

## University Programme Regulations Chapter III - Foundation Degrees

<b>Document Reference:</b>	Foundation Degrees
<b>Identifier:</b>	QH:B3
<b>Version:</b>	2 09 <span style="float: right;"><b>Date:</b> Sept 16</span>
<b>In force:</b>	On Approval
<b>Approved By:</b>	Senate
<b>Originator:</b>	Learning Enhancement and Academic Practice
<b>Application to collaborative provision:</b>	<b>Mandatory</b>
<b>Responsibilities:</b>	Heads of School Chairs of module and programme boards
<b>Contacts:</b>	quality@hull.ac.uk
<b>Applications for exemptions to:</b>	Student Progress Committee
<b>Report Exemptions to:</b>	University Learning, Teaching and Assessment Committee

### Summary/ Description:

These Regulations govern the award of Foundation degrees (240 credits) designed to reflect external and University expectations for the award of degrees. They also apply in the case of candidates who have completed an Fd and transferred to the related Honours degree. University Student Progress Committee is the final arbiter of the interpretation and application of the Regulations.

A guide to the Regulations, intended for members of boards of examiners, is published and updated annually by Learning Enhancement and Academic Practice at:

[http://www.hull.ac.uk/quality/examining/boards\\_of\\_examiners/index.html](http://www.hull.ac.uk/quality/examining/boards_of_examiners/index.html)

**Version 2 09** (Sept 2016) introduces the following changes:

- Amendments to a number of Regs. in order to provide clarity and consistency for decision making at examination boards
  - Re-orders Reg 22 Assessment Extensions (previously Absence with Good Cause) to provide clarity.
  - Re-orders Reg 25 Mitigating Circumstances to provide clarity
  - Provides transparency for the rounding of module marks, Reg 24
  - Provides clarity for the award of credits, Reg 38

**Version 2 08** (June 16) introduces the following changes:

- Introduces revised regulations for applications for Mitigating Circumstances (reg. 25)
- Replaces Unfair Means with Academic Misconduct
- Replaces Intercalation with Suspension of Study
- Replaces Sub-Module with Module Component
- Replaces Programme Approvals Committee with Programme Management Committee

- Replaces Semester with Trimester
- Replaces Head of Department with Head of School

**Version 2 07** (September 15) introduces the following changes:

- Discontinues the practice of using Level 5 marks to contribute to the classification of the articulated Honours degree (reg. 41).
- Transitional arrangements: **for students registered on the Intermediate stage, or on the Honours stage of the articulated Honours degree, in the academic session 2014-15**, the Honours degree classification be calculated using version 2 06 of the regulation and the new regulation (version 2 07) and the best outcome be awarded (reg. 41).
- Change of name Head of Student Support to Head of Student Wellbeing, Learning and Support

**Version 2 06** (September 14) introduces the following changes:

- Addition of an explanatory note regarding extensions for students studying with a Tier 4 visa (reg. 22)
- Removes the discretion of Boards of Examiners to deny reassessment on the grounds of attendance (reg. 26)

**Version 2 05** (Sept 13) introduces the following change:

- Introduces the award of Foundation degree with merit and Foundation degree with distinction (reg 37) **for students commencing the Intermediate stage of a programme on or after 1 September 2013**

**Version 2 04** (June 12) introduces the following changes:

- Minor amendment to Regulation 25 (e) for clarity
- Addition of an explanatory note (reg. 25(e)) to clarify the circumstances under which a Mitigating Circumstances Committee would recommend to the Module Board: (i) a fresh attempt; (ii) refer the matter to the Programme Board; or (iii) award a 'pass with mitigation'.

**Version 2 03** (March 12) introduces the following change:

- Amends Regulation 31(a) to reflect that each individual module mark shall be weighted relative to its credit value

**Version 2 02** (Apr 11) introduces the following change with immediate effect:

- Clarifies the scope of Borderline cases (reg. 40 (b)(v))

**Version 2 01** (Oct 10) introduces the following changes:

- Updates the code with reference to the new committee structure

**Version 2 00** (Oct 09) introduces the following changes with immediate effect:

- Re-orders the Regulations to better reflect the student lifecycle, beginning with programme and modules and moving from admissions through progression to notification of results.
- Clarity of language throughout and notes (which do not form part of the Regulations)
- Removes references to the withdrawal of programmes and modules
- Clarifies the responsibilities of the Mitigating Circumstances Committees and the Module and Programme Boards (reg. 25)

**Version 1 03** (Mar 08) introduced the following changes:

- Provides where a module specification requires all elements to be passed, the maximum mark to be awarded for the module in the event of an element being failed is 34 (reg. 6)
- Makes explicit reference in the Regulations to 'pass with mitigation' adopting the wording approved in the code of practice on boards of examiners (QH:D2) (reg. 6)

**Version 1 02** (Sep 07) introduces the following changes:

- Preliminary Certificate stage introduced for Fds comparable with the Honours degree Regulations (QH:B4) including a new interim award, the Foundation Certificate in HE (regs. 8, 9(a), 22(b), 24, 29(c), 32(a)(iii), 33(a), 34(a))
- Revision of evidential requirements following intercalation on grounds of risk (reg 26)
- Replace references to Graduate Research Committee with Research Degrees Committee
- Remove references to Academic Approvals Committee.

**Version 1 01** (Jul 06) introduced two changes:

- Definition of compensation (regs. 6(j), 31(a), 32(c))
- Definition of referral (reg. 32(d)).

