

Document Reference: Academic Regulations (Foundation Degrees)

Reference Code: AcR.

Version: 1.0

Date of Implementation: **September 2014**

Originator: Higher Education Quality and Standards Department

Approval by: Curriculum and Quality Committee

Date for Review: **June 2015**

Description:

These academic regulations and the procedures and principles that underlie them, are intended to ensure stakeholder confidence in the academic standards and quality of the Foundation Degrees awarded by the Grimsby Institute of Further and Higher Education. Approved by the Curriculum and Quality Committee, this document sets out the requirements for the assurance of academic standards and quality which includes programme regulations, admissions, progression and assessment of students. Within the context of these regulations, the 'Quality Handbook' further sets out a series of Codes of Practice which must be adhered to and which may be varied from time to time subject to the development and approval of the Quality Improvement Committee and the boards to which it delegates specific responsibilities.

These regulations should be read in conjunction with:

QAapi1.	Accuracy and Completeness of Published Information
QAARwp	Retention in Higher Education
QAARtl	Review of Teaching and Learning Higher Education
QArts	Recognised Teacher Status (Higher Education)
QAEa.	External Examiners
QABEac.	Boards of Examiners: Administrative Conduct
QAWBL.	Management of Placement Learning in Higher Education
QAAss.	Assessment of Students
QAAtmcms.	Assessment Terminology, Criteria and Marking Schemes
QAPcaum.	Plagiarism, Cheating and Unfair Means
QAMc.	Mitigating Circumstances
QAEa	Ethics Approval
QAANp	Approval of New Programmes (Higher Education)
QAPr.	Periodic Review
QAAAd.	Higher Education Admissions
QAAAAdm.	Admissions Appeals & Complaints
QAAPl	Accreditation of Prior Learning (Certificated and Experiential)
QASe	Student Engagement (Higher Education)
QAfts	Fitness to Study (Higher Education)
QAss	Interruption of Study (Higher Education)
AS-compli1013	Investigation and Determination of Complaints Policy & Procedure

QAAa Academic Appeals (Higher Education)

For further advice on how these regulations work, contact the Higher Education Quality and Standards Department (Higher Education): University Centre: Rm. 3H05: (01472) 311222

Additional guidance can be obtained by visiting www.qaa.ac.uk: refer to 'The HE Quality Code' and 'The Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the Higher Education European Area'.

**This document is available in alternative forms
on request from the Quality and Standards Department**

Contents

1.	Introduction	6
2.	Powers	7
2.1.	<i>Responsibilities</i>	8
3.	Use of Language	8
4.	Structure and Stages	12
4.1.	<i>Employability, Work Based and Work Related Learning</i>	13
4.2.	<i>Permitted duration for the accumulation of credits</i>	14
4.3.	<i>Contained Awards and interim credit</i>	14
5.	Approval, Validation, Monitoring and Review	14
5.1.	<i>Approval and Validation</i>	14
5.2.	<i>Timescales for approval of programmes</i>	17
5.3.	<i>Monitoring and Review</i>	17
5.4.	<i>Publication of Programmes of Study</i>	18
6.	Admissions: Standard and Non Standard Entry	18
6.1.	<i>Standard and Non Standard Applicants</i>	18
6.2.	<i>Applicants with English as a Foreign Language</i>	19
6.3.	<i>Concurrent and consecutive enrolment</i>	19
6.4.	<i>Accreditation of Prior Learning</i>	19
6.4.1.	<i>APL Maxima</i>	20
6.5.	<i>Change of module or foundation degree</i>	20
6.6.	<i>Interruption of study</i>	21
6.6.1.	<i>Retrospective Interruption of Studies</i>	21
6.6.2.	<i>Interruption of Study on the grounds of risk</i>	22
6.6.3.	<i>Academic Issues Relating to Interruption of Study</i>	23
6.6.4.	<i>Access to Services</i>	23
7.	Assessment, Reassessment and Awarding Credits	24
7.1.	<i>Summative Assessments Methods</i>	24
7.2.	<i>Attempts at assessment</i>	25
7.3.	<i>Reassessment</i>	25
7.4.	<i>Student Responsibilities for Assessment and Reassessment</i>	26
7.5.	<i>Module marks</i>	26
7.6.	<i>Awarding Marks and Credits</i>	27
7.7.	<i>Mitigation</i>	27

7.8.	<i>Absence with Good Cause and Non Standard Extension with Good Cause</i>	27
7.9.	<i>Impaired Performance</i>	29
7.10.	<i>Late Applications</i>	30
8.	Academic and professional behaviour	30
8.1.	<i>Non attendance/submission</i>	30
8.2.	<i>Exclusion from assessment and termination of programme</i>	30
8.3.	<i>Professional Misconduct</i>	30
9.	Boards of Examiners	31
9.1.	<i>Chairs of Boards of Examiners</i>	31
9.2.	<i>Module Boards</i>	31
9.3.	<i>Unfair Means</i>	32
9.4.	<i>Confirmation of marks</i>	32
9.5.	<i>Programme Boards</i>	32
9.6.	<i>Role of the programme board</i>	33
9.7.	<i>Mitigating circumstances</i>	33
9.8.	<i>Unfair Means</i>	33
9.9.	<i>Maxima: Compensation, Condonement and Referral</i>	34
9.9.1.	<i>Maxima</i>	34
9.9.2.	<i>Compensation</i>	34
9.9.3.	<i>Condonement</i>	34
9.9.4.	<i>Referral</i>	35
9.10.	<i>Progression and Classification</i>	35
9.10.1.	<i>Calculation of Stage Weighted Average</i>	35
9.11.	<i>Consequences of Ineligibility to Progress</i>	35
9.11.1.	<i>Fail repeat year</i>	35
9.11.2.	<i>Repeating a stage</i>	36
10.	External Examiners	36
10.1.	<i>Responsibilities</i>	37
10.2.	<i>Appointment</i>	38
10.3.	<i>Conflicts of Interest</i>	38
10.4.	<i>Period of Tenure</i>	39
10.5.	<i>Approval</i>	39
10.6.	<i>External Examiner Induction</i>	40
10.7.	<i>Submitting Reports</i>	40
10.8.	<i>Responses to External Examiners</i>	41
10.9.	<i>Termination of Appointment</i>	41
10.10.	<i>Resignation of External Examiners</i>	42

11. Results and transcripts	42
11.1. <i>Notifications of Results and Transcripts</i>	42
11.2. <i>Posthumous Awards</i>	43
11.3. <i>Aegrotat Award</i>	44
11.4. <i>Conferral at a Graduation Ceremony</i>	45
11.5. <i>Certification Wording</i>	45
12. Academic Appeals and Complaints	45
12.1. <i>Grounds for an Academic Appeal</i>	46
12.2. <i>Complaints</i>	46
12.3. <i>Legitimate Incidental Expenses</i>	47
Appendix 1 : Major Amendment or New Programmes Approval Process	48

1. Introduction

- a) The following regulations apply to all Foundation Degrees and Contained Awards validated by the Grimsby Institute of Further and Higher Education (the Institute)
- b) These regulations should be read in conjunction with relevant programme specifications, which may in some cases include approved variations or exclusions of specific regulations herein
- c) The medium of instruction and assessment for all Foundation Degree and Contained Awards will be English except where the subject content dictates that a part of the programme will be delivered in a language other than English
- d) In recognition of entry to a higher education learning environment, before commencing studies for a Foundation Degree or other Contained Award, students will normally have reached a minimum of 18 years of age
- e) A student who has reached the age of 17 but not 18 on the first day of the month in which their foundation degree commences will not be admitted except with the express permission of a member of the senior management team (with a responsibility for curriculum) and with the written authorisation of his or her parent or guardian
- f) As part of the Institute's commitment to equality, diversity, inclusion and human rights, the Institute recognises that it must endeavour to meet its legal obligations under the Equality Act (2010) which states that institutions must work towards the elimination of harassment, discrimination and victimisation; advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations. This includes all protected characteristics and associated dimensions ([equality statement](#))
- g) Students for the award of a qualification from the Institute, must satisfy its regulatory framework and the criteria and regulations set within the specifications for a published and approved foundation degree
- h) A Foundation Degree, Contained Award or credit will not be conferred upon a student if the student has outstanding tuition fees to the Institute or if its general and specific programme regulations are unfulfilled
- i) A student who has been awarded a Foundation Degree on completion of one programme of study must not present for a second time for the examination for the same programme of study or for another programme of study where half or more of the second programme of study comprises modules presented for the first programme of study
- j) Subject to the provisions of the relevant programme regulations, a student who has not met the requirements for a Foundation Degree may be deemed to be a student for a Contained Award provided that he or she has met the requirements of that award. A student who has been granted a Contained Award in such circumstances and has exhausted all assessment opportunities

as specified in the regulations will not normally be permitted to progress to a further attempt at the Foundation Degree

- k) The Regulations, Performance and Progression Committee is the final arbiter of the application and/or interpretation of these regulations and associated codes of practice
- l) The final responsibility for the academic standard of awards approved by the Institute, rests with the Quality Improvement Committee

2. Powers

- a) Subject to the responsibilities of the Corporation, the Institute is responsible for the determination of its academic and other activities across its higher education provision. These will permit the Institute to:
 - i. determine the requirements for the admission of persons to the Institute or to any particular course or programme operated by the Institute, and to make regulations therefore;
 - ii. grant and confer Foundation Degrees or other Contained Awards on students who have pursued programmes of study approved by the Institute and shall have passed such examinations and / or other assessments as required by its regulations, Codes of Practice and validation documents;
 - iii. determine the terms and conditions, and to prescribe the regulations for the granting and conferment of Foundation Degrees, contained academic awards and distinctions;
 - iv. grant and confer, subject to such conditions as the Institute determines, Honorary Foundation Degrees on persons approved by the Institute;
 - v. deprive any student of a Foundation Degree or other Contained Award and to rescind any Foundation Degree or other award conferred to them on any grounds which the Institute shall from time to time determine to be good and sufficient cause;
 - vi. provide lectures, tutorials and other forms of instruction or supervision in such branches of learning and scholarship as the Institute shall deem appropriate and to make provision for research, scholarship and the advancement and dissemination of knowledge in such manner as the Institute determines;
 - vii. provide lectures and other forms of instruction or supervision to persons who are not enrolled students of the Institute, as the Institute shall from time to time determine;
 - viii. approve and review programmes pursued by students to qualify for an academic award;
 - ix. ensure that no test related to any of the characteristics protected by the Equality Act 2010 shall be imposed on any person as a condition of admission to a Foundation Degree or of receiving any Foundation Degree or other award;
 - x. discontinue a programme with no further recruitment due to academic issues (such as currency, progression, retention, feedback from students or external examiners, internal or external review); the compatibility of the programme with the strategic plan; or on grounds of viability or resource availability

