

SUMMARY OF CHANGES TO ACADEMIC REGULATIONS, PROCEDURES AND PROCESSES

Academic Regulations

Reference	Rationale	Regulations Change (New text in bold , deleted in strikethrough)
F7 Examination Arrangements	Clarifying that the principles of the code of conduct for examinations apply equally to all types of formal timed assessment i.e. reasonable adjustments and arrangements for effective invigilation must be in place	F7.2 The University operates a strict Code of Conduct in relation to the behaviour of examination candidates, as set out in Appendix 3c (The Conduct of Assessment). A copy is made available to all examination candidates. The principles of invigilation (see Appendix 3c Section 7) and arrangements for students requiring additional examination arrangements (see Appendix 3c Section 12) shall also apply to 'in-class tests' and other types of assessment that take the form of a formal timed assessment.
F8.6 Module Reassessment	Making clear that this option is available when the module in question (or a suitable alternative) is available in the next academic session.	F8.6 Providing there is no conflict with professional statutory or regulatory body requirements when a student has failed both the original assessment and the reassessment for a module, and where there is evidence of engagement with the reassessment process, and the module (or a suitable alternative) is available , the student shall be entitled to retake the module on one occasion within the following limits: Level 3 – 120 credits Level 4 – 120 credits Level 5 and 6 combined – 120 credits Level 7 – up to the total credit value of the award
F11 Assessment Boards	<p>Removing Quality Enhancement Boards. A review is underway to agree how to formally engage with EEs during 24/25, to be confirmed and communicated by Sep/Oct 24</p> <p>Extending options for the Chairing of UPABs to include HLTSEs</p>	<p>(Removal of QEBs throughout)</p> <p>F11.8 University Progression and Award Board Membership of the University Progression and Award Board (UPAB), comprises: • Chair (Dean/Director of Institute, or Institute Centre, the Head of Learning Teaching and Student Experience or the Dean for Student Success)</p>

	<p>Addition of a new function for the UPAB for completing apprentices, in light of the new Procedures for the Quality Assurance of End Point Assessment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The relevant Head of Learning Teaching and Student Experience (where not chairing) • Relevant Programme Leaders (University and Partners) • Relevant Module Leaders • Assessment, Awards and Compliance Manager (Academic Registry) or their nominee • Chief Subject Examiners <p>F11.9 For Finalists</p> <p>.1 receives finalised module marks for each student to approve applied award rules in accordance with the regulations</p> <p>.2 approves applied rules in relation to borderline cases that determine the final award</p> <p>.3 approves applied rules in relation to compensation and reassessment decisions in accordance with the regulations</p> <p>.4 makes recommendations to the Academic Board in relation to posthumous and ægrotat awards (see H6.1)</p> <p>.5 ensures comparability of treatment for students in the interpretation of regulations and with reference to precedents across different subjects and programmes of study</p> <p>.6 determines the award for students in debt to the University. A decision as to whether to confer the award will be determined in line with the University’s Student Financial Regulations</p> <p>.7 receive confirmation of satisfactory sampling of gateway requirements being met for apprentices being presented for the confirmation of the final academic award and the apprenticeship.</p>
<p>G Termination of Study</p>	<p>Extension of the regulation to cover student groups/classes being disrupted - not just client groups in clinical settings.</p>	<p>G6.3 Exceptionally, where there is evidence that the presence of a student is detrimental to the physical, educational or emotional safety or well-being of a client group or to the University community, or evidence that the student has failed to establish effective working relationships with professional colleagues, or where behaviour is deemed to amount to unprofessional conduct, a recommendation may be made for termination of the student’s registration on the programme in accordance with the Student Code of Conduct.</p>