**This document is available in alternative formats from  
Learning Enhancement and Academic Practice**

## Table of Contents

1	Modules .....	5
2	Credit values .....	5
3	Valid life of credits .....	6
4	Credits required for Qualifications .....	6
6	Duplication of awards .....	7
7	Programme Stages .....	7
8	Pass/Fail Modules .....	7
9	Publication of programmes of study .....	8
10	Admission to a programme .....	8
11	Accreditation of Prior Learning .....	9
12	Programme of study requirements .....	9
13	Change of programme of study .....	10
14	Change of module .....	11
15	Permitted duration for the accumulation of credits .....	11
16	Suspension of Study requested by candidate .....	11
17	Suspension of Study on grounds of risk .....	12
18	Repeating a stage .....	13
19	Interim awards following withdrawal .....	13
20	Awarding credits .....	14
21	Written examinations and other forms of assessment .....	14
22	Assessment Extension .....	15
23	Non attendance/submission .....	16
24	Module marks .....	16
25	Mitigating circumstances .....	17
26	Reassessment .....	19
27	Fail repeat year .....	20
28	Exclusion from assessment and termination of programme .....	22
29	Academic Misconduct .....	22
30	Professional Misconduct and Professional Unsuitability .....	23
31	Calculation of Stage Weighted Average .....	23
32	Compensation, Referral and Condonement Maxima .....	24
33	Progression and Continuation .....	24
34	Compensation .....	25
35	Referral and Compensation .....	25
36	Condonement .....	27
37	Merits and distinctions .....	28
38	Consequences of Ineligibility to Progress .....	29
39	Progression to an associated Bachelors degree .....	30
40	Progression to the award of the Honours degree .....	30
41	Honours Classification .....	31
42	Consequences of ineligibility to progress to the Award .....	32
43	Notifications of Results and Transcripts .....	32

## Preamble

The following University Regulations apply to Foundation Degrees and to Honours degrees awarded by the University in cases where candidates have progressed to the Honours degree (Honours stage) having previously completed the associated Foundation Degree.

Candidates for the award of a qualification of the University must satisfy both the University Regulations and the Regulations embodied in the published programme of study.

The following Regulations apply to all programmes leading to University of Hull awards unless University Learning, Teaching and Assessment Committee, after consultation with Regulations, Codes and Processes Committee and Student Progress Committees, has approved alternative Regulations for a specified Partner Institution responsible for the delivery of collaborative provision.

The Regulations are consistent with relevant guidance published as part of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (QAA), for example *The Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies* (Nov 14) and the *Higher Education Credit Framework for England: Guidance on Academic Credit Arrangements in Higher Education in England* (Aug 08).

The University Student Progress Committee is the final arbiter of the application and/or interpretation of the Regulations.

## MODULES AND CREDITS

### 1 Modules

- (a) For the purposes of these Regulations a module is defined as being a separately assessed unit of learning). All candidates on the same module must be assessed by the same method(s) of assessment.
- (b) A single level is assigned to each module, indicating the academic standard of that module:

Level 3	preparatory undergraduate level
Level 4	introductory undergraduate level
Level 5	intermediate undergraduate level
Level 6	advanced undergraduate level

#### *Explanatory note (added Oct 09)*

- (a): Previously reg. 1
- 'method(s) of assessment': reg. 14 cross-refers to the University's Assessment Tariff
- (b): Previously reg. 8

### 2 Credit values

- (a) A credit value is assigned to each module indicating the total learning time, including assessment, which a candidate might expect to spend in achieving the

learning outcomes associated with the module. Each credit shall nominally represent 10 hours of learning.

- (b) Modules shall be of 20 credits. Proposals to offer modules of credit values other than 20 credits shall be subject to the approval of the Programme Management Committee.

*Explanatory note (added Oct 09)*

- Previously reg. 2
  - 'learning': includes private study, revision and assessment in addition to formal teaching time
- (b): See reg. 6 regarding collaborative provision where modules of 10 credits are permitted

### **3 Valid life of credits**

Modules credited to a candidate may not be used towards an award after nine years have elapsed from the end of the candidate's registration for the module.

*Explanatory note (added Oct 09)*

- Previously reg. 14
- for specific programmes leading to an award a lower 'shelf life' may be set for example to reflect the requirements of professional bodies
- see also reg. 11 regarding the time limit for the completion of each stage of a programme of study

### **4 Credits required for Qualifications**

- (a) The total credit value of qualifications to which these Regulations apply are as follows:

Honours Degrees:	360 or 480 credits
Foundation Degrees	240 or 360 credits
Undergraduate Certificates in Higher Education:	120 credits
Foundation Certificates in Higher Education:	120 credits
(at the Preliminary Certificate stage only).	

- (b) Any other credit value shall be subject to the approval of the Programme Management Committee and shall be as specified in the relevant programme.

*Explanatory note (revised Oct 09):*

- (a): Foundation Certificate in HE added Sep 07; Foundation Certificates can only be awarded following the Pre-Certificate stage – regs. 37
- A 360 credit Foundation Degree is one which includes the Preliminary Certificate stage
- (b): PMC would rarely approve a programme with a different credit value unless required to meet professional, regulatory or statutory body requirements

### **5 Collaborative provision**

- (a) Programmes designated as Collaborative Provision **must** be organised on a modular basis but may not be organised in trimesters. The duration of a module may therefore vary from that referred to in Regulation 1(a).

- (b) Programmes designated as Collaborative Provision may include modules of 10 credits in addition to, or instead of, 20 credits.

*Explanatory note (revised Oct 09):*

- Added (standard)
- (a): All programmes leading to University of Hull awards must be modular and credit-based
- 'Collaborative Provision'; the latter defined in QH:G1 to mean provision delivered in whole or in part by a partner institution (irrespective of how that provision is funded)
- 'Distance taught' defined in QH:G1 to mean programmes delivered in their entirety by University of Hull staff at a location other than one of the University campuses
- (b): this modifies reg. 2(b) in respect of collaborative provision

## **6 Duplication of awards**

The same credits cannot be counted towards two separate qualifications unless one qualification is a stage in the normal progression to the other qualification.

*Explanatory note (revised Oct 09):*

- Previously reg. 15
- This prevents 'double counting' of credits. Credits leading to the award of an Honours degree are deemed spent (irrespective of the awarding institution) and cannot be used towards another (University of Hull) Honours degree. However, a Diploma can be used towards another relevant Honours degree as the Diploma is part of the normal progression towards an Honours degree
- See reg. 3 regarding 'shelf life' of modules

## **PROGRAMME STRUCTURES**

### **7 Programme Stages**

(a) For the purposes of progression each Foundation Degree programme is divided into stages as follows:

Certificate stage	first 120 credits at level 4, with a minimum of 100 credits at level 4
Intermediate stage	second 120 credits, with a minimum of 100 credits at level 5.