2.1. Responsibilities

- a) In meeting its powers and responsibilities the Institute shall ensure governance over:
- i. Foundation Degrees and other Contained Awards to ensure programmes meet the standards required as determined by the approved learning outcomes and the UK Quality Code for Higher Education as appropriate;
 - ii. curriculum and foundation degree including arrangements for work based, related or practical training and experience;
 - iii. the qualifications and experience of the teaching and support staff;
 - iv. facilities and resources available;
 - v. the quality of teaching and scholarship;
 - vi. student achievements;
 - vii. student learning opportunities;
 - viii. arrangements for assessment and for the appointment of external and internal examiners;
 - ix. arrangements for monitoring, sustaining and developing the standard of student performance and the quality of learning, teaching and assessment

3. Use of Language

- a) **Mandatory:** denoted by the word ‘**must**’ - there is no discretion whether to take the action in question. Failure to comply with such a clause leaves individuals/ departments/ Schools liable to sanction
- b) **Advisable:** denoted by the word ‘**should**’ and which denotes good practice. A justification will be required for not taking the action advised
- c) **Desirable:** denoted by the word ‘**may**’ taking the action is discretionary but evidence will be required to demonstrate that taking the action has been considered
- d) **Institute:** means the Grimsby Institute of Further and Higher Education
- e) **Major Amendment:** amendments to an approved Foundation Degree are categorised as major according to whether or not the proposed changes are significant in intent or effect. Major amendments require approval in accordance with section 6. Major amendments include:
- i. A change in programme title
 - ii. Change in mode of study
 - iii. Change of entry criteria
 - iv. Changes to modules which necessitates a change to the aims and programme learning outcomes
 - v. Changes to the programme learning outcomes which necessiate a change to the module structure, module specifications or module learning outcomes
 - vi. The intrduction of a new pathway(s)
 - vii. Restructuring
 - viii. Changes to major elements of teaching, learning or assessment e.g the introduction of distance delivery, change of location
 - ix. Professional accreditation

- x. Changes to module credits
 - xi. The addition of a Pre-Certificate year
 - xii. Changes that would mean the programme would not be in accordance with the Institute's regulations
- f) **Minor Amendment:** amendments to an approved Foundation Degree are categorised as minor according to whether or not the proposed changes are insignificant in intent or effect. Minor amendments require approval at local level via a School's Quality and Academic Standards Committee and must be clearly recorded within the minutes of the Committee. Minor amendments include:
- i. Changes that are not major
- g) **Foundation Degree:** for the purposes of determining whether a Foundation Degree is an FdA, FdEd or FdSc, each shall be deemed by the Institution's Full Approvals Panel to be an 'Arts', 'Education' or a 'Science' programme in best alignment with the sector subject codes
- h) A Foundation Degree shall be awarded by the Institute, to a student who has satisfactorily completed a prescribed academic programme of study, followed over a period of time, normally two years full time and three years part-time study and which is designed to ensure:
- i. knowledge and critical understanding of the well-established principles in their field of study and the way in which those principles have developed
 - ii. successful application in the workplace of the range of knowledge and skills learnt throughout the programme
 - iii. an ability to apply underlying concepts and principles outside the context in which they were first studied, and the application of those principles in a work context
 - iv. knowledge of the main methods of enquiry in the subject(s), and an ability to evaluate critically the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems in the field of study and apply these in a work context
 - v. an understanding of the limits of their knowledge, and how this influences analyses and interpretations based on that knowledge in their field of study and in a work context
- i) **Contained Award:** is a lesser award than the one the student was aiming for at the time of registration on their course. A contained award will only be conferred if the student positively achieves the specified requirements of that contained award.
- j) **Module:** The Institute's awards are modular in structure and for the purposes of these regulations a module is defined as being a separately assessed unit of learning either studied and assessed during a single semester ('short fat') or over two consecutive semesters ('long thin')
- i. all students on the same module must be assessed by the same method(s) of assessment except in instances where a disability precludes a student from the same opportunities as their peers and an alternative assessment is required ([Code of Practice Assessment of Students](#)).

- ii. each module must be assigned a credit value and to a level of study as defined by the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications; the level specifies the academic standard of that module:
- Level 3: Foundation (pre-certificate) undergraduate level
 Level 4: Certificate undergraduate level
 Level 5: Intermediate undergraduate level (Foundation Degree)
- iii. before any module can become valid as leading to a Foundation Degree, the Full Approvals Panel must approve its scope, form of assessment and credit value
- k) **Credit:** a credit value must be assigned to each module indicating the total learning time, including assessment, which a student might expect to spend in achieving the learning outcomes associated with the module. Each credit should nominally represent 10 hours of learning; and:
- i. modules should normally be of 20 credits but module values of 10 credits are also permitted and must be subject to the approval of the Full Approvals Panel. No other credit value must be permitted
- ii. modules credited to a student must not be used towards an award after six years have elapsed from the end of the student's registration for the module
- iii. the total credit value of qualifications to which these regulations apply are as follows:
- | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------|
| Foundation (pre certificate) Stage | 120 credits |
| Certificate Stage | 120 credits |
| Foundation Degree | 240 credits |
- iv. credits must not be awarded for a module more than once
- v. the same credits must not be counted towards two separate qualifications unless one qualification is a stage in the normal progression to the other qualification
- l) **Failure:** at the discretion of the Programme Board, students who have been unsuccessful in any modules of study which contribute to the award may be permitted one further attempt (clause 7.3) to redeem the failure in each such module, for the bare pass-mark of 40% at module level only
- m) **Distinction:** at the discretion of the Programme Board, students may be granted a 'Foundation Degree with Distinction' when the overall credit weighted average is calculated and equals a final result of 70% or above
- n) **Credit Weighted Average (CWA):** to determine a Foundation Degree with distinction the CWA is calculated through 30% of the Penultimate Level Average (PLA) plus 70% of the Final Level Average (FLA) divided by 2
- For example:
$$\frac{30\% \text{ PLA} + 70\% \text{ FLA}}{2} = \frac{74\% + 72\%}{2} = 73\% \text{ (Distinction)}$$
- o) **Pass:** students with a CWA between 40 -69% at level 5 shall be eligible for the award of an unclassified 'Foundation Degree'

- p) **Pass/ Fail Modules:** some modules may be designated within a 'Professional' category. This category is not in itself a 'level', but may include work at various levels. The category designates situations in which the Institute's approval procedures are unable directly to control the learning environment. These include such activities as school experience, work placements, certain approved work undertaken abroad, and professional requirements in fulfilment of an academic programme. In such cases a Foundation Degree may include pass/fail elements for assessment of a module(s):
- i. where a vocational or professional element exists which includes competency based assessments specified by a relevant professional, statutory or regulatory body
 - ii. Professional Pass/Fail modules will be disregarded in calculating any weighted average required under these regulations
- q) **Transferable Skills:** the development of transferable skills is deemed essential for all undergraduates irrespective of the nature or subject area of the particular Foundation Degree. In some instances, transferable skill outcomes may occur inherently within modules where learning outcomes are both subject specific and skills based
- r) Whilst it is recognised that different subject areas require different emphases upon transferable skills; that some programmes will facilitate intrinsic skill development; and some learning outcomes may derive transferable skills from generic criteria and external benchmarks, all Foundation Degrees awarded by the Institute must also demonstrate the development and assessment of a set of generic skills outcomes
- s) **Generic Key Skill Outcomes:** on completion of a Foundation Degree programme, students must be able to:
- i. communicate with others in a clear and articulate manner, both verbally and in writing
 - ii. use information and communication technology to store, retrieve and produce material, which may include the use of word-processing, databases, spreadsheets and other applications as appropriate to the programme
 - iii. exercise personal responsibility for own decision making, learning, development and time management
 - iv. work with others with confidence, initiative and take responsibility for an agreed area of shared activity
 - v. show flexible, methodical, informed and creative approaches in identifying and proposing solutions
 - vi. act in a professional and ethical manner, demonstrating the ability to learn from and reflect on experiences
- t) To avoid poor integration of generic key skills within programmes, or mapping of skill outcomes many times and superficially, as a minimum, each Institute defined generic key skill outcome must be mapped to the programme learning outcomes. These programme learning outcomes **should** be further mapped no less than three times at each level of the Foundation Degree. This will ensure each skill is addressed in depth

- u) **Working Day:** a clear working day is defined as a complete period of 24 hours (excluding weekends and Bank Holidays), beginning and ending at midnight on the day in question

4. Structure and Stages

- a) For the purposes of progression, each Foundation Degree programme must be divided into two stages or three stages if including a pre-certificate stage as follows:

Pre-Certificate stage	120 credits at level 3
Certificate stage	first 120 credits at level 4
Foundation Degree/Intermediate stage	second 120 credits at level 5

- b) With the approval of the Full Approvals Panel, a Foundation Degree programme may also include a Pre Certificate stage comprising the first 120 credits of a 360 credit Foundation Degree, each stage to comprise 120 credits at level of 3, 4 and 5 respectively
- c) Students must study modules for each semester in accordance with the instructions specified in the programme for which they are enrolled
- d) A part-time student must not enrol for modules worth more than 80 credits during one academic year, excluding resits
- e) A student must not be permitted to undertake more than 120 credits in a single stage other than with the express approval of the Progression Board (in accordance with these regulations) and subsequent ratification by the Regulations, Performance and Progression Committee. Where such approval is granted the student shall be required to pass all credits attempted to progress to the next stage. Credits achieved over and above the 120 credits required for the stage must not be carried over and counted towards the next stage of the programme
- f) Where a particular first semester module is specified as a prerequisite for a module to be taken in a following semester, then the prerequisite will be deemed to have been satisfied provided that the student has been enrolled for the former module; has maintained satisfactory attendance at, and submitted all assessments associated with the module. Otherwise, to satisfy a prerequisite, the student must have been awarded the credits for the module
- g) Where a particular module is specified as a co-requisite, the student must enrol for and maintain satisfactory attendance at the module
- h) The principle and requirements of 'satisfactory attendance' must be published within the programme or module specifications and made available in student handbooks

