcome of the investigation at Stage One.

12.35 The Director of Quality and Standards will convene the meeting; and will dispatch to the members of the Panel copies of:

- (i) The notice convening the meeting;

- (ii) The statement of the case that is to be investigated
- (iii) The summary of the evidence;
- (iv) This procedural document;
- (v) A reminder that Panel members should not discuss the case prior to the meeting of the Panel.

12.36 The Director of Quality and Standards will also send copies of the notice of the meeting, the statement of complaint, the summary of the evidence and the procedural document to the student against whom the complaint is made. The Director of Quality and Standards will additionally advise the student that:

- (i) He or she is entitled to be present during the hearing, though not for the deliberations of the Panel, accompanied if s/he so wishes by a friend, who may offer moral support and/or ensure that the procedures are followed properly. A 'friend' may include a representative from the Students' Union, other personal friend or family member, but excludes any form of legal representation;
- (ii) He or she may question all evidence presented to the Panel, either personally or through his or her friend;
- (iii) He or she may present evidence personally, or through his or her friend or by summoning witnesses; and that the Panel may question the evidence offered;
- (iv) The names of witnesses to be called by the student must be lodged with the Director of Quality and Standards at least five calendar days before the meeting of the Panel;
- (v) The proceedings of the Disciplinary Panel would not be invalidated if the student failed to appear or be represented at the meeting and the meeting would be deferred only in exceptional circumstances.

12.37 The Director of Quality and Standards will arrange for the attendance at the meeting of witnesses. Witnesses will be informed that attendance at the Disciplinary Panel takes precedence over all other University commitments. Witnesses will be provided with the following:

- (i) the notice convening the meeting;
- (ii) the statement of the allegation of misconduct that is to be investigated;
- (iii) a reminder that witnesses should not discuss the case prior to the hearing.

Costs of witnesses attending the Disciplinary Panel will be borne by the student involved.

Procedure at the Hearing

12.38 Before the proceedings of the Disciplinary Panel commence, the Chair will:

- (i) investigate where necessary the reasons for any absence of the student against whom the complaint is made or his or her representative or any witness; and decide whether the meeting should continue or be deferred;
- (ii) ensure that the Panel is satisfied that the student concerned is aware of the extent of his or her rights to represent his or her case to the Committee.

12.39 The Disciplinary Panel will hear the evidence supporting the allegation of misconduct; allow the student concerned (or friend) to question the evidence or witnesses; and ask such questions as they may consider necessary to explore and test the evidence. The student will then be invited to provide a statement or produce evidence or witnesses to refute the complaint. Any such evidence may be questioned by the Panel.

12.40 The Panel will then withdraw to consider the evidence and decide whether the complaint has been substantiated. In reaching its findings, the Panel will be guided by the accepted rules of evidence⁴

⁴ The standard of proof that will be applied is the 'balance of probabilities' test. The presiding member of staff is required

and the relevance of evidence to the specific nature of the complaint; it should make due allowance for any difficulty that the student may have experienced in presenting his or her case, especially in questioning any written evidence. In making its decision on action to be recommended, the Panel will pay regard to the student's previous record of conduct.

12.41 The Disciplinary Panel may impose any of the following penalties:

- (i) no action should be taken against the student.
- (ii) the student should be given a formal warning that further misconduct could result in expulsion;
or
- (iii) the student should be suspended for a period that will vary with the severity of the case; or
- (iv) the student be excluded; or
- (v) the student should pay for damage for which he or she has been found responsible; or
- (vi) the student be required to pay a fine, appropriate costs (e.g. for damage) or to make appropriate restitution and/or that the student should carry out an appropriate period of service to the University community.

12.42 The Panel may also recommend the expulsion of the student to the Vice-Chancellor. The Chair of the Panel will inform the student of the findings and recommendations of the Panel and the reasons for them. The Director of Quality and Standards will confirm the findings and recommendations in writing to the student concerned, the members of the Panel and the Vice-Chancellor. The Director of Quality and Standards will also inform the student that:

- (i) he or she may appeal to the Vice-Chancellor against the Disciplinary Panel's decision;
- (ii) any appeal to the Vice-Chancellor must be submitted in writing to the Director of the Quality and Standards within 14 calendar days of the decision of Disciplinary Panel being announced;
- (iii) a record of the outcome of the case will be kept on the student's file and may, where relevant, be referred to in references to employers.

12.43 If no appeal is received by the due date, the Director of Quality and Standards will issue the student with a Completion of Procedures letter.

Definitions

12.44 'Suspension' refers to a total prohibition on attendance at or access to the University and on any participation in University activities, but it may be subject to qualification, such as permission to attend for the purpose of assessment.

12.45 'Exclusion' involves selective restriction on attendance at or access to the University or prohibition on exercising the functions or duties of any office or committee membership in the University or the Students' Union for a specified period, the exact details to be specified in writing.

12.46 'Expulsion' involves the permanent withdrawal of the student from all activities concerned with the University.

12.47 An order of suspension or exclusion may include a requirement that the student should have no contact of any kind with a named person or persons.

Appeal to Vice-Chancellor

to consider whether, looking at all the evidence objectively, it is possible to say that it is more probable than not that the allegation is correct. In other words, has the party making the allegation satisfied the member of staff overseeing the process that the allegation has substance.

12.48 On receipt of an appeal against the decision of a Disciplinary Panel, the Vice-Chancellor will decide the action to be taken. An appeal will be considered normally within 14 calendar days of its receipt. In considering the appeal, the Vice-Chancellor will not normally re-examine the evidence but will judge both the application of the procedures detailed above and also the merits of the decision made by the Panel.

12.49 The Vice-Chancellor will inform the student concerned, and the members of the Disciplinary Panel, of the outcome of the appeal (and the reasons behind it). The Director of Quality and Standards will issue the student with a Completion of Procedures letter.

Independent Adjudicator

12.50 Any further correspondence on the issue would be addressed through the student seeking recourse through the services offered by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator, under the rules and regulations published by that office (www.oiahe.org.uk).