(b) With the approval of the Programme Management Committee, a Foundation Degree programme may also include a Preliminary Certificate stage comprising the first 120 credits of a 360 credit Foundation degree, the stage to comprise credits at levels 3 and 4 with at least 100 credits at level 3.

*Explanatory note (added Oct 09)*

- Previously reg. 22
- Progression from the first trimester to the second trimester within each stage is automatic subject to any action being taken arising from non-attendance/non submission under reg. 28

### **8 Pass/Fail Modules**

(a) Regulation (a) notwithstanding, a school may present a pass/fail assessment for any module which:

- (i) forms a minor part (not greater than 30%) of a dissertation, project or placement, or

- (ii) has, in the case of modules of a vocational or professional nature, competency based assessments specified by the relevant professional, statutory or regulatory body.
- (b) Where a programme of study includes one or more pass/fail modules, such modules shall be disregarded in calculating any weighted average required under these Regulations.

*Explanatory note (added Oct 09)*

- Added (standard Regulation)
- (a): This grants exemption from having to attach a numerical mark (reg. 22(a) where this would be inappropriate, for example because the assessment for the module is concerned with demonstrating competency
- (b): 'weighted average' – defined in reg. 31

## **9 Publication of programmes of study**

- (a) The programmes for qualifications governed by these Regulations are available in programme specifications as published by the University.
- (b) The University makes every effort to ensure that the published programmes and modules are complete and up to date, but reserves the right to make changes following the approval by the relevant Faculty or University Committee. Any changes made by the University will be communicated to all students.

*Explanatory note (revised Oct 09)*

- (a): Previously reg. 11
  - (a)(b): 'published' – programme specifications are published at [www.hull.ac.uk/quality](http://www.hull.ac.uk/quality)
  - (b): Previously reg. 18
- 'approval' – programme and module approvals are specified in QH section G

## **ADMISSION**

### **10 Admission to a programme**

To be admitted to a programme to which these Regulations apply a candidate must have satisfied:

- (i) the University's requirement for Matriculation as specified in the Regulations for Matriculation or in any Matriculation Agreement
- (ii) such entry requirements as may be specified for the degree programme generally or in an applicable Progression Agreement.

*Explanatory note (revised Oct 09)*

- Previously reg. 20
- (i): reference to Matriculation Agreement added; such agreement governs the entry of a defined category of candidates to the initial stage of the programme, cf Progression Agreements, below
- (ii): 'in' replaced by 'for' as publication may be through the University Prospectus rather than the programme specification
- (ii): reference to progression agreement added to address cases where candidates are admitted to a later stage of programme (usually Diploma or Honours). Progression agreements are as approved by the



University (partnerships are approved by PVC(edu) after consulting with Deans and resulting collaborative activities are approved by PVC(edu) on the advice of PMC) and published in the Collaborative Provision Register

- Progression agreements must specify entry requirements, especially for international students, as visa applications may depend on demonstrating adherence to requirements such as English language skills.

## **11 Accreditation of Prior Learning**

- (a) The University will accept credits for general transfer, awarded by other Universities, or awarded by this University, for Accredited Prior Learning (APL).
- (b) The University will also consider applications for Accredited Prior Experiential Learning (APEL).
- (c) The acceptance of applications for accredited prior certificated or experiential learning relating to a specific programme shall be subject to the approval of the dean of the relevant faculty in accordance with the relevant University code of practice.
- (d) Any award of the Foundation Degree shall be subject to a minimum of 60 credits from the final stage of the award sought having been awarded by this University.
- (e) Any award of an Honours Degree shall be subject to a minimum of 120 credits from the final stage of the award sought having been awarded by this University.

### *Explanatory note (revised Oct 09)*

- Previously regs. 16-17, with revisions
- This Regulation is subject to the minimum requirement for credits to be achieved as part of the programme leading to the Fd – reg. 4
- Credit awarded other than by the University of Hull is not counted towards stage weighted averages for purposes of determining progression (reg. 31) or degree classification (reg. 37). There is therefore no need to record marks awarded or a mark 'equivalence' for such credit
- (b): introduces explicit reference to APEL for the first time
- (c): relevant code of practice – the University's code governing all aspects of APL/APEL is published at QH:J7. APL applications are considered on an individual basis of progression agreements
- (d)(e): moved from reg. 4; both set minimum requirements for the award
- 'final stage' – as defined in reg. 7 being the Intermediate stage for the Fd, and the Honours stage for the Honours degree where the candidate is 'topping up' from an Fd
- 'this University' – refers to the University as the awarding body and therefore includes (collaborative) provision delivered by partner institutions
- 'awarded' – means having passed the module either through achieving the pass mark (reg. 22(a) below) or being awarded pass by mitigation (reg. 25) or by compensation (reg. 34).
- a candidate with direct entry to the Honours stage (i.e. from other than a UoH awarded Fd) cannot benefit from condonement – see reg. 40(iv)

## **REGISTRATION FOR PROGRAMMES AND MODULES**

### **12 Programme of study requirements**

- (a) Candidates shall select modules for each trimester in accordance with the instructions specified in the programme for which they are registered.