H Classification of Awards	Introduction of classification to the award of Graduate Diploma, enabling all students on a Graduate Diploma to obtain a classified award.	(Addition of Graduate Diploma to the table H3.5 and linked section)
I Appeals Regulations	Removal of the 3rd grounds for appeal, instead directing any student with allegations of unfair treatment or bias <u>directly</u> to the complaints process, streamlining the process and reducing the administrative burden of taking this through both appeals and complaint processes	<p>I2.1 Valid grounds for consideration of an appeal will be restricted to circumstances:</p> <p>.1 where there has been or could have been material administrative error or procedural irregularity which has affected the student's results</p> <p>.2 where significant new evidence concerning extenuating circumstances which for good reason had not been available to the MCB or UPAB (for example a medical condition which had not been diagnosed at the time of the Board) has been produced; appeals on these grounds will be referred to the EC Panel</p> <p>.3 where unfair treatment, bias or perception of bias is alleged as part of the assessment or other relevant process which for good reason had not been considered previously under the University Complaints Procedure. Where the third ground for appeal is applicable the issue will be forwarded and processed through the formal Student Complaints Procedure.</p> <p>.3 Where re-registration to re-attend a module following reassessment (F8.6) has not been offered and there is new evidence relating to the student's engagement or non-engagement with reassessment, which had not been available to the UPAB, for good reason, at the time of making that decision.</p> <p>All the timescales for the complaints procedure are available within the procedures,</p>
J External Examiners	<p>Extending responsibilities to reflect specific responsibilities of a small number of EEs who, for Apprenticeships, will be appointed to provide the quality assurance of End Point Assessment (in line with the QA of EPA Policy).</p> <p>Further changes to reflect the removal of Quality Enhancement Boards.</p>	<p>J2.4 External Examiners have responsibilities in relation to Programmes and modules, and (in the case of some integrated apprenticeships) for the internal quality assurance of End Point Assessment. The University will ensure appropriate coverage of these areas through the appointments process.</p> <p>J3.2 External Examiners are concerned with assessment in Levels 5 and 6 of Bachelor's degrees, for the whole of Foundation degree, Graduate and Postgraduate awards and with the whole of Undergraduate awards that are not divided into parts, as well as all target awards. External moderation by Subject Examiners is confirmed through the Module Confirmation Board.</p> <p>J3.3 External Examiners appointed to undertake the internal quality</p>

		<p>assurance of End Point Assessment are concerned with ensuring the consistency and quality of assessment for EPA, in line with the University's Quality Assurance Procedures for End Point Assessment.</p> <p>J3.3 Attendance Engagement with at appropriate Assessment Board activity s is a primary function. Subject Examiners confirm external moderation of work through the Module Confirmation Board process. attend the Quality Enhancement Board, Chief Examiners attend the University Progression and Award Board. Chief Examiners attending the University Progression and Award Board follow agreed processes to confirm that they are satisfied with the outcome of Board deliberations.</p>
<p>Apprenticeships</p>	<p>Add the following to respective sections of the regulations to reflect any specific Apprenticeship requirements and ensure clarity for learners and staff involved in these programmes.</p> <p>These regulations reflect current practice i.e. do not represent a change in practice, rather greater clarity within regulations.</p>	<p>AWARDS</p> <p>B3.8 Higher and Degree Apprenticeships The University may only make those degree awards listed in C1.3. Degree apprenticeship awards are made to those apprentices who have been registered for, and who have satisfactorily followed, the programme linked to that award, and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • who have successfully completed the programme associated with that award and met any other requirements as specified in the programme specification, and • who have been awarded the required credits, and • who have successfully completed the required on the job learning and end-point assessment as set out in the apprenticeship standard and assessment plan. <p>The degree certificate is issued by the University. The apprenticeship is confirmed by an end-point assessment organisation (EPAO), which could be the University, once the end-point assessment is successfully completed and degree apprenticeship certificates are issued by the Apprenticeship Assessment Service.</p> <p>ADMISSIONS</p> <p>E2.4 Applicants are required to meet all ESFA requirements for an apprentice (e.g. be in employment in a relevant job role, and also meet any academic entry requirements set by the university. Whilst ESFA set functional skills at level 2 as a requirement for Gateway to End Point Assessment, the university may set this or a higher standard as an entry requirement for a specific programme depending on the skills required for that programme. Where level 2 English and Maths are an academic entry requirement for the programme this must be in place before the apprenticeship commences. Exceptionally,</p>