4.1. Employability, Work Based and Work Related Learning

- a) To support the development of employable graduates and to encourage the development of employability and the skills needed to compete in a competitive labour market, a long thin 20 credit 'Personal Development Planning and Employability' module **must** be included at level 4 in all Foundation Degrees. This 'core' module must also include links to personal development planning and will develop skills and attributes in relation to graduate employability profiles.
- b) To support a critical understanding of career development and the process of personal development planning for a student's career in the graduate labour market, at level 5 a long thin 20 credit 'Personal Development for Learning, Enterprise and Employability' module **must** be included at level 5 in all Foundation Degrees. This 'core' module will focus ensuring students are better prepared for seeking, continuing or changing employment and that they are more able to articulate skills and knowledge gained. Encouraging creativity, ideas development, problem solving, communication and practical action, students will recognise, value and evidence their learning and development, both inside and outside the curriculum.
- c) Core modules are authored and validated at Institute level
- d) At level 5 20 credits **must** be attributed to a work based (placement) or work related module (which must not include the 'Personal Development for Learning, Enterprise and Employability' module); the module should be authored by the developing team and the module descriptor will make clear whether the module is work based or work related e.g. Module Title: Working in Hospitals (WBL) OR Module Title: Managing Events (WRL)
- e) Modules that integrate work based (or placement) learning will occur when a student is required to apply what they have learnt in a real work place setting. In such instances work-based learning must be an integral part of the Foundation Degree and will be clear within the module learning outcomes. Module credits should be attributed to the hours spent in the work place in addition to any directed learning
- f) In any work based (placement) learning module the [Code of Practice Placement and Work Based Learning](#) must be applied in every instance
- g) Modules that integrate work related learning will not normally require the student to carry out a period of work based (or placement) learning in a real work place but learning must be based upon the world of work. In such instances the curricula, learning outcomes and assessment must be based upon or derived from the context of work or the workplace
- h) In situations where professional, statutory, regulatory bodies demand other work based/ work related criteria that may require a deviation from the criteria identified in 4.1 e, f and g, this should normally be requested at stage 2 of the Programme Proposal Approval process. Responsibility for final approval rests with the Full Approvals Panel who will determine the overall suitability of

the proposed deviation ensuring that the programme is properly designed, that arrangements for its delivery and assessment have been properly planned, that it conforms to its regulations, associated Codes of Practice and policies and that, where relevant, it meets the requirements of the UK Quality Code and other relevant external reference points

4.2. Permitted duration for the accumulation of credits

- a) Where a student is permitted to extend his/her period of study through mitigating circumstances, the grant of a non standard extension for good cause or interruption of study, such extension is subject to the overriding requirement that each stage of the foundation degree must be completed within a period of three years

4.3. Contained Awards and interim credit

- a) Subject to 4.3 (b) a student may withdraw from a foundation degree and be awarded one of the following Contained Awards:
- i. A Pre-Certificate of Higher Education with at least 120 credits
 - ii. A Certificate of Higher Education with at least 120 credits
- b) Any award under these regulations must be subject to a minimum of 60 credits having been awarded by the Institute
- c) Any Contained Award with professional practice requirements must not be awarded in a named Subject which implies that the student is entitled to practise that profession

5. Approval, Validation, Monitoring and Review

5.1. Approval and Validation

- a) There are three formal stages (see [Appendix 1](#)) in granting new Foundation Degree programmes or the major amendment of existing programmes:
- i. Stage 1: Strategic Planning Approval ([SPA](#))
 - ii. Stage 2: Programme Proposal Approval ([PPA](#))
 - iii. Stage 3: Full Programme Approval ([FPA](#))
- b) Whilst for all three stages the authority to grant new programmes and major amendments rests with the Quality Improvement Committee, the Committee delegates the authority to grant:
- i. SPA to the Regulations, Performance and Progression Committee (RPPC)
 - ii. PPA to the Proposal Approvals Panel (PAP)
 - iii. FPA to the Full Approvals Panel (FAP)
- c) **Stage 1 - Strategic Planning Approval (SPA):** establishes if there is a prima facie academic and appropriate business case, to support the development of

a full proposal. SPA permits a strategic decision to support the development of new programmes and resources as an addition to the Institute's portfolio, or to support enhancement through major amendments of existing programmes

- d) Applications for Strategic Planning Approval should be submitted as early as possible to ensure sufficient lead-in time for the full development, approval and marketing of the programme
- e) A programme must not progress to a Proposal Approvals Panel (PAP) or Full Approvals Panel (FAP) without Strategic Planning Approval (SPA)
- f) Strategic Planning Approval (SPA) is **mandatory** for all new programmes
- g) Applications for Strategic Planning Approval (SPA) approval must be submitted on form [SP1](#) to RPPC. Within **20 working days** of the RPPC receiving an application, the committee must either 'Grant', 'Not Grant' or 'Defer with Conditions' the application for SPA
- h) If Strategic Planning Approval (SPA) is 'Not Granted' or 'Deferred with Conditions', the School must follow the processes specified in [Appendix 1](#)
- i) **Stage 2 - Programme Proposal Approval (PPA):** is a process by which the Institute gives approval for the full approvals specification to be developed following SPA approval. It assists in scheduling the full approval panel to consider the full approvals document once developed. It provides an early check that the programme proposal is appropriate for development in terms of adherence to regulations and Codes of Practice, resources and provides an opportunity to identify any advice and guidance to support the development of the programme and its specifications. It may also facilitate the early involvement of full approval panel members who may be involved in the final approval decision
- j) A programme must not progress to a Full Approvals Panel (FAP) without Programme Proposal Approval (PPA)
- k) Programme Proposal Approval (PPA) is mandatory for all programmes
- l) A proposed new programme or proposed major amendment to an existing programme must not be advertised through any means unless Programme Proposal Approval has been granted by a Proposal Approvals Panel (PAP) in accordance with these regulations and associated Codes of Practice. Following PAP approval a programme must only be advertised as 'Subject to Approval'
- m) For a proposed major amendment to an existing programme an [Existing Programme Evaluation](#) is mandatory. The completed form must be submitted at the same time as the Programme Proposal Approval.
- n) Applications for [Programme Proposal Approval](#) (PPA) must be submitted on form PPA2 to the HE Quality Office. Within **25 working days** the PPA panel must convene and either 'Grant', 'Not Grant' or 'Defer with Conditions' the application for PPA

- o) If Programme Proposal Approval (PPA) is 'Not Granted' or 'Deferred with Conditions', the School must follow the processes specified in [Appendix 1](#)
- p) **Stage 3 – Full Approvals:** is a process through which the Institute seeks to confirm that a new programme or one that has been significantly amended, is properly designed, that arrangements for its delivery and assessment have been properly planned, that it conforms to its regulations, associated Codes of Practice and policies and that, where relevant, it meets the requirements of the UK Quality Code and other relevant external reference points. Stage 3 is comprised of three sub-stages:
- i. **Stage 3a:** a [Full Approvals document](#) must be submitted on a full approvals specification template to the HE Quality Office within **40 working days** after PPA is granted
- A Full Approvals Panel (FAP) must convene as a reading group (independently of the developing team) and scrutinise the full approvals documentation. The FAP reading group must provide written feedback within **15 working days** after the approvals document is submitted to the HE Quality Office
- ii. **Stage 3b:** the Full Approvals document must be re-submitted to the HE Quality Office no less than **20 working days** after written feedback is received from the FAP reading group.
- The submission must be supported with feedback on the Full Approvals document by:
- a. a suitably qualified and experienced external academic consultant (in accordance with clause 10.3) on form [OEA1](#) and
- b. an employer involved in the development of the full approvals document on form [OEP1](#)
- iii. **Stage 3c:** The Full Approvals Panel must convene for a full approvals event no less than **15 working days** and no more than **30 working days** after stage 3b (when the completed approvals document was submitted to the HE Quality Office)
- q) At each stage, the emphasis is on dialogue to enhance good practice in programme development, design and approval, with support and guidance being provided throughout the process
- r) Full Approval is implemented through programme scrutiny by a full approvals panel; is **mandatory** for all programmes and is a process through which a full approvals panel confirms that recruitment to and delivery of the foundation degree may commence
- s) Within **5 working days** of an approvals event, the chair of the Full Approvals Panel (FAP) (Code of Practice, Approval of New Programmes (Higher Education)) must send a FAP report to the chair of the Quality Improvement Committee (QIC)

- t) Within **5 working days** of receipt of the FAP report, the Chair of the Quality Improvement Committee must issue a 'Confirmation of Permission to Proceed' that is either 'Granted', 'Not Granted' or 'Deferred with Conditions'
- u) A programme is not approved until a School receives a 'Confirmation of Permission to Proceed' that is 'Granted'
- v) If a programme is not approved, either because a 'Confirmation of Permission to Proceed' has been 'Not Granted' or 'Deferred with Conditions', developing teams must follow the processes specified in [Appendix 1](#)
- w) A new programme must be approved in accordance with these regulations before any student is enrolled on a programme

5.2. Timescales for approval of programmes

- a) From the date of SPA approval, the full approvals timescale will not surpass a period of 15 months
- b) In accordance with each of the Institute's stages of approval, should a programme not receive approval from the Chair of the Quality Improvement Committee within a 15 month period (following the date of SPA approval), SPA approval must be re-submitted and the development and approvals stages started afresh
- c) All 'new' Foundation Degree programmes, or Foundation Degrees undergoing 'major amendments' must be fully approved by 1st July to ensure sufficient time for planning, preparation and delivery in the September of the following academic year
- d) When an application for Strategic Planning Approval (SPA) is approved by RPPC, within the mandatory timescales set out in these regulations, a schedule of events for programme development and approval may be determined by the Chair of RPPC in agreement with the Assistant Principal 14-19 and Higher Education
- e) Within the mandatory timescales set out in these regulations, the timeframe for the approval of new programmes and major amendments will be tailored, within reason, to meet the demands of the environment in which programmes are offered

5.3. Monitoring and Review

- a) Annual Monitoring is a process of ongoing critical scrutiny of qualitative and quantitative evidence relating to the operation and performance of a Foundation Degree programme which has been validated; or of individual validated modules undertaken by the academic staff responsible for their delivery. Annual monitoring facilitates the Institute's approach to the management and safeguarding of standards and quality; promotes a continual improvement agenda through the setting of actions and contributes to sharing of practice

- b) All Foundation Degrees must be monitored annually through the production of [Annual Monitoring Reports](#) (AMRs) and reported through the relevant Quality and Academic Standards Committee held bi annually within each School
- c) Review is a process of routine thematic or periodic evaluation of the accumulated evidence about a programme or group of programmes drawn from a range of sources and is conducted by a panel of academic and/or professional peers. Review may lead to the revision and redefinition of a programme and to the preparation of new programme or module specifications
 - i. Thematic review: permits flexibility in the review process; thematic reviews permit the Institute to theme the focus and scope of its audit and review activities
 - ii. Periodic review: must occur in accordance with the Institution's [Code of Practice Periodic Review](#)
- d) All foundation degrees **must** be subject to a periodic programme review every six years to ensure that the programme remains current, unless the programme has undergone a major amendment.