- (b) A candidate shall not be permitted to undertake more than 120 credits in a single stage other than with the express approval of the Student Progress Committee. Where such approval is granted the candidate shall be required to pass all credits attempted to progress to the next stage or to the award and credits achieved over and above the 120 credits required for the stage shall not be carried over and counted towards the next stage of the programme.
- (c) Where a particular first trimester module is specified as a prerequisite for a module to be taken in the following trimester, then the prerequisite will be deemed to have been satisfied provided that the candidate has been registered for the former module and has maintained satisfactory attendance at, and submitted all assessments associated with, the module. Otherwise, to satisfy a prerequisite, the candidate must have been awarded the credits for the module.
- (d) Where a particular module is specified as a co-requisite, the candidate must register for, and maintain satisfactory attendance at, the module.
- (e) A candidate who, for valid academic reasons, wishes to vary the weighting of modules between trimesters, may apply to the Head of School for permission to take modules weighted 50/70, 70/50 or 60/60. Permission shall only be granted where the head of school is satisfied that the candidate fully understands the workload implications of the request. In deciding whether to grant permission the head of school shall take account of to which stage of the programme the application relates, and must be satisfied that the combination of modules can be taken within the timetable as published. Decisions shall be monitored by the Faculty Education Committee (or equivalent).

*Explanatory note (revised Oct 09)*

- Previously reg. 12
- (a): 'specified in the programme' – as stated in the published programme specification; the information should also be provided through the student handbook or equivalent
- (b): added from equivalent provision in B4 - this prevents a candidate 'cherry picking' i.e. taking more credits than necessary in order to then drop a module with the worst performance. UoH programmes are premised on the need to pass all credits undertaken except where condonement is applied (reg. 36; all the credits are also used in calculating any stage weighted average – see reg. 31; this does not apply to modules undertaken following referral under reg. 35
- (c)(d): 'satisfactory attendance' – applicable only where the school has published an attendance requirement in the module specification and student handbook. (b) means that where a candidate has been referred in the pre-requisite s/he is deemed to have satisfied the pre-requisite requirement
- (e): added - standard provision – appropriate for programmes involving a combination of short fat and long thin modules
- Faculty Education Committee previously Faculty Learning, Teaching and Assessment Committee

### **13 Change of programme of study**

- (a) A candidate may, subject to published restrictions, change a programme of study with the written approval of the Head(s) of School(s).
- (b) Candidates are responsible for complying with the procedures for the time being in force as published on the 'change of programme of study' form.

*Explanatory note (revised Oct 09)*

- Previously reg. 23 (modified to achieve consistency)
- (a): 'published restrictions' – e.g. entry requirements for the programme (reg. 10), and pre-requisites published in the programme specification
- 'Head(s) of School(s)' – plural in the event that the two programmes are in different schools
- (b): 'published' – the form is published by Registry Services via their website

#### **14 Change of module**

- (a) A candidate may, subject to timetable and other published restrictions, change a choice of module with the written approval of the school responsible for teaching the module and (if different) the school responsible for the candidate's programme of study. No withdrawal from a module will be permitted once the assessment process specified for the module has been completed.
- (b) Candidates are responsible for complying with the procedures for the time being in force as published on the 'change of module' form.

*Explanatory note (added Oct 09)*

- Previously reg. 10
- (a): written approval is obtained by using the published change of module form referred to in (b)
- 'assessment process ... completed' means that all assessment (module component) elements for the module have been undertaken by the candidate (assignment submitted, examination sat) but irrelevant that the work may not have been marked. This prevents candidates wanting to change believing they have not done well in the assessments, especially after obtaining their results
- 'subject to timetable' – not all optional modules will be available because of timetable clashes
- 'other published restrictions' – this includes where a limit has been placed on the number of candidates who can take the module
- (b): 'published' – the form is published by Registry Services via their website

## **SUSPENSION OF STUDY AND REPEAT PERIODS**

#### **15 Permitted duration for the accumulation of credits**

Where a candidate is permitted to extend his/her period of study through the grant of an extension for good cause or for a suspension of study or similar circumstances, such extension is subject to the overriding requirement that each stage of the programme of study – as defined in Regulation 7 - must be completed within a period of three years.

*Explanatory note (revised Oct 09)*

- Previously reg. 13
- 'Extension' – reg. 22
- Suspension of Study – regs. 16 and 17
- Credits also have a 'shelf life of nine years – reg. 3
- Suspension of study previously 'intercalation'

#### **16 Suspension of Study requested by candidate**

Subject to Regulation 15 a candidate may suspend his/her studies by making a written application to his/her personal supervisor and subject to the approval of the Head of School for periods not exceeding 12 months, and approval of the Student Progress Committee for periods of more than 12 months.

*Explanatory note (revised Oct 09)*

- Previously reg. 25
- A suspension of study may be permitted for personal/medical reasons and for other circumstances, for example a candidate wishing to spend a period abroad or in industry which is not part of the programme of study s/he is following
- Procedures governing suspensions of study are set out in a code of practice published at QH:K13
- Suspension of study previously 'intercalation'

**17 Suspension of Study on grounds of risk**

- (a) A candidate on any University of Hull module or programme, wheresoever located, who is judged, on substantial evidence, to be unfit to study by reason of posing a risk to him/herself or others may be required to suspend those studies even in the absence of the candidate's consent provided the procedures defined below are followed.
- (b) Where such evidence is deemed to exist, this shall be reported in writing to the Head of Student Wellbeing, Learning and Welfare Support, and the candidate shall be required to undertake such 'risk assessment' as the Head of Student Wellbeing, Learning and Welfare Support determines appropriate. Refusal to undertake such assessment shall be deemed justification in itself for the candidate being required to suspend his/her studies.
- (c) The Head of Student Wellbeing, Learning and Welfare Support shall report his/her findings of the risk assessment, in writing, to the Student Progress Committee (undergraduate and taught postgraduate students) or the Research Degrees Committee (research students), and the relevant Committee shall determine whether, in the light of the assessment, suspension of study shall be required.
- (d) A candidate who is required to suspend studies in accordance with this Regulation shall have the right to appeal in accordance with the University's Academic Appeals Regulations. The said Regulations shall be modified to the extent that a member of the University's Health sub-committee shall be invited to submit such advice or evidence as the parties and/or those involved in determining the appeal deem useful, and attend any hearing on the same basis.
- (e) The decision to require suspension of study shall be effective once made, and notified to the candidate in writing by recorded delivery to such addresses as recorded on the University Student Information System at the time, and unless and until any appeal is heard and allowed.
- (f) A candidate who is required to suspend studies in accordance with this Regulation shall not be regarded as a student of the University during the period of suspension and shall not be entitled to use University facilities and services or be present on the University campuses.
- (g) A candidate who is required to suspend studies in accordance with this Regulation shall not be permitted to resume his/her studies until s/he has provided evidence to Student Wellbeing, Learning and Welfare Support agreed by them to be relevant and appropriate that s/he is fit to resume his/her studies. Where a candidate has ongoing support needs these should be documented along with an agreement as to who will be responsible for providing this support. This agreement may be made