		<p>apprentices who cannot provide evidence of level 2 English and Mathematics may be permitted to register to the programme of study, in which case they must gain their level 2 English and Mathematics qualifications before the gateway for the End Point Assessment.</p> <p>APL</p> <p>C6.7 Higher and Degree Apprenticeships</p> <p>.1 All applicants to a degree apprenticeship programme should complete an Initial Needs Assessment to ascertain whether they will be exempt from part(s) of the programme based on prior knowledge, skills and behaviour. Exemption from the programme of study is subject to the applicant meeting the requirements of the University's APL procedures and processes.</p> <p>.2 Where an apprentice is exempted from a part(s) of their programme of study based on prior study/experiential learning, the content (and possibly the duration of the apprentice's study) will be reduced to reflect this. Any reduction in duration should meet the minimum threshold of the individual needing 12 months of learning on programme to comply with the ESFA Funding Rules.</p> <p>REGISTRATION PERIODS</p> <p>D3.4 In exceptional circumstances where there are confirmed extenuating circumstances the Director/Dean of Institute may extend the maximum period of registration for a given award for an individual apprentice in accordance with the maximum period for completion of the apprenticeship standard as set out by the ESFA and programme specifications.</p> <p>STUDENT PROGRESSION</p> <p>G2.2 In determining progression recommendations, University Progression and Award Boards will apply these Academic Regulations and any professional body or programme-specific regulations approved at validation. Programme specific progression regulations may, by exception, be approved by Academic Board for Apprenticeships provision where the nature, design and delivery of the curriculum across the full calendar year creates challenges for progression (there not being standard recoup / reassessment periods before progression points).</p>
--	--	---

Academic Procedures and Processes

Reference	Rationale and Summary of Change
Appendix 1 – Approved Variations	Housekeeping only to reflect a) decisions already made by Academic Board (e.g. UG Business 30 credits) and b) any exceptions for programme no longer running.
Appendix 2 – Qualification and Grade Descriptors	No changes
Appendix 3a –Grade Descriptors	Housekeeping only to include ‘Technical Proficiency’ in full, following feedback from international partners (shortened to Tech Prof currently)
Appendix 3b – Marking and Moderation	Removal of references to Quality Enhancement Boards. Reference to module internal moderation templates for reviewing the outcomes of moderation (all institutes using from 23/24)
Appendix 3c - The Conduct of Assessment	Addition of a new section on Confidentiality, the content of which is taken from the separate Confidentiality Policy which it is being stood down as a separate standalone policy.
Confidentiality	<p>13 Confidentiality</p> <p>13.1 Confidentiality relates to the maintenance of anonymity of individuals and privileged information about the activities of organisations and workplaces gained through working and/or studying within them.</p> <p>13.2 Student work in the context of this policy includes, but is not limited to, the production of assignments, written work, communications and when interacting online.</p> <p>13.3 Unless permission has been given, it is essential that confidentiality is maintained in all students’ work. This principle is in keeping with professional ethics and the Caldicott Report 1997, 2012.</p> <p>13.4 Permission must be received in writing from an authorised representative of the relevant organisation that information may be used.</p> <p>13.5 The University strictly and equitably imposes penalties for confidentiality breaches, to protect the above principle. Any allegations that a student has breached confidentiality will be considered when marking of assessment is undertaken.</p> <p>13.6 If there is suspicion that there has been a deliberate attempt by a student to gain an unfair advantage in the assessment by breaching confidentiality or other means the issue will be progressed through the University’s Malpractice Procedures.</p>