5.4. Publication of Programmes of Study

- a) Foundation Degree programmes for qualifications governed by these regulations must be published and available in programme and module specifications
- b) The Institute must make every effort to ensure that the published programmes and modules are complete and up to date, but reserves the right to make minor changes following approval by the relevant Quality and Academic Standards Committee held bi annually within each School and chaired by the Head of School
- c) A programme specification and module specification must not be published until a Confirmation of Permission to Proceed' is 'Granted' and the approvals document is held on file by the HE Quality and Standards department

6. Admissions: Standard and Non Standard Entry

- a) The Institute's Code of Practice Higher Education Admissions specifies the procedures that must be followed for all standard and non standard applicants

6.1. Standard and Non Standard Applicants

- a) Standard entry refers to those applicants who obtain, or expect to obtain the specified and traditional points or qualifications needed to gain entry onto a specific foundation degree
- b) Non standard entry refers to those applicants who do not meet standard entry criteria, but gain entry through other criteria/ assessment

- c) Whilst taking into account criteria 1.3 and 1.4, the arrangements made for considering all standard and non standard applications for entry must ensure equality of opportunity. The criteria and means by which the eligibility of individuals for admission will be judged must be clearly published
- d) The admission of any standard or non standard applicant onto a Foundation Degree awarded by the Institute must occur in accordance with these regulations and the admissions criteria specified within the programme specification for a chosen foundation degree
- e) The judgment made regarding an applicant's suitability for a particular foundation degree must be based on the reasonable expectation that each applicant will be able to fulfil the intended learning outcomes of the foundation degree concerned and achieve the standard required for the particular academic award(s) to which the foundation degree leads
- f) In considering each application submitted for admission to a programme, evidence should be sought of personal, professional and educational experiences that provide indications of the applicant's ability to meet the demands and specified entry requirements of the programme. Account should be taken of relevant information which may include:
 - i. The applicant's personal statement
 - ii. Assessment at interview
 - iii. Performance in written tasks or other tests set for admissions purposes
 - iv. Other evidence of the applicants performance or potential
 - v. Relevant work experience

6.2. Applicants with English as a Foreign Language

- a) Applicants with English as a foreign language must be able to demonstrate a satisfactory command of English language in relation to reading, writing, speaking and listening
- b) The Institute's certificated entry criteria for applicants with English as a foreign language can be found in the [Code of Practice Higher Education Admissions](#)

6.3. Concurrent and consecutive enrolment

- a) An applicant may only be permitted to enrol for more than one foundation degree at the Institute to run concurrently under the following conditions:
 - i. both programmes are part-time;
 - or
 - ii. one of the programmes is full-time and the other is part-time, and it is the declared opinion of the Programme Leader (or equivalent) for each course that the concurrent registration will not detract from the student's performance or fulfilment of any attendance requirements; in such cases a student may not subsequently appeal against poor performance on grounds of inability to satisfy the demands of concurrent enrolment

6.4. Accreditation of Prior Learning

- a) All Accredited Prior Learning (APL) claims and approvals processes must comply with these regulations and the principles and processes defined within the Institute's [Code of Practice Accreditation of Prior Learning \(Certificated and Experiential\) \(Higher Education\)](#)
- b) Credits for general transfer when awarded by other higher education colleges, universities or approved private institutions will be accepted for consideration for Accredited Prior Learning (APL)
- c) Credits for general or specific transfer when awarded by the Institute will be accepted for consideration for APL
- d) The Institute will also consider applications for Accredited Prior Experiential Learning (APeL)
- e) The acceptance of applications for accredited prior certificated or experiential learning relating to a specific programme must be subject to the approval of the Board for Accreditation of Prior Learning and the following maxima
- f) Any prior learning must be no more than six (6) years old and must have remained sufficiently contemporaneous to the subject in the time since the award was made

6.4.1. APL Maxima

- a) Applicants or enrolled students must complete at least the full final stage of the award sought (with limited exceptions); meaning:

Of the 240 credits required for the award, a maxima of no more than 180 APL credits must be permitted with a minimum of 60 credits from the final stage of the award sought having been awarded by the Institute

6.5. Change of module or foundation degree

- a) A student has no given right to change a programme of study but may, following consultation and advice, change a foundation degree with the approval of the Head of School
- b) Changes should normally be at an appropriate point in the academic year and must be subject to published restrictions
- c) Students are responsible for complying with the requirements for a change of programme in force and published at the time of change, on form [CPS1](#)
- d) A student may, subject to timetable, published and programme restrictions, change a choice of module with the approval of the Head of School responsible for teaching the module. No withdrawal from a module must be permitted once any assessment process specified for the module has been completed

6.6. Interruption of study

- a) A student has no given right to a period of interruption of study (suspension of studies) but may, following consultation and advice, interrupt a period of study with approval
- b) Students must apply for a period of interruption of study (suspension of study) to the Mitigating Circumstances and Interruption of Studies Panel Terms with the support of the Head of School. The process is defined in the Institute's [Code of Practice Interruption of Studies \(Higher Education\)](#)
- c) interruptions of study will normally be granted on the following grounds
 - i. **Medical reasons** where there are strong medical reasons for a period of interruption of study. In such cases the student is required to submit appropriate medical evidence
 - ii. **Personal reasons** where there are strong personal reasons for a period of interruption of study. In such cases the student should briefly outline the circumstances pertaining to the request for interruption of study supported by third party evidence
 - iii. **Academic reasons** where there are good academic reasons for a period of interruption of study beneficial to the student's programme e.g. study, a year in industry or work experience abroad
- d) The maximum period of interruption of study permitted for a two year full time or three year part time Foundation Degree must not exceed one academic year
- e) Students are responsible for complying with the requirements for interruption of study in force and published at the time of change, on form [ISF](#)
- f) A student who interrupts their study may have to accept that in doing so he or she will return to a programme which has been modified from the one on which he or she was originally enrolled. This may require acceptance of an ad hoc variation of programme in order to achieve completion
- g) If an interruption of study is approved the student must be informed in writing and the Institute must inform the Funding Body, the Student Loans Company and any other relevant body

6.6.1. Retrospective Interruption of Studies

- a) Interruption of study is expected to be applied for in advance, or at the start of any problems affecting studies.
- b) However, if the interruption of study is for reasons of illness or personal problems, it may be the case that students do not immediately take the decision to interrupt their study, and do not inform their department for the reason for their absence.
- c) Retrospective interruption of study must therefore be seen as exceptional, and when applied for, must come with the full support of the academic

department, and with clear evidence of the rationale behind the request. All requests for retrospective interruption of study must be approved by Regulations, Performance and Progression Committee (RPPC).

- d) There must also be a clear rationale shown as to why the request is for a retrospective interruption of study (confirming that the student was effectively not in attendance) and not a request for a repeat period (where the student was in attendance but had their ability to study affected by their circumstances).

6.6.2. Interruption of Study on the grounds of risk

- a) If a student on a Foundation Degree approved by the Institute, where-so-ever located, is judged, on substantial evidence, to be unfit to study by reason of posing a risk to him/herself or others, he/she may be required to suspend those studies. The process is defined in the Institute's [Code of Practice Fitness to Study \(Higher Education\)](#)
- b) In the absence of the student's consent the Vice Principal Curriculum and Quality or other suitably qualified and experienced individual nominated by the Principal and Chief Executive can approve an interruption of study period on the grounds of risk where substantial evidence is deemed to exist
- c) Where a School perceives that a student is in need of an interruption of study on the grounds of risk, this must be reported in writing to the Head of Learner Services, and the student must be required to undertake a 'risk assessment' as the Head of Learner Services determines appropriate. Refusal to undertake an assessment shall be deemed justification in itself for the student being required to suspend study
- d) The Head of Learner Services must report his/her findings of the risk assessment, in writing, to the Head of Quality and Standards Department who must determine in light of the regulations and assessment, whether an interruption of study period shall be required and if so the period of interruption and any conditions that may be attached to such period
- e) Once an interruption of study on the grounds of risk is confirmed, the student must be notified in writing by recorded delivery to such addresses as recorded on the Institute's Student Records system at the time, and unless and until any appeal is heard and upheld
- f) An individual who is required to interrupt their study in accordance with these regulations must not be regarded as a student of the Institute during the period of suspension and shall not be entitled to use Institute facilities and services or be present on the Institute's campuses
- g) An individual who is required to suspend study must not be permitted to resume his/her studies until s/he has provided evidence to the Institute's Learner Services and which is subsequently deemed satisfactory by the Head Quality and Standards Department. Evidence must be relevant and provide assurance that the individual is fit to resume his/her studies

- h) Where a student has ongoing support needs these should be documented in a learner contract along with an agreement as to who will be responsible for providing this support. This agreement (if appropriate) should be made with the Institute's Learner Services or with external agencies. This evidence should be submitted to the student's Head of School
- i) A student who is required to suspend study (or whom is denied return to study) in accordance with these regulations shall have the right to appeal in accordance with these regulations. A member of the Institute's Learner Services should be invited to submit such advice or evidence as the panel and/or those involved in determining the appeal deem useful, and must attend any hearing on the same basis
- j) Any decision to require an interruption of study, the outcome of any appeal, and the decision to allow the student to resume his/her studies must be communicated to the student in writing by recorded delivery within five working days of the decision being made

6.6.3. Academic Issues Relating to Interruption of Study

- a) Students who are interrupting their studies are defined as taking a break from studies. As such, they are not registered students and are not entitled to receive any tuition or supervision.
- b) If the student has outstanding assessments or examinations, they may request to take those assessments whilst interrupting their studies. No students should be compelled to undertake assessments whilst interrupting their studies and this issue must be discussed at the time of the interruption of study request. The final decision as to whether the student is permitted to take outstanding assessments rests with the Head of School (or nominee). Schools must be particularly aware of students interrupting their studies due to health problems, and take into account that such students may not be fit to take assessments whilst interrupting their studies.
- c) Students who normally have alternative arrangements for their assessments may have those arrangements affected by interrupting their studies, particularly if those arrangements rely on the availability of DSA funding. Students in this position must discuss this with Disability Services and their academic department before interrupting their studies.