with Student Wellbeing, Learning and Welfare Support or with external agencies and seen by Student Wellbeing, Learning and Welfare Support. This evidence should be submitted to the candidate's Head of School and forwarded for the chair of the Student Progress Committee or Research Degrees Committee. The chair shall determine whether the candidate is permitted to resume his/her studies taking such advice as s/he deems necessary in making the decision.

- (h) Any decision to require suspension of study, the outcome of any appeal, and the decision to allow the student to resume his/her studies shall be communicated to the student in writing by recorded delivery within three working days of the decision being made.

*Explanatory note (revised Oct 09):*

- Previously reg. 26
- This is designed to address very exceptional circumstances where a candidate needs to be excluded from studying for a limited time period because of an assessed risk to him/herself and/or others
- (g) amended for Sep 07 – requirement for evidence of fitness to resume revised so that Student Wellbeing, Learning and Welfare Support can determine what evidence is appropriate given the nature of the case
- Procedures governing suspensions of study are set out in a code of practice published at QH:K13
- Suspension of study previously 'intercalation'

## **18 Repeating a stage**

- (a) A candidate shall not be permitted to repeat a stage, or register for the programme *de novo* other than with the approval of the Student Progress Committee. Approval shall only be granted where the candidate has demonstrated significant medical or exceptional personal circumstances affecting the period which is sought to be repeated and subject to Regulation 15.
- (b) Where a repeat is permitted all credits gained during the original attempt shall cease to count towards the programme, and the entire stage shall be repeated. Any marks awarded during the original attempt shall not appear on the candidate's official transcript.

*Explanatory note (revised Oct 09)*

- Previously reg. 27
- This Regulation governs repeats granted solely for exceptional personal/medical circumstances, an application which can only be granted by SPC following application by the candidate and appropriate supporting evidence
- It must not be confused with the power of the Programme Board to permit a repeat stage where a candidate has failed more than 60 credits at first attempt ('FREP') – reg. 27
- Credits cannot be awarded for a module more than once – reg. 20

## **19 Interim awards following withdrawal**

- (a) Subject to paragraph (b) a candidate may withdraw from a programme of study and be awarded:
- (i) A Certificate in Higher Education with at least 120 credits
  - (ii) A Foundation Certificate in Higher Education with at least 120 credits from the Preliminary Certificate stage.

- (b) Any award under paragraph (a) shall be subject to a minimum of 60 credits having been awarded by this University.
- (c) Any award under this Regulation shall be made provided that Certificates in Higher Education for professional programmes shall not be awarded in a named subject which implies that the candidate is entitled to practise that profession.

*Explanatory note (added Oct 09)*

- (a): Previously reg. 24, reworded to improve clarity
- (b): Previously reg. 9(b)
- 'this University' – refers to the University as the awarding body and therefore includes (collaborative) provision delivered by partner institutions
- (c): Previously reg. 9(c) - this power is designed to ensure that a candidate is not awarded a certificate/diploma which implies s/he is entitled to practise a particular profession (such as Social Work) where this is not the case. The Programme Board of Examiners is responsible for recommending the title of the award for approval by SPC
- Where insufficient credits are achieved to gain one of the stated awards, the full details of those credits will appear on the Transcript – reg. 43

## ASSESSMENT AND MITIGATION

### 20 Awarding credits

To be awarded the credits for a module, a candidate must have passed the assessment for that module. The credits for a particular module cannot be awarded to a candidate more than once.

*Explanatory note (revised Oct 09)*

- Previously reg. 3
- 'passed the assessment' – where the published module specification states that a specific module component must be passed; failure in that component results in failure of the module and the maximum mark which can be awarded is 34; see reg. 24(b)
- Non completion of assessed work is addressed in reg. 22(a)
- Credits once awarded have a 'shelf life' of nine years – reg. 3

### 21 Written examinations and other forms of assessment

- (a) Methods of assessment for all modules **must** be in accordance with the Assessment Tariff.
- (b) Written examinations, when used for assessment, shall be of two or exceptionally three hours duration. Permission to hold examinations lasting three hours must be given by the Faculty Education Committee (or equivalent).
- (c) Written examinations **must not** be held for modules of two trimester's duration at the end of the first trimester.

*Explanatory note (added Oct 09)*

- Previously reg. 5
- (a): 'Assessment Tariff' - see the Code of Practice on Assessment Procedures – QH:F1, chapter I; this addresses permitted methods and volumes of assessment
- (b): 'assessment' in this context (as in all of the Regulations) means summative assessment. The dean is responsible for determining which committee will exercise the authority specified in (b)
- Faculty Education Committee previously Faculty Learning, Teaching and Assessment Committee

- (c): the Assessment Tariff also places a restriction on the volume of assessment in the first trimester where alternative forms of assessment are used - QH:F1, chapter I, para. 22  
In certain circumstances the use of 'class-based' assessments may be appropriate; these are governed by the Code of Practice on Assessment Procedures – QH:F1, Chapter III

## 22 Assessment Extension

- (a) A candidate who is unable to submit a piece of assessed work by the date published by the relevant school, may apply, using the approved application form, for an extension with good cause, provided the application is made prior to the published submission date, and subject to paragraph (c), supported by the appropriate documentary evidence.
- (b) Where an application is made within the deadline specified in paragraph (a), the Mitigating Circumstances Committee **must** determine, by reference to the published criteria, whether the application constitutes 'good cause' and report accordingly to the relevant Module Board.
- (c) If the application is submitted within the deadline specified in paragraph (a) but supporting documentary evidence is submitted after the deadline, the Mitigating Circumstances Committee is empowered to consider the application in accordance with paragraph (b) once all supporting documentation has been received.
- (d) Where the Mitigating Circumstances Committee has determined that good cause has been established in accordance with paragraph (b), the Module Board shall award the candidate an extension, subject to the new deadline being set.
- (e) The power to determine extensions under paragraphs (b) and (d) may be delegated by the Module Board to the Head of the relevant School, or such person as it deems appropriate. The grant of an extension under this paragraph shall be reported to the relevant Module Board.
- (f) A Module Board may defer decision on any application submitted within the deadline referred to in paragraph (a), and seek the guidance or decision of the Student Progress Committee where it deems this appropriate.