13.7 Examples of breaches of confidentiality include:

- i. Any inclusion of names or material in student work (including both the body of the work and supplementary material such as appendices) that would allow any individual to be identified would be considered a breach of confidentiality.**
- ii. Any identification of an organisation in relation to individuals or other activities that are not already publicly available.**
- iii. The inclusion of material, original or photocopied, on identifiable stationery that can be linked to the privileged information e.g. letterhead of an organisation that identifies that organisation.**
- iv. Providing information that could lead to the identification of an individual or organisation e.g. dates of birth, hospital numbers, addresses, children's names etc or the inclusion of any unusual circumstances that could allow the reader to identify individuals or organisations.**

13.8 If it is necessary to name individuals in an assignment, their anonymity must be preserved by changing their names to fictitious ones. The assignment must be prefixed with a statement stating that this is the case. If it is necessary to link the name of an organisation with privileged (non-public) information (as in (ii) above) the name of the organisation must also be changed to a fictitious one.

13.9 Examples that would not be breaches of confidentiality include:

- i. The signature of staff who sign the students' official documentation.**
- ii. The acknowledgement of individuals who have supported students in their work provided that their names only are included and not their designation/job title or workplace;**
- iii. Any naming of individuals or organisations where the information cited has now entered the public domain eg the name of renowned cases such as Victoria Climbié and the Bristol Heart Scandal would no longer be confidential;**
- iv. Any naming of organisations that is not subsequently linked in the student's work to privileged information eg simply discussing the existence and function of an organisation or service; discussing publicly available published information relating to an organisation. To support the fact that information is now in the public domain, the burden of proof lies with the student. A citation in the text and corresponding reference on the reference list would be necessary to demonstrate that the information was indeed in the public domain;**
- v. Abuse reporting in line with the student and staff guidelines relating to this and statutory requirements**
- vi. Instances where permission has been expressly given (eg. by an NHS Trust, school, company), clearly stating the inclusion of their details in the work is approved. This permission must be in writing and included as a preface to the work;**
- vii. Inclusion of materials eg. 'welcome packs' provided that individuals, patients and organisations (as appropriate) are anonymised;**
- viii. Information that is publicly available eg. information leaflets provided that**

<p>Word limits and penalties</p>	<p>they are not subsequently linked in the student's work to privileged information</p> <p>13.10 If a student is in any doubt about the inclusion of any documentation or written information in his/her work, s/he should seek the advice of his/her tutor.</p>
	<p>Revised to address recent student feedback which evidenced an inconsistent application of the previous provisions and limited evidence of informing students if they were being applied. Additionally reflecting the move to authentic assessment.</p> <p>3 Word limits for assignments</p> <p>3.1 It is expected that suggested lengths (in numbers of words for written work, or in time periods for presentations) are designed to indicate to students what length of work will, for most students, be appropriate to meet the learning outcomes of the assignment. Unless there is a requirement to work to a particular length related to the module learning outcomes or regulatory requirements (see 3.2 below), these suggested lengths must be presented as guidance. Students who ignore this guidance may receive formative feedback on the effectiveness of their writing/ presentation, but there is no penalty for not adhering to the guidance.</p> <p>3.2 Some assignments may have a strictly defined lower or upper limit for a reason linked to the module learning outcomes or regulatory requirements e.g. Apprenticeship Standard Assessment Plans; this means that there will be a specific and explicit criterion in the assessment process relating to the required length of the written work or presentation. For example, an exercise in writing to a client brief for text presented on a webpage may require the student to communicate their content in a very concise manner, and there will be an assessment criterion to reflect this as an intrinsic element of the learning outcome being assessed. Similarly, an assignment requiring a presentation to make a funding bid with an audience Q&A may include as a criterion the inclusion of sufficient time for the Q&A within a defined presentation slot, replicating the real-world experience of professional funding application processes. The assignment brief will make clear what weighting the length element has in the assignment overall.</p> <p>3.3 Where the assignment/presentation has a defined lower and/or upper limit, notification must be given to students at the outset of the module through the Assessment Brief available on the Module Blackboard site. The requirement to conform to a word/time limit must be expressed as an assessment criterion and linked explicitly to the module learning outcomes. Students should be advised clearly of the consequences of breaching these specified limits, in terms of the impact on the overall mark for the assignment. Programme teams are strongly encouraged to ensure that students understand, through live and written briefings for assessment, why some assignments have defined length limits and others do not.</p>

3.1 — It is expected that all students can demonstrate achievement of the learning outcomes for an assessment within the defined word limit. The upper limit specified may be exceeded by up to 10% without penalty. There is no lower limit but failure to include demonstration of the requisite learning outcomes will lead to a fail.