6.6.4. Access to Services

- a) Access to Institute services may be affected by interruption of studies. Once the student's status has been amended on the Management Information Systems, this information will be shared with other areas e.g. Library access. The main effects will be:
- Accommodation
 - Library
 - IT Services
 - Disability Services

7. Assessment, Reassessment and Awarding Credits

- a) The results of assessments and examinations must be approved by the Institute's Module Board of Examiners
- b) Any progression and/or awards decisions (including the award of credit) must be determined by the Programme Board of Examiners
- c) Progression and Awards must be ratified by the Regulations, Performance and Progression Committee

7.1. Summative Assessments Methods

- a) Methods of summative assessment for all modules must be in accordance with the Institute's [Code of Practice for Assessment of Students](#)
- b) Based on academic judgement and level, a 20 credit module must be assessed by either:

A 3,000-5,000 word written assignment

Or:

A mixture of modes of assessment, which is evidence-based and commensurate with the allocated learning hours, and which may include, for example:

- A formal 2-hour written examination
- A 2,000-3,000 word written assignment
- Presentations
- Laboratory work
- Experiments
- Performances
- In-class tests
- Oral examinations
- Projects
- Portfolios
- Computer-based tests
- E-assessment
- Exhibition of art works
- Live performance or outcomes evidenced through digital media

Schools **must**, if using a mixture of assessment modes within a single module, ensure that the overall assessment load for each student is not excessive, bearing in mind the requirements above

Modules of other than 20 credits must have an assessment load which takes the above requirements into account.

- c) Written summative assessments (including examinations) must not be held within the first 14 weeks for modules of two semesters duration

7.2. Attempts at assessment

- a) A student must be deemed to have made a first attempt at each component or sub-component of assessment at the due date, whether or not the attempt has been made, unless:
 - i. a standard extension of five working days deadline is authorised by the Programme Leader: or
 - ii. a non standard extension of time is agreed by the Mitigating Circumstances committee: or
 - iii. a deferral is agreed by the relevant Programme Board of Examiners. Where a deferral is granted, the student will be expected to attempt the assessment at the next available opportunity; this will usually be in August/September: or
 - iv. a student has been assessed by a Disability and Dyslexia Support Coordinator as requiring alternative assessment arrangements and permission authorised to cite his/her disability in a claim for an extended deadline. In such a case an appropriate period of extension should be recommended by the Disability and Dyslexia Support Co-ordinator and agreed with the Programme Leader
- b) In each instance work submitted by the extended deadline will be marked in the normal way with no capping of marks
- c) If the period of extension or deferral has expired, the student must be deemed to have made a first attempt at each component or sub-component of assessment, unless the relevant Programme Board of Examiners grants a further deferral on grounds of mitigating circumstances as approved by the Mitigating Circumstances committee

7.3. Reassessment

- a) The Institute will normally make a minimum of one re- assessment opportunity available for students who have satisfied programme and module requirements and the deadlines for submission of assessed work but who fail assessments or examinations, (except where precluded by the specific provision in a programme and module specification)
- b) A student must be denied reassessment in all modules if more than 60 credits within a stage has been failed
- c) Reassessment is not an automatic right of the student and must only be permitted at the discretion of the Programme Boards of Examiners. Schools must publish any criteria which they intend to use to determine the exercise of this discretion
- d) Any re-assessment opportunity will only be made available to students who have presented for the assessment on the first occasion or were absent with good cause. Persistent absence, absence without good cause or neglect of work may result in re-assessment being disallowed
- e) The second attempt for assessments should normally be in the late summer

- f) An exceptional, third and final attempt at a module assessment may be offered to a student at the discretion of the Programme Board of Examiners at a time to be determined by the Programme Board of Examiners. A student may be required to repeat study the module with attendance before engaging in re-assessment
- g) The method of re-assessment must be the same as the method of first assessment unless either the alternative method was published prior to the commencement of the module, or the written consent of the student(s) is obtained. Where alternative methods have been agreed, the same method must be adopted for all students to be reassessed in the current session
- h) A student who repeats an assessment for a module will normally only be eligible for the minimum pass mark (40%) as designated in the Institute's marking scale
- i) Where permissible within the specific regulations for a foundation degree, a student who has failed the first assessment for an optional module may withdraw from that module and substitute an alternative module. The student will have two attempts to pass the module but will only be eligible for the minimum pass mark of 40% at module level.
- j) A student who is not successful in the final attempt to meet the progression requirements or award requirements of a foundation degree after all assessment opportunities have been exhausted will be required to withdraw from the programme and may receive a contained award if sufficient credits have been attained

7.4. Student Responsibilities for Assessment and Reassessment

- a) Dates of examinations and for the submission of assessments/ reassessments must be published by the relevant School. It is the responsibility of student to:
 - i. make themselves aware of these dates, *and*
 - ii. attend examinations and submit work for assessment/ reassessment on the dates required

7.5. Module marks

- a) The performance of a student in meeting the assessment requirements of a module is determined by the Module Board of Examiners, and is indicated by a numerical mark recorded on the following scale:

Fail	0% to 34%
Compensation	35% to 39%
Pass	40% to 69%
Distinction	70% +
- b) Where the module specification stipulates that to pass the module a student must achieve a pass in one or more sub-module elements, and

the student does not pass such elements, the maximum mark which can be awarded for the module is 34%

- c) For modules passed **after** reassessment, a mark of 40% must be applied to the final and overall mark for the module, and must be used in calculating the stage weighted average for each stage of a programme

7.6. Awarding Marks and Credits

- a) A student who fails to submit a component or sub-component of assessment as required will be awarded a mark of 0% for that component or sub-component of assessment
- b) A student must make an attempt at all assessments and can not pass a module if they fail to submit a component or sub-component of assessment. An attempt has been made if a mark of 20% or more has been gained
- c) Students must complete and pass any assessments or examinations as specified in their foundation degree to be awarded credit for that module
- d) Students may not be permitted to present themselves for assessments if they have not participated in the activities specified for a module
- e) Credits for the same module cannot be awarded to a student more than once

7.7. Mitigation

- a) Mitigation is a process designed to assist students who have encountered unforeseen circumstances which have prevented them from submitting an item of assessed work for the published deadline; or from attending an examination; or from performing to their usual standard; and to bring these unforeseen circumstances to the Institute's attention. The process is designed to maintain student engagement in assessment
- b) Mitigation is not the correct process to follow if a student has a chronic long term disability or long term medical condition (unless it has suddenly deteriorated). In such instances assessment adjustments and support should be discussed with Learner Services Department who will refer the student to the Disabilities and Dyslexia Service through which adjustments may be put in place throughout the year
- c) Mitigation is categorised into 3 criteria; namely: absence with good cause; non standard extension with good cause; and impaired performance with good cause

7.8. Absence with Good Cause and Non Standard Extension with Good Cause

- a) A student who is unable to attend a scheduled written examination/assessment, or submit a piece of assessed work by the published summative date, may apply, for 'Absence with Good Cause' or a 'Non Standard Extension with Good Cause', provided that the application is formally made no later than

7 working days after the date of the examination; or **7 working days** after the date on which submission of the assessment material was due

- b) Where an application is made within the permitted timescale, the Mitigating Circumstances Committee must determine whether the application constitutes 'good cause' and report accordingly to the relevant Module Board of Examiners
- c) It is not possible to give definitive examples of what a Mitigating Circumstances Committee will consider reasonable cases of 'Good Cause' which relate to unforeseen or exceptional circumstances affecting a student's ability to study. Examples may include serious illness; incapacity (which must only be considered in extreme cases such as emotional stress resulting from bereavement, being a victim of crime). Difficulties in travel do not constitute good cause unless exceptional circumstances exist, such as adverse weather conditions affecting travel. Students are expected in all circumstances to attempt alternative forms of transport
- d) All applications must be supported by the appropriate documentary evidence. The Mitigating Circumstances Committee must have regard to the extent to which the evidence submitted confirms the student's claim against the circumstances. Other than in exceptional circumstances no claim based upon medical circumstances must be accepted in the absence of evidence from a medical practitioner. Such evidence should be rejected where it is not evident that the medical practitioner witnessed first-hand the medical circumstances claimed
- e) Where the Mitigating Circumstances Committee determines that good cause has been established, the Committee will recommend to the Module Board of Examiners that:
 - i. in the case of a written examination, the student must be awarded a 'Fresh Attempt' at the examination. A 'Fresh attempt' means the student is offered a new first attempt, and in the case of a re-assessment, that the student is offered a new re-assessment
 - or*
 - ii. in the case of a piece of assessed work, the student will be awarded an extension, subject to a new deadline being set by the Mitigating Circumstances Committee
- f) Where a student is offered a fresh attempt s/he must be informed in writing of the offer and the mark achieved in the module, notwithstanding the mitigating circumstances, and must be permitted to decline the offer, in writing, within five working days of notification
- g) Where the student declines the offer the mark for the original attempt must stand and no further action must be taken
- h) Where the student does not decline the offer within the time limit the mark for the original attempt must become void irrespective of any mark subsequently achieved by the student

7.9. Impaired Performance

- a) A student who has attempted their examination, or submitted their assessment to the published deadline but who believes that their performance has been significantly impaired by mitigating circumstances, may apply for 'impaired performance with good cause'
- b) A student application for impaired performance must be made no later than 7 working days after the date of the examination; or 7 working days after the date on which submission of the assessment material was submitted
- c) Where an application is made within the permitted timescale, the Mitigating Circumstances Committee must determine whether the application constitutes 'good cause' (as defined in criteria 13.6 and 13.7) and report accordingly to the relevant Module Board of Examiners
- d) Where the Mitigating Circumstances Committee determines that good cause has been established, the Committee will recommend to the Module Board of Examiners that:
 - i. in the case of a written examination, the student must be awarded a 'Fresh Attempt' at the examination. A 'Fresh attempt' means the student is offered a new first attempt, and in the case of a reassessment, that the student is offered a new reassessment
or
 - ii. where it judges that but for the exceptional mitigating circumstances the student would have passed the module, award the student a 'pass with mitigation' with an overall module mark of 40. A 'pass with mitigation' **must not** be recorded on the student's Official Transcript
or
 - iii. the matter is referred in exceptional mitigating circumstances to the relevant Programme Board of Examiners with the recommendation that the circumstances be taken into account by that Board when determining the final award of the student's Foundation Degree
- e) Where a student is offered a fresh attempt s/he shall be informed in writing of the offer and the mark achieved in the module, notwithstanding the mitigating circumstances, and should be permitted to decline the offer, in writing, within five working days of notification. Where the student declines the offer the mark for the original attempt shall stand and no further action shall be taken. Where the student does not decline the offer within the time limit the mark for the original attempt shall become void irrespective of any mark subsequently achieved by the student
- f) Where a student is offered a pass with mitigation s/he shall be informed in writing of the offer and the mark achieved in the module, notwithstanding the mitigating circumstances, and should be permitted to decline the offer, in writing, within five working days of notification and elect a fresh attempt

- g) A 'pass with mitigation' is entirely separate from compensation, condonement and referral and is not restricted by or part of the maxima specified in relevant regulations