### *Explanatory note (added Aug 09, revised Sept 14)*

- Tier 4 students are not permitted to stay in the UK beyond the expiry date stated on their visa. Although an extension to studies may be permitted by the University, it may not be appropriate or legally advisable for the student to remain at the University or in the UK to complete their programme of study. Advice regarding whether or not the University will be able to support a further visa application needs to be sought by the relevant School, from the Visa Compliance Team, in advance of the case for granting the extension being heard.
- Previously reg. 5
- Amended to ensure alignment with QH:D2 (which has also been amended); some reordering to enhance clarity
- While the decision in both cases is formally that of the Module Board schools must establish Mitigating Circumstances Committee's (as defined in QH:D2) to undertake the consideration of the candidate's application so that personal circumstances are discussed by as few staff as possible. The Module Board is therefore bound to accept the MCC's evaluation of the evidence. In the case of extensions, the decision (both about whether good cause has been established and the length of the extension) can be delegated – out of necessity – but schools need to ensure that decisions are both transparent and consistent

- (a) 'date published' – this should be in the module handbook or equivalent
- 'piece of assessed work' – to be interpreted broadly to cover any form of summative assessment other than a formal written examination
- 'approved application form' – published as annexe 1 to QH:D2 and available from the Registry Service website
- 'good cause' – see para (i);
- (c): new – making clear how to treat applications where the supporting evidence is necessarily delayed; codifies guidance issued by SPC; on receiving such an application, the Module Board should set, and confirm in writing to the candidate, a new deadline for submission of the evidence taking into account the reasons for the delay (which might be out with the candidate's control)
- (f): referral to SPC is designed to promote consistency in the consideration of late and difficult cases
- Assessment Extensions previously 'absence and extension for good cause'

### 23 Non attendance/submission

Where a candidate fails to attend an examination, or submit a piece of assessed work without receiving the approval of the Module Board or Student Progress Committee in accordance with Regulation 5, a mark of zero **must** be awarded for that examination/piece of assessed work. Any opportunity for a further attempt shall be subject to the discretion of the Module Board under Regulation 26(a).

*Explanatory note (added Oct 09):*

- Previously part of the above Regulation; separated for clarity
- the examination or piece of work is awarded zero and the Module Board must calculate the overall module mark taking into account any other module component marks. Such non-attendance/non submission would entitle the Module Board to deny reassessment under reg. 26(a) in the event of the candidate failing the module

### 24 Module marks

(a) The performance of a candidate 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 University scale:

40 - 100	Pass
35 - 39	Compensatable
0 - 34	Fail.

- (b) Where the module specification stipulates that to pass the module a candidate must achieve a pass in one or more module components, and the candidate does not pass such elements, the maximum mark which can be awarded for the module is 34.
- (c) A mark of 40 **must** be recorded for modules passed after reassessment, applying 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.
- (d) Module marks **must** not be rounded upwards or downwards except to a whole integer. So, for example a mark of 39.4 may be rounded to 39 and a mark of 39.5 rounded to 40 but a mark less than 39.5 **must** not be rounded upwards.

*Explanatory note (revised Oct 09)*

- Previously reg. 5(a), (b), (o)
- (a): 'compensatable' – a mark which is eligible for compensation and will be compensated if the criteria in regs. 32 and 34 are satisfied



- Zero for any module component not submitted by the published deadline must be applied – reg. 22(a)
- (b): wording revised to make clear that the mark of 34 is the maximum which can be awarded
- (c): the capping of the mark applies to the final mark for the module as a whole rather than to any module component, which must be marked in accordance with the applicable marking criteria. Candidates are entitled to be informed of the marks actually achieved (as part of feedback on assessment) in addition to the overall capped mark
- 'stage weighted average' – defined in reg. 31
- (d) 'rounded to the nearest integer' - .45 is rounded up; .44 is rounded down

## 25 Mitigating circumstances

- (a) The Mitigating Circumstances Committee shall consider evidence of mitigating circumstances submitted by a candidate using the approved form, provided that the application has been submitted no later than 5 working days after the examination or 5 working days after the deadline for submission of assessed work to which the application relates and, subject to paragraph (d), supported by the appropriate documentary evidence.
- (b) Claims may only be submitted where candidates have not attempted the examination or submitted the assessed work due. If a candidate elects to sit an examination, then they do so on the basis that they are able to perform to their normal ability, except as outlined in 25c. Where the candidate is due to submit assessed work then the normal process would be to apply for an extension to the deadline. Where this is either not sufficient to allow the candidate to submit the work or the extension is refused only then should a claim for mitigation be submitted.
- (c) Where a student is taken ill during an examination then the Senior Invigilator will submit a report to the Head of Registry Services. The student will then have 5 working days to submit a claim for mitigation to the Head of Registry Services who will forward all of the documentation to the relevant department for consideration
- (d) If the application is submitted within the deadline specified in paragraph (a) but supporting documentary evidence is submitted after the deadline, the Mitigating Circumstances Committee is empowered to consider the application in accordance with paragraph (h) once all supporting documentation has been received.
- (e) Exceptionally, where an application has not been submitted but the Mitigating Circumstances Committee is aware of valid mitigating circumstances it **must** refer the matters to Student Progress Committee for guidance on whether the circumstances can be taken into account.
- (f) Where an application is made after the deadline referred to in paragraph (a), the School **must** refer the application to the Student Progress Committee, which **must** decide whether the application will be considered by having regard to:
- (i) the reasons given by the candidate for the lateness of the application
- the risk of the candidate gaining, or being perceived to be gaining, an advantage through such late application.