3.2 — These guidelines on wordage for written assessment/length of presentations exist both to enable the student to see the scale of the item and to establish an upper parameter within which it should be completed (see 3.4.1 below).

3.3 — Word limit requirements

3.3.1 — Essays, Reports and Dissertations

The word count includes the body of the work (i.e. the main text, including in-text quotations and in-text citations), within which all the learning outcomes should be demonstrated, but excludes:

- Reference lists/ Bibliographies
- Tables and the title of tables (any variation will be set out explicitly in module guides)
- Graphs
- Appendices

Note: Quotations should not normally be more than three lines of text, and are included in the wordage. Appendices should only be included where necessary and should not be used as an alternative location for the demonstration of learning outcomes, as the main body of the work should stand alone.

3.3.2 — Portfolios

The same principles apply as for essays, reports and dissertations, except that evidence supporting the portfolio is not included in the word count. However, the module team should give advice to students on the nature and length (if possible/appropriate) of the evidence to be provided, along with an indication of the broad number of items which may be appropriate.

3.3.3 — Presentations

The length of presentations should be proportionate to the number and complexity of learning outcomes which need to be demonstrated. For parity, up to a 10% time excess is permitted.

3.3.4 — Other forms of assessment

It is acknowledged that other forms of assessment exist that may not fall within these guiding principles but which are defined as an equivalence in course documents (e.g. music performance, art exhibition and posters). These guidelines only apply where time/wordage/volume limits are given.

3.4 — Application of the guidelines

3.4.1 — Where the assignment/presentation has a defined upper limit, notification must be given to students at the outset of the module through the Assessment Brief available on the Module Blackboard site. Students should be advised clearly of the consequences of breaching specified limits (see 3.5 below).

3.4.2 — Students must declare the word count at the end of their written submission before the bibliography.

3.4.3 — Different subject areas may require students to use different fonts, typefaces and spacing.

3.5 — Penalties

3.5.1 — Where the word count exceeds 10%, the full assignment will be marked following which the appropriate penalty will be applied (see below). In the case of presentations, the presentation will be ended when the 10% leeway has been reached.

Word count exceeded by: — Penalty (to be applied to assessment item)

	<p>0% – 10% – No penalty Over 10% – 30% – 10 marks deducted (from assessment item), or pass mark awarded (whichever is the higher) Over 30% – Maximum mark awarded is a pass mark [Also see Academic Regulation F5.8]</p> <p>3.5.2 – In addition, for students who falsify the word count, the above penalties will apply and they will also be subject to Minor Malpractice procedures (see Appendix 3d).</p>
3d. Policy and Procedures Governing Academic Malpractice	<p>The section on Confidentiality has been updated to enable breaches of confidentiality to be dealt with through malpractice procedures (with the standing down of the separate confidentiality policy).</p> <p>6. <u>Breach of Confidentiality</u></p> <p>6.1 Breaches of confidentiality will be dealt with through University procedures. The University imposes penalties for confidentiality breaches, to protect the above principle. Any allegations that a student has breached confidentiality will be considered when marking of assessment is undertaken (see Appendix 3c Conduct of Assessment Section I).</p> <p>6.2 If there is suspicion that there has been a deliberate attempt by a student to gain an unfair advantage in the assessment by breaching confidentiality or other means the issue will be progressed through the Malpractice Procedures.</p> <p>Changing membership of Panels of Inquiry to allow the independent panel member to come from another subject area, rather than another institute, ensuring independence but increasing the pool of staff that may be called on to act as Panel members.</p> <p>6.3 <u>Composition of the Panel of Inquiry</u></p> <p>i. A Panel of Inquiry will be drawn from a pool of members of academic staff nominated by the Dean/Director of Institute.</p> <p>ii. A Panel of Inquiry shall comprise the Chair and one member taken from the pool, together with the appropriate secretarial support. No member of the Panel shall be drawn from the Subject Area Institute within which the malpractice has occurred</p>
Appendix 3e – Extenuating Circumstances	No changes to P&P. Student facing guidance and forms will be updated to reflect that, in the case of the EC being related to an EC, a death certificate is not required, other alternative evidence may be provided (examples will be given).
Appendix 3f – Assessment Boards	Removal of Quality Enhancement Boards (in line with regulations change)
Appendix 4 – External Examining	Addition of detail of the requirements for EEs appointed to quality assurance End Point Assessment. Removal of reference to QEBs