7.10. Late Applications

- a) Where a student makes an application after the deadline referred to in clause 13.4, the Mitigating Circumstances committee must decide whether the application will be considered by having regard to:
 - i. the reasons given by the student for the lateness of the application and the evidence to support this
 - ii. the risk of the student gaining, or being perceived to be gaining, an advantage through the late application
- b) Where the Mitigating Circumstances Committee determines that an application shall be considered and is satisfied, by reference to the published criteria of good cause, that it should be approved as per clause 13.8

8. Academic and professional behaviour

8.1. Non attendance/submission

- a) Where a student fails to attend an examination, or submit a piece of assessed work without receiving the approval of the Mitigating Circumstances committee a mark of zero must be awarded for that examination/piece of assessed work. Any opportunity for a further attempt must be subject to the discretion of the Programme Board of Examiners
- b) Where the examination or piece of work is awarded zero, the Module Board of Examiners must calculate the overall module mark taking into account any other sub module element marks

8.2. Exclusion from assessment and termination of programme

- a) A student who has not satisfied the attendance requirements which are part of an approved programme or module specification, or the deadlines for submission of assessed work as published by the Institute, may be:
 - i. excluded from the assessments for the module, or
 - ii. have his/her foundation degree terminated
- b) Exclusion and termination shall both be subject to the approval of the Programme Board of Examiners

8.3. Professional Misconduct

- a) Professional misconduct means any behaviour that falls below the standards of behaviour that are expected of students whilst enrolled on a particular foundation degree and which normally relate to preparation for professional

registration and demonstration of professional suitability (with a professional, regulatory or statutory body)

- b) Professional misconduct includes any actions taken by the student during the course of their study on any of the Institute's Group; or on any placement/work based activity linked to the foundation degree; or any conduct outside of the Institute's campuses including the student's social life, that may call into question the student's professional suitability or/and as such would bring the reputation of the Institute and/or foundation degree into disrepute
- c) The procedure for dealing with allegations of professional misconduct relating to unfair means will be managed through the Institute's [Code of Practice Plagiarism, Cheating and Unfair Means](#). All other allegations of professional misconduct will be managed via the Student Disciplinary Policy. In both instances the Institute is empowered to terminate a student's foundation degree

9. Boards of Examiners

- a) The Institute requires two levels of boards of examiners, both of which have separate and distinct responsibilities:
- Module boards verify module marks awarded to candidates for summative assessment tasks
 - Programme boards verify progression between programme stages, to awards, and where applicable the classification of awards
- b) Under no circumstances may module and programme boards alter any decision made by the other. Neither may impose a penalty for plagiarism or other unfair means. A programme board, acting on information not available to module boards, may invite the chair of a module board to consider whether the marks verified for a specified module(s) were appropriate.

9.1. Chairs of Boards of Examiners

- a) Heads of School **must** consult with the Academic Registrar before appointing chairs of module and programme boards. A list of chairs **should** be sent to the Secretary of the Regulations, Performance and Progression Committee before the assessment period begins.
- b) Chairs **should** be appointed for a period of three years, a period which may be renewed. Each chair must attend the Institute briefing session provided by HE Quality and Standards Department before their first board, and should receive annual updates provided by the Institute unless otherwise directed by Regulations, Performance and Progression Committee.

9.2. Module Boards

- a) A module board **must** comprise:
- The chair appointed in accordance with para.9.1
 - The relevant external examiner(s)
 - The relevant internal examiners
 - A secretary who must not be the same person as the chair

- b) A module board will be deemed quorate only where the chair and no fewer than 50% of the internal examiners are present. Any decisions made by an inquorate board remain provisional until confirmed by a board which is quorate. Where the external examiner is unable to attend the board may proceed but the Academic Registrar (or nominated person) **must** be informed.
- c) Where an external examiner is unable to attend s/he must be provided with the opportunity to provide relevant comments by another means (e.g. e-mail, telephone, fax, video conferencing).

9.3. Unfair Means

- a) The module board **must** be informed of all relevant unfair means cases, including those resolved and the penalty imposed, whether via a Plagiarism Caution or by an Adjudication Panel in accordance with the Regulations on the Use of Unfair Means, and cases ongoing. Where the board is informed of a penalty imposed in accordance with the Regulations the board **must** apply that penalty to the module in question and confirm the mark. Under no circumstances is a module board permitted to change the decision specified in the Caution or specified by the Adjudication Panel. Where a case is ongoing the module board **must** defer decision for the candidate(s) in question

9.4. Confirmation of marks

- a) Agreement of the marks awarded, and therefore resolution of any disagreement between examiners, **should** be achieved before the module board sits. The board **should** therefore be able to focus on confirming the marks awarded taking into account and confirming any recommendations of the Mitigating Circumstance Committee and any penalties for unfair means. In the event that a disagreement has not been resolved, the chair is the final arbiter of the mark to be awarded following consultation with members of the board, including the external examiner(s).
- b) In confirming the marks awarded the board's decision must be informed by the relevant module results data, which includes comparing the current range of marks with those in previous years and on other modules at the same level. Boards **must** consider any anomalies which become apparent and take steps to address any unfairness, including re-scaling marks where appropriate.
- c) The board **must** ensure that for all candidates, members are clear whether it is a first attempt or reassessment which is being considered, and therefore ensure that for modules passed by reassessment, that the mark is capped at the pass mark.

9.5. Programme Boards

- a) A programme board **must** comprise:
- The chair appointed in accordance with para. 9.1
 - The relevant external examiner(s)
 - The relevant programme leader

- At least two other internal examiners responsible for modules from the programme (including those from other departments where the programme involves modules from more than one department)
 - A secretary who **must** not be the same person as the chair
- b) A programme board will be deemed quorate only where the chair and no fewer than 50% of the internal examiners are present. Where the external examiner is unable to attend the board may proceed but the Academic Registrar & HE Quality Manager (or nominated person) must be informed.

9.6. Role of the programme board

- a) Programme boards are responsible for determining the progression of candidates between the stages of a programme and to an award including, where applicable, determining the classification of the award. Under no circumstances is a programme board permitted to change the marks of a module. A programme board, acting on information not available to module boards, may invite the chair of a module board to consider whether the marks verified for a specified module(s) were appropriate.

9.7. Mitigating circumstances

- a) Programme boards are empowered to consider applications for mitigating circumstances where supported by valid evidence, on the recommendation of the Mitigating Circumstances Committee, provided that the same circumstances have not already been considered by one or more module boards
- When determining whether to exercise discretion in favour of a candidate (referral and condonement)
 - When determining degree classification.
- b) 'Considered' above means, determined that the application is valid and decided to make a decision based on the circumstances (offered fresh attempt or 'pass with mitigation'), or decided not to act (e.g. because the impact of the circumstances is deemed too limited).
- c) A 'pass with mitigation' means an award of 40 for the module will be given; but only the mark will appear on the transcript with no reference to the mitigation.

9.8. Unfair Means

- a) The programme board **must** be informed of all cases where a penalty has been imposed by an Unfair Means Adjudication Panel which relates to the application of compensation, referral or condonement. A programme board is not permitted to override the decision of an Adjudication Panel (for example by granting compensation, referral or condonement where the Panel has determined that this be denied). However, where a Panel has determined not to deny referral or condonement, the programme board, in the exercise of its discretion may deny provided that such denial is solely on grounds other than unfair means (such as non attendance or non submission).

9.9. Maxima: Compensation, Condonement and Referral

9.9.1. Maxima

- a) Maxima are categorised in order to achieve an appropriate balance between providing a safety net in the event of modules being failed (usually after reassessment) and ensuring that sufficient credits are passed to merit the award
- b) Subject to the criteria relating to 'Compensation', 'Condonement' and 'Referral', the following maxima must apply to the exercise of any combination of compensation, referral or condonement (whether individually or in combination):
 - i. no more than 40 credits at pre-certificate stage
 - ii. no more than 40 credits at certificate stage
 - iii. no more than 40 credits at Foundation Degree/intermediate stage
 - iv. no more than 40 credits per Foundation Degree (without a pre-certificate stage)
 - v. no more than 80 credits per Foundation Degree with a pre-certificate stage, with no more than 40 credits in total for both certificate and Foundation Degree/intermediate stage
- c) Where a referred module is subsequently passed and the student is allowed to progress to the next stage, the referral ceases to be included in the maxima defined above

9.9.2. Compensation

- a) Excluding any module declared in the foundation degree to be non-compensatable, compensation allows a module to be treated as a pass and the credits to be awarded in defined circumstances; those circumstances being:
 - i. when the raw mark for the module is in the range 35-39%
 - ii. the weighted average of all marks for the stage is 40% or greater, and no mark for the stage is 34% or below
- b) A student may waive the right to pass a module(s) by compensation and choose instead to be reassessed. If the reassessment is subsequently failed then the original pass by compensation shall be reinstated

9.9.3. Condonement

- a) A student at the Pre-Certificate or Foundation Degree/Intermediate Stage who has completed the assessments for all modules in the stage and who has not achieved a pass mark in all modules may, at the discretion of the Programme Board of Examiners, be condoned in any module or modules with a mark of 34% or less provided that:

- i. the weighted average of all the marks for the stage is 40 or greater, and
 - ii. for students on the Pre-certificate or Foundation Degree/Intermediate stage the total number of credits to be condoned is no greater than 20, and
 - iii. the module (or modules) in question is not declared in the foundation degree to be non compensatable or non condonable
- b) Condonement **must** not be permitted prior to an attempt at re- assessment(s) for the module
- c) Condonement **must** not be permitted at the certificate stage

9.9.4. Referral

- a) Referral allows a failed module to be retaken with attendance in its entirety simultaneously with the next stage of the programme
- b) For students on the certificate stage the total number of credits to be referred is no greater than 20
- c) Referral must not be permitted at the pre-certificate stage

9.10. Progression and Classification

9.10.1. Calculation of Stage Weighted Average

- a) Credit which has been accepted towards the foundation degree in accordance with the repeat year regulation must be disregarded for the purposes of calculating stage weighted averages
- b) The stage average mark shall be rounded to the nearest integer
- c) Overall average marks must be rounded to the nearest integer. For example: .5 is rounded up; .4 is rounded down. Rounding must be carried out at the point at which the stage average is calculated
- d) The credit weighted average must equal 70% or more for the award of a Foundation Degree with Distinction. However, if the overall average mark is within 2% or less (i.e. 68% or more) of the 70% boundary for Foundation Degree with Distinction, the Board of Examiners may award the distinction provided that more than 50% of the credits at level 5 are in the higher classification

9.11. Consequences of Ineligibility to Progress

9.11.1. Fail repeat year

- a) A student on the Certificate stage of a Foundation Degree, who fails more than 60 credits at the first attempt, shall be deemed ineligible to proceed further with the programme

- b) At the discretion of the Programme Board of Examiners, the student may be permitted to repeat the stage in question in its entirety, on academic grounds determined by:
 - i. the profile of marks, particularly any evidence of improvement during the stage in question
 - ii. the academic standing of the student (attendance and submission of work)
 - iii. the student's potential to succeed at the stage if given a new attempt, and their potential to progress to subsequent stages
 - iv. any mitigating circumstances such as personal or medical problems which the student has suffered and which affected their performance in assessments during the stage In question
 - v. confirmation that the repeat year can only be granted after first assessments; not after reassessments; a student who has failed 60 credits or more after **reassessment** would be ineligible to progress
- c) Credits originally awarded during the stage to be repeated must be disregarded.