- (g) Where the Student Progress Committee determines under paragraph (f) that an application shall be considered it shall refer the matter back to the Mitigating Circumstances Committee for further consideration under paragraphs (h).
- (h) In considering the evidence submitted by the candidate, the Mitigating Circumstances Committee shall have regard to the extent to which the evidence submitted confirms the claim of the candidate as to the circumstances. Other than in exceptional circumstances no claim based upon medical circumstances shall be accepted in the absence of evidence from a medical practitioner. Such evidence **must** be rejected where it is not evident that the medical practitioner witnessed first-hand the medical circumstances claimed.
- (i) The Student Progress Committee shall from time to time publish criteria by which 'good cause' shall be determined, whether as a result of cases referred under paragraphs (f) and (g) or otherwise.
- (j) Where the Mitigating Circumstances Committee is satisfied that the evidence so submitted is of a sufficient and appropriate nature, it shall be empowered to make one of the following recommendations to the Module Board as an exercise of academic judgement:
- (i) offer the candidate a fresh attempt at the examination or piece of assessed work,
  - (ii) refer the matter to the relevant Programme Board with the recommendation that the circumstances be taken into account by that Board when determining the final classification of the candidate's degree,
  - (iii) where it judges that but for the mitigating circumstances the candidate would have passed the module, award the candidate a 'pass with mitigation' with an overall module mark of 40
- (k) 'Fresh attempt' under this Regulation shall be interpreted to mean, in the case of a first attempt, that the candidate is offered a new first attempt, and in the case of a reassessment, that the candidate is offered a new reassessment.

*Explanatory note (added June 12)*

- Para (j)(i): this should be the default decision.
- Para (j)(ii): this decision could be taken where the student is a finalist who has passed the module in question, and offering a fresh attempt at the assessment would cause a delay in graduation, with no possible improvement in classification.  
A module board will refer a student progression issue to the programme board where that board may be able to consider the student's particular mitigating circumstances and offer or award progression to the student.  
Where a candidate is a finalist the programme board may take the relevant mitigating circumstances into account and offer a degree classification. However, following academic progression advice from their home school, the candidate should also be offered the opportunity to re-sit the module/s as a first attempt should they choose to do so. This decision would defer graduation.
- Para (j)(iii): this decision should be made only where a fresh attempt at the assessment would not be possible due to the mitigating circumstances.

- (l) A Module Board receiving a recommendation from a Mitigating Circumstances Committee under paragraph (j) shall apply the recommendation unless the Board is satisfied that there is a compelling reason to make an alternative decision, provided that such alternative decision shall be limited to the outcomes specified in paragraph (j)(i)-(iii) or to deciding that no action be taken. Where such alternative decision is made, the reason for the decision shall be minuted.
- (m) Where a candidate is offered a pass with mitigation under paragraph (j) s/he shall be informed in writing of the offer and the mark achieved in the module, notwithstanding the mitigating circumstances, and shall be permitted to decline the offer, in writing, within a time limit set by the Module Board and elect a fresh attempt. If the candidate does not decline the offer within the time limit, the pass with mitigation shall stand and no further action shall be taken.
- (n) A 'pass with mitigation' is entirely separate to compensation, condonement and referral and is not restricted by or part of the maxima specified in relevant University Programmes Regulations.
- (o) The fact that a candidate has been awarded a 'pass with mitigation' **must not** be recorded on the candidate's Official Transcript.

*Explanatory note (revised Sep 09)*

- Previously reg. 6(c)-(o) [former (o) deleted]
- Amended to ensure alignment with QH:D2 (which has also been amended); some reordering and minor amendment to enhance clarity
- While the decision in both cases is formally that of the Module Board; schools must establish Mitigating Circumstances Committee's (as defined in QH:D2) to undertake the consideration of the candidate's application so that personal circumstances are discussed by as few staff as possible. The Module Board is therefore bound to accept the MCC's evaluation of the evidence, although it is empowered to make an alternative decision only where there is a 'compelling reason' [deliberately not defined] to do so.
- (a)(d): Module Board replaced by Mitigating Circumstances Committee
- (a): 'approved application form' – published as annexe 1 to QH:D2 and available from the Registry Services website
- (d): new – making clear how to treat applications where the supporting evidence is necessarily delayed; codifies guidance issued by SPC; on receiving such an application, the Module Board should set, and confirm in writing to the candidate, a new deadline for submission of the evidence taking into account the reasons for the delay (which might be out with the candidate's control)
- (e): incorporated from (former) para. 24 of QH:D2; use of this provision should be rare. Referral to SPC is designed to ensure consistency of practice
- (f=h): 'exceptional circumstances' – guidance to be issued by SPC
- 'fresh attempt' – defined in para. (k)
- (j)(ii): 'programme board' – such referral means that the circumstances cannot be acted upon by the Module Board as well
- (j)(iii): 'overall module mark' – irrespective of the number of module components; 'pass with mitigation' – see paras. (j)(k)
- (m): 'decline the offer' – 'accept or' removed to make clear that unless the candidate declines within the given time period, that will constitute acceptance by default

## 26 Reassessment

- (a) Subject to Regulation 27 a candidate who has satisfied the deadlines for submission of assessed work as published from time to time by the School has the right to be reassessed in a failed module on one occasion only, normally during the reassessment period before the beginning of the next academic year. Otherwise reassessment of a failed module may be permitted at the discretion of

the Module Board of Examiners. Schools **must** publish any criteria or policy which they intend to use to determine the exercise of this discretion. Blanket policies must not be used but each student's case considered individually, taking into account any known circumstances.