Appendix 5 - Academic Appeals Procedure	<p>Removal of the 3rd grounds for appeal (in line with the change to regulations).</p> <p><u>Circumstances under which an appeal can be considered</u></p> <p>1.3.1 Consideration of an appeal will be restricted to the following grounds:</p> <p>1.3.1.1 Where there has been or could have been material administrative error or regulatory or procedural irregularity which has affected the outcomes (including results) for a student's results</p> <p>1.3.1.2 Where significant new evidence concerning extenuating or mitigating circumstances which for good reason had not been available to the Module Confirmation Board (MCB) has been produced (for example a medical condition which had not been diagnosed at the time of the Board); or where insufficient weight had been given to extenuating circumstances. Appeals on these grounds will be referred to the EC Panel</p> <p>1.3.1.3 Where unfair treatment, bias or perception of bias is alleged as part of the assessment or other relevant process which for good reason had not been considered previously under the University Complaints Procedures.</p> <p>1.3.1.4 Where re-registration to re-attend a module following reassessment (Regulation F8.6) has not been offered and there is new evidence relating to the student's engagement or non-engagement with reassessment, which had not been available to the UPAB, for good reason, at the time of making that decision.</p>
Appendix 6 - APL	No changes
Appendix 7 - Ceremonies	No changes
Appendix 8 - 4 Week Rule	No changes
<p>NEW</p> <p>Changes approved in line with launch of new Student Procedures from 27 January 2025</p> <p>(new text in bold)</p> <p>Appendix 3d</p>	<p>ACADEMIC REGULATIONS:</p> <p>G6 Termination of Study</p> <p>G6.1 Termination of study may occur because of failure in academic or professional components (see G4), lack of appropriate attendance/engagement (see D5), or for reasons of misconduct. Procedures for the conduct of students, including suspension and exclusion for disciplinary offences, are covered under the Student Code of Conduct and the Student Disciplinary Procedure and are not part of these regulations.</p> <p>G7 Interruption to Study and Student Wellbeing</p> <p>G7.2 Students are also governed by the Student Code of Conduct and the Student Disciplinary Procedure (including Fitness to Practice) and a range of other procedures as pertinent to their programme.</p> <p>Policy and Procedures Governing Academic Malpractice:</p>

- | | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">1. Preface1.2 Cheating is considered to be a deceitful attempt to convey the impression of acquired knowledge, skills, understanding, or credentials. Such behaviour represents a contravention of the award regulations, which also undermines the academic standards of the University. The University regards any form of academic malpractice as a serious matter. Where the incident has implications for fitness to practise, an academic malpractice incident may lead to the adjudication or progress review procedure being initiated (or Health and Conduct Committee / Professional Practice Committee or Disciplinary meeting as appropriate).7.6.5 Matters following the meeting of the Panel of Inquiryv. Where the student is registered for a professional award the Panel of Enquiry's written report shall be copied in confidence to the relevant Head of Institute who will determine whether the outcome of the Panel of Inquiry has implications for Fitness to Practise in which case the adjudication process (or Health and Conduct Committee/Professional Practice Committee meeting) or progress review procedure may be initiated. |
|--|---|