9.11.2. Repeating a stage

- a) A student must not be permitted to repeat a stage, or enrol for the programme de novo other than with the approval of the Programme Board of Examiners and subsequent ratification by the Regulations, Performance and Progression Committee
- b) With the exception of regulation 9.11.2 a, a student may apply for a repeat stage to the Mitigating Circumstances board which must be ratified by the Regulations, Performance and Progression Committee
- c) Approval must only be granted where the student has demonstrated significant medical or exceptional personal circumstance affecting the period which is sought to be repeated. An application to the Mitigating Circumstances board must not be approved if not supported with appropriate, authentic, reliable and valid supporting evidence
- d) Where a repeat is permitted all credits gained during the original attempt shall cease to count towards the programme, and the entire stage must be repeated. Any marks awarded during the original attempt must not appear on the student's official transcript

10. External Examiners

- a) The Institute must appoint one or more external examiner(s) to carry out the role(s) and responsibilities defined for all provision that leads to a Foundation Degree or Contained Award
- b) The Institute must ensure it maintains accurate, complete and up to date information about External Examiners including their name, position, institution and period of tenure

- c) The Institute must make External Examiners annual reports available in full to students, with the sole exception of any confidential report made directly, and separately, to the Principal and Chief Executive of the Institute. The External Examiners name, designation and institution must also be published in relevant student handbooks
- d) The Institute must provide a considered and timely response to any confidential report received, outlining any actions it will be taking as a result

10.1. Responsibilities

- a) The general responsibilities of an External Examiner are to:
 - i. Provide the Institute with impartial and independent advice, as well as informative comments on the standards of the Institute's Foundation Degrees and on student achievement in relation to those standards
 - ii. Ensure equity and fairness in the decisions reached in respect of each student being assessed and that the standards of the Institute's Foundation Degrees are maintained
 - iii. Report to the Institute on aspects of the quality of the assessment process, the standards set, and the threshold and typical standards of achievement and to advise the Module Board of Examiners on the marks to be awarded
 - iv. Provide informative comments and recommendations on observed evidence of good practice and innovation relating to learning, teaching and assessment observed by the external examiner
 - v. Meet with students and contribute to opportunities to enhance the quality of the learning opportunities provided to them
 - vi. At the Programme Board of Examiners ensure that academic regulations are fairly and consistently implemented
 - vii. Conform with the requirements and criteria specified in these regulations and the Institute's [Code of Practice External Examining](#).
- b) The specific responsibilities of an Institute appointed External Examiner are to provide informative comments and recommendations upon whether or not:
 - i. The Institute is designing and setting its assessments for modules (examination papers and coursework briefs) in terms of standards and relevance to intended learning outcomes
 - ii. Samples of marked work (or other evidence as appropriate, such as artefacts, design shows and presentations) meet the programme and module requirements, in addition to threshold and typical standards of achievement
 - iii. The Institute is maintaining the threshold academic standards set for its Foundation Degrees in accordance with the frameworks for higher education qualifications and applicable subject benchmark statements
 - iv. The Institute is measuring student achievement within the assessment process rigorously and fairly against the intended outcomes of the programme(s) and is conducting assessment in line with its policies and regulations
 - v. Academic standards and the achievements of students are comparable with those in other UK higher education institutions of which the external examiner has experience

- c) Within the Module Board of Examiners and prior to the confirmation of mark lists, pass lists or similar documents, the External Examiner must formally endorse the outcomes of the assessment processes they have been appointed to scrutinise. This must be clearly recorded within the minutes of the Module Board of Examiners

10.2. Appointment

- a) All external examiner appointments shall be approved by the RPPC
- b) The Academic Registrar (or nominated person) must maintain a central register of appointments and periods of tenure to avoid inadvertent conflicts of interest and ensure the proper rotation of external examiners
- c) The terms of appointment require External Examiners to provide evidence of the following:
 - i. knowledge and understanding of UK sector agreed reference points for the maintenance of academic standards and assurance and enhancement of quality
 - ii. competence and experience in the fields covered by the foundation degree, or parts thereof
 - iii. relevant academic and/or professional qualifications to at least the level of the qualification being externally examined
 - iv. competence and experience relating to designing and operating a variety of assessment tasks appropriate to the subject and operating assessment procedures
 - v. sufficient standing, credibility and breadth of experience within the subject to be able to command the respect of academic peers and, where appropriate, professional peers
 - vi. familiarity with the standard to be expected of students to achieve the award that is to be assessed
 - vii. fluency in English, and where programmes are delivered and assessed in languages other than English, fluency in the relevant language(s) (unless other secure arrangements are in place to ensure that external examiners are provided with the information to make their judgements)
 - viii. at the time of appointment demonstrate permission to work within the UK
 - ix. meeting applicable criteria set by professional, statutory or regulatory bodies
 - x. awareness of current developments in the design and delivery of relevant curricula
 - xi. competence and experience relating to the enhancement of the student learning experience

10.3. Conflicts of Interest

- a) The Institute must not appoint an External Examiner who is deemed to have a conflict of interest such as anyone in the following categories or circumstances:
 - i. a member of a governing body or committee or current employee of the Institute or partner Institution

- ii. anyone with a close professional, contractual or personal relationship with a member of staff or student involved with the foundation degree
- iii. anyone required to assess or moderate work of colleagues who are recruited as students to the foundation degree
- iv. anyone who is, or knows they will be, in a position to influence significantly the future of students on the foundation degree or in employment
- v. be directly involved in the placement of students in the External Examiner's organisation, or in contact with placement students following the programme to which he or she is appointed
- vi. anyone significantly involved in recent or current substantive collaborative research or scholarship activities with a member of staff closely involved in the delivery, management or assessment of the programme(s) or modules in question
- vii. former staff or students of the institution unless a period of five years has elapsed and all students taught by or with the External Examiner have completed their programme(s)
- viii. a reciprocal arrangement involving cognate programmes at another institution
- ix. the succession of an External Examiner by a colleague from the Examiner's home department and institution
- x. the appointment of more than one External Examiner from the same department of the same institution

10.4. Period of Tenure

- a) The duration of an External Examiner's appointment will be for four years (covering three annual cycles of assessment) normally from September in the first year of the appointment until December following the final academic year of the appointment (e.g. September 2012 - December 2016) with an opportunity for an exceptional extension of one year to ensure continuity
- b) All External Examiner appointments will reviewed annually in line with clause 10.1
- c) An External Examiner may be reappointed in exceptional circumstances but only after a period of five years or more has elapsed since their last appointment by the Institute
- d) External Examiners should normally hold no more than two External Examiner appointments for taught programmes/modules at any point in time

10.5. Approval

- a) All External Examining appointments must be approved by the RPPC
- b) The Academic Registrar (or nominated person) must on approval by the RPPC and via the Institute's Human Resources Department ensure that all External Examiners are informed about organisational procedures, practices, and academic regulations, and the crucial value of External Examiners' feedback to the Institute as part of the broader system of quality assurance and enhancement

- c) The Academic Registrar (or nominated person) must ensure that all newly appointed External Examiners receive a copy of the latest External Examiner report(s)
- d) As a minimum, the Institute must provide External Examiners with written information about, and access to:
 - i. modules, programmes and/or award(s) to which each External Examiner is appointed
 - ii. relevant Institute and programme regulations for its Foundation Degrees
 - iii. the various responsibilities and powers assigned to their External Examiner role including the extent of their authority in a Board of examiners
 - iv. examining and assessment regulations and the Code of Practice for External Examiners and Code of Practice Assessment of Students
 - v. information such as programme and module handbooks, and marking and classification criteria
 - vi. learning, teaching and assessment strategies
 - vii. information about relevant professional issues, such as fitness to practise, and any features that relate to the specific discipline
 - viii. the processes through which their work contributes to the Institute's quality assurance processes
- e) The Institute must inform External Examiners, in writing at the beginning of their term of office, that they have a right to raise any matter of serious concern with the Principal and Chief Executive, if necessary by means of a separate confidential written report

10.6. External Examiner Induction

- a) All newly appointed External Examiners must receive a letter inviting them to attend the Institute's External Examiner Induction, for a generic induction to the role of External Examiner at the Institute

10.7. Submitting Reports

- a) External Examiners must submit an annual report, to the Assistant Principal 14-19 and Higher Education within **20 working days** of the Programme Board being held
- b) External Examiners' annual reports must provide clear and informative feedback on those areas defined as part of the External Examiners responsibilities

In addition, External Examiners' reports must:

- i. confirm that sufficient evidence was received to enable the role to be fulfilled (where evidence was insufficient, they give details)
- ii. state whether issues raised in the previous report(s) have been, or are being, addressed to their satisfaction
- iii. address any issues as specifically required by any relevant professional or regulatory body
- iv. give an overview of their term of office (when concluded)

10.8. Responses to External Examiners

- a) The Institute must provide each External Examiner with a considered and timely response within **30 working days** to their comments and recommendations, outlining any actions they will be taking as a result or the reasons for not taking action

10.9. Termination of Appointment

- a) The appointment of an External Examiner may be terminated by the RPPC if the Committee judges that the responsibilities of the appointment have not been or cannot be fulfilled in the manner or to the standard which the Institute requires
- b) Reasons for termination may include:
 - i. failure to provide reports (or complete reports) on the assessment process required by the Institute
 - ii. inability to attend two successive boards
 - iii. persistent refusal to work within the Institute's academic regulations
 - iv. conduct which in the case of an employee of the Institute would be the subject of disciplinary action
 - v. relocation of the External Examiner from the UK
- c) The Institute recognises that a change in the External Examiner's circumstances which brings about potential conflicts of interest might jeopardise objectivity. Where this cannot be resolved, normal practice would be for the External Examiner to resign. Only, as a last resort the Institute will terminate the appointment to protect the independence of its External Examining arrangements
- d) The power to terminate the appointment is not restricted to a particular time period, such as the end of the academic year, but the Institute must ensure that decisions are made on sound evidence of non fulfilment and make such decisions in accordance with procedures set out in these regulations and relevant policies and Codes of Practice
- e) When circumstances arise which are considered as possible grounds for termination of an External Examiner's contract, the HE Academic Registrar (or nominated person) and HR Manager must be notified as soon as practicable
- f) The HE Academic Registrar (or nominated person) will write formally to the Examiner to inform him/her that the termination is being considered and to offer the opportunity for the Examiner to explain the circumstances and request that the termination is not effected
- g) The Chair of the RPPC will take the final decision regarding the termination; the External Examiner will be notified in writing of this decision within 5 working days of the Committee being held