- (b) The method of reassessment **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 candidate(s) is obtained. Where alternative methods have been agreed, the same method shall be adopted for all candidates to be reassessed in the current session.
- (c) All other references to reassessment in these Regulations shall be subject to paragraphs (a) and (b).

*Explanatory note (added Oct 09, revised Sept 14)*

- Previously reg. 4(a)(c)(d)
- (a): denial of reassessment – often referred to as RNP ('resit not permitted') – is possible where a candidate has failed the module and not satisfied the published submission requirements for the module. As the decision is discretionary any exercise of discretion to deny reassessment must be properly minuted given the possibility of an appeal. See reg. 28 for more extensive powers to address non submission
- 'reg. 27' denies a candidate reassessment in all modules if more than 60 credits at the Certificate stage have been failed
- (b): the requirement for treating all candidates on the module the same in terms of method of reassessment mirrors the requirement for (first) assessment, reg. 1(a)

## **27 Fail repeat year**

- (a) A candidate on the Certificate stage of the foundation degree, who fails more than 60 credits in that stage at first attempt, shall be deemed ineligible to proceed further with the programme.
- (b) At the discretion of the Programme Board of Examiners, the candidate may be permitted to repeat the stage in question in its entirety, on academic grounds, taking into account guidance issued from time to time by the Student Progress Committee. Credits originally awarded during the stage to be repeated shall be disregarded for the purposes of the degree. The eligibility of a candidate not permitted to repeat the stage under this paragraph shall be further determined in accordance with Regulation 37.
- (c) Paragraphs (a) and (b) do not apply to any candidate following reassessment.

*Explanatory note (added Oct 09)*

- Previously reg. 4(b); separated from reg. (a) to improve clarity
- (a): This sets out the situation where a candidate is not permitted to undertake any reassessments having failed **more than** 60 credits at **first** attempt.
- 
- (b): The Programme Board may permit a repeat year but must take into account the guidance which has been issued by SPC. This power is often known as 'FREP' [Fail, Repeat Year]. It must be contrasted with repeat years granted by SPC for exceptional personal/medical circumstances – reg. 18 above
- The current guidance issued by SPC provides as follows:
  - (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 candidate'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
- (c): the repeat year in (a)-(b) can only be granted after first assessments; not after reassessments; a candidate who had failed more than 60 credits after **reassessment** would be ineligible to progress and reg. 37 must be applied

## ACADEMIC/PROFESSIONAL DISCIPLINE

### 28 Exclusion from assessment and termination of programme

- (a) A candidate who has not satisfied the attendance requirements or the deadlines for submission of assessed work as published from time to time by the School may:
- (i) be excluded from the assessments for the Module, or
  - (ii) have his/her programme of study terminated.
- (b) Exclusion and termination shall both be subject to the prior issue of both a School Warning and a University Warning, and the approval of the Chair of the Student Progress Committee, on the recommendation of the Head of School and Senior Tutor. The entitlement of a candidate shall thereafter be determined in accordance with Regulations 31 onwards as applicable.
- (c) Other than where a candidate is excluded from assessment or his/her programme of study is terminated under this Regulation, there shall be no barrier to progression from the first to the second trimester of a stage.

#### *Explanatory note (added Oct 09)*

- Previously reg. 36
- This enables a candidate who has repeatedly failed to attend or submit to be excluded or have his/her programme terminated. While this may not be possible early on in a programme of study the system of school and University Warnings (via SPC) should be applied consistently, and where conduct does not improve, exclusion (or more often) termination can then be sought
- Non submission can also be penalised in the event of module failure under reg. 26(a)
- (a): reference to Module Catalogue removed
- (b): 'entitlement' to the award of credits or a Certificate or Diploma depending on the number of credits achieved at the point of exclusion or termination; see regs. 37 (Foundation Degree) and 0 (Associated Honours degree where the candidate has progressed previously from the Fd)

### 29 Academic Misconduct

- (a) Allegations of academic misconduct, (excluding non-compliance with the attendance and submission requirements of the programme of study), shall be subject to the Regulations for Academic Misconduct, and no penalty shall be imposed other than in accordance with the said Regulations.
- (b) Academic Misconduct shall be defined to exclude conduct which may amount to either professional misconduct or professional unsuitability as defined in Regulation 30 below.

#### *Explanatory note (added Oct 09)*

- Previously reg. 35
- (a): the Regulations for Academic Misconduct are published at QH:F8 – these specify the way in which penalties for academic misconduct **must** be applied by Module and Programme Boards
- (non) 'attendance and submission' – this is addressed under reg. 22(a)
- Academic misconduct previously 'unfair means'

### 30 Professional Misconduct and Professional Unsuitability

- (a) 'Professional misconduct' shall be defined as conduct which falls below the level of conduct required by the professional body or bodies responsible for regulating the profession to which a candidate is seeking entry by virtue of completing the programme of study on which s/he is registered.
- (b) 'Professional unsuitability' shall be defined as behaviour which does not demonstrate the standards of behaviour specified by the professional body responsible for allowing candidates who complete the programme of study to be admitted to practise the relevant profession.
- (c) Allegations of conduct or behaviour considered to fall within the above definitions shall be made, investigated and determined in accordance with any applicable Regulations for the time being in force. Such Regulations shall empower the University to suspend or terminate a candidate's programme of study.

*Explanatory note (added Oct 09)*

- Previously reg. 37
- (c): 'applicable Regulations' – published at QH:F17. In accordance with QH:F17 the relevant dean of faculty must determine whether the allegations are to be investigated as professional misconduct/unsuitability under these regulations or as academic misconduct (see reg. 29). Conduct is only punishable under these Regulations if there are professional standards laid down by the relevant body (such as the Nursing and Midwifery Council or Health and Care Professions Council) which appear applicable to the allegations in question.

## PROGRESSION: FOUNDATION DEGREES

### 31 Calculation of Stage Weighted Average

- (a