10.10. Resignation of External Examiners

- a) Where an External Examiner wishes to resign before the end of their term, this should be done in writing to the Academic Registrar (or nominated person), Higher Education Quality and Standards Department who will send a letter confirming termination of employment

11. Results and transcripts

11.1. Notifications of Results and Transcripts

- a) It is the responsibility of students to find out their results, however the Student Handbook must explain to students how and where the results of their assessments will be published and how to object to the publication of their results
- b) Provisional marks for first semester assessments should be published at the start of the second semester (normally February), as required by the assessment calendar
- c) It must be made clear to students that the marks are provisional and are subject to ratification by the Board of Examiners at the end of semester two (normally June)
- d) Where students (such as those studying part time) are eligible for progression between levels at a mid-year point (such as between semester one and two) a Programme Board of Examiners must be held and the progression ratified by the board before a student is permitted to proceed onto modules at the next level
- e) No final marks or the decisions relating to a student's award and progression that are held on the Institute's Board of Examiner records may be released or published until approved by the Regulations, Performance and Progression Committee
- f) No results must be disclosed before the formal date of publication
- g) Unless a student wishes otherwise, results should be published on relevant notice boards and/or published electronically on a protected site
- h) Results must not be released to students by telephone
- i) Results published must identify students by their student number and not by name
- j) With compliance to clause 11.1.f, on completion of a stage and academic year, the student must be issued with a letter of results which must record all modules taken (including withdrawals), all marks and credits awarded (including fails) and marks obtained

- k) With compliance to clause 11.1.f, on completion of the foundation degree and/or period of enrolment, the student must be issued with a transcript of results which must record all modules taken (including withdrawals), all marks and credits awarded (including fails), marks obtained and any credit obtained or conferred award
- l) No student is entitled to any assessment results, results letter, transcript, certificate and award unless all fees for tuition, library loans, accommodation and any other sums of money have been paid and/or any rightful property of the Institute has been returned in its original condition (at the point it was taken or loaned)
- m) Unfair means penalties must not be included on a result letter and or transcript

11.2. Posthumous Awards

- a) The Board of Examiners, with the recommendation of the Head of School and support of the External Examiner, may recommend to the Regulations, Performance and Progression Committee the award of a Posthumous Foundation Degree to a deceased student, for conferral at a graduation ceremony
- b) In the interests of courtesy and sensitivity a Posthumous Award must only be made with the knowledge and consent of the next of kin and/or immediate family members
- c) For the award of a Posthumous Foundation Degree the student must have:
 - i. Good academic standing
 - ii. Assessment results (whilst studying at the Institute) where it is reasonable to conclude that the student would have successfully completed the programme and qualified for the award in question
 - iii. Completed 200 credits of the requirements for the Foundation Degree
- d) There should be no known evidence to suggest that the conferral of an award will cause offence or undue stress to the relatives of the deceased, or others within the Institute or community
- e) In cases where it is determined the student did not meet the above requirements for a Foundation Degree, a Posthumous Certificate may be awarded, if appropriate. A Posthumous Certificate may be awarded if the student has made significant progress toward the attainment of a Foundation Degree
- f) A Posthumous Foundation Degree or certificate must be unclassified and, in all other respects, upgraded
- g) A Posthumous Award must be awarded in the name of the deceased student and may be announced at the next relevant graduation ceremony, if the next of kin so desires. The award certificate may be presented to the student's next

of kin as part of a private meeting by the Head of School or alternative, or sent by post as soon as possible, if this is the wish of the next of kin

- h) The student's certificate will be printed with the words "Awarded Posthumously". On the transcript, it will be noted that the award is "Posthumous"
- i) In the event that it is not permitted by a professional body to award a Posthumous Foundation Degree or Contained Award for which the student was enrolled, the Board of Examiners may consider an alternative award

11.3. Aegrotat Award

- a) Should a student be prevented by illness or other event from attempting/completing a Foundation Degree, the Board of Examiners, with the recommendation of the Head of School and support of the External Examiner, may recommend to the Regulations, Performance and Progression Committee an Aegrotat Foundation Degree
- b) There must be little doubt that the student will be unable, due to illness or other event, to return to complete his/her studies at a later date
- c) For the award of a Aegrotat Foundation Degree the student must have:
 - i. Good academic standing
 - ii. Assessment results (whilst studying at the Institute) where it is reasonable to conclude that the student would have successfully completed the programme and qualified for the award in question
 - iii. Completed 200 credits of the requirements for the Foundation Degree
- d) In cases where it is determined the student did not meet the above requirements for a Foundation Degree, a Aegrotat Certificate may be awarded, if appropriate. An Aegrotat Certificate may be awarded if the student has made significant progress toward the attainment of a Foundation Degree
- e) An Aegrotat Foundation Degree or certificate must be unclassified and, in all other respects, upgraded
- f) The student's certificate will be printed with the words "An Aegrotat Award". On the transcript, it will be noted that the award is "Aegrotat"
- g) In the event that it is not permitted by a professional body to award a Aegrotat Foundation Degree or Contained Award for which the student was enrolled, the Board of Examiners may consider an alternative award
- h) The student must indicate that he/she is willing to accept an Aegrotat award. Where a student is unwilling to accept an Aegrotat award, he/she shall be permitted to complete the examinations or assessments in question by an approved subsequent date

11.4. Conferral at a Graduation Ceremony

- a) In those cases where a relative has agreed to accept the award on behalf of a deceased graduand, the relative receiving the award on their behalf should be encouraged to sit with other graduands participating in the ceremony, but given the option of sitting with relatives and friends if they would prefer
- b) If the relative receiving the award elects to sit with the graduands, they should also be given the option of wearing a black academic gown (but not a hood and trencher/ mortarboard or other applicable head wear)
- c) When the Posthumous Award is presented to the graduation ceremony, the presenting officer will wait for the previous graduand to leave the platform and will then read: “[Graduands full name] who has completed all aspects of a Foundation Degree [name of the degree] but has sadly passed away before this conferral ceremony. To receive this award today, I present [name of family member and their relationship to the deceased]”

(Note: the wording of this part may be amended subject to the award, and if after consultation with the family of the graduand, it is felt that more appropriate wording in relation to the graduand should be included)
- d) As a memorial gift the Institute will present, to the relatives of the deceased graduand a framed certificate of the award made

11.5. Certification Wording

- a) The Institute’s Foundation Degrees will be conferred in a named subject
- b) A Certificate of Higher Education will not be conferred in a named subject
- c) A Posthumous Award must comply with clause 11.2.g
- d) An Aegrotat Award must comply with clause 11.3.f

12. Academic Appeals and Complaints

- a) An academic appeal is defined as a request for the review of a decision of an academic body charged with decisions on student progression, assessment and awards, such as a Board of Examiners
- b) In the event of a set of circumstances legitimately giving rise to grounds for both appeal and complaint the Chair of Regulations, Performance and Progression Committee, should determine in consultation with the appellant/complainant the manner in which the two matters shall be resolved, and the appropriate timescale. All parties shall ensure that the requirements of the respective regulations are fully adhered to
- c) As a result of making an appeal in good faith, a student has the right to appeal against a decision of the Module or Programme Board of Examiners without fear of disadvantage or recrimination

- d) The regulations can (save in exceptional circumstances) only be applied by the student (appellant) themselves and not by someone acting on their behalf
- e) At all the stages of the appeals process, the appellant has a right to be accompanied to any meeting called by the Institute as part of the appeals process by a friend, who may not (save in exceptional circumstances) be a lawyer acting in a professional capacity. The friend may not speak on behalf of or otherwise represent the interests of the individual concerned unless invited to do so by the Institute
- f) Where any of the Institute's Foundation Degrees or Contained Awards are conferred at a graduation ceremony, either in person or in absentia, the student shall be deemed to have accepted that qualification and all marks and classifications which constitute it. No appeal shall thereafter be considered

12.1. Grounds for an Academic Appeal

- a) The Institute permits 3 grounds for academic appeals:
 - i. that, at the time of the assessment, there existed circumstances which adversely affected the appellant's performance which, for the most exceptional reasons, the appellant was unable to communicate to the Board of Examiners before it reached its decision. In making such a case, the appellant must provide valid documentary evidence where appropriate. Other than in exceptional cases, retrospective medical certification will not be accepted as valid
 - ii. that there has been an administrative error or procedural irregularity during the conduct of the relevant assessment of such a significant nature as to have materially affected the approved grade or mark awarded
 - iii. that there are reasonable grounds to believe that the recommendation or decision was influenced by prejudice or bias on the part of one or more of the examiners
- b) Posting of a results letter or transcript to an appellant's address that is listed as current but the appellant claims is a previous address, does not constitute grounds for any claim within the appeals process. It is the responsibility of the student (appellant) to ensure that his/her current addresses are up to date via the student records department
- c) If an enrolled student wishes to raise a submit an appeal, the Institute's regulations for [Academic Appeals](#) (Higher Education, Foundation Degrees) must be followed.

12.2. Complaints

- a) If an enrolled student wishes to raise a concern or make complaint, the Institute's regulations for [Concerns and Complaints \(Higher Education\)](#) must be followed.
- b) If an applicant (an individual who is not enrolled with the Institute) wishes to make an appeal against an academic decision and unsuccessful outcome of an

application (for admission to a Foundation Degree), or to make a complaint regarding the way their application (for admission) was processed, the Institute [Code of Practice Admissions Appeals and Complaints \(Higher Education\)](#) must be followed.

12.3. Legitimate Incidental Expenses

- a) In the event of an appeal being upheld, the appellant may be entitled to the payment of legitimate and reasonable incidental expenses necessarily incurred in relation to the appeal, which may include the cost of travel to the appeal hearing and overnight accommodation, but must not include the cost of producing or copying evidence relevant to the appeal, or the obtaining of any advice or instruction relating to the appeal
- b) The Chair of the Appeals Committee should determine which expenses shall be paid following a successful appeal, subject to any further guidance or instruction which may be issued by the Human Resources Department

Appendix 1 : Major Amendment or New Programmes Approval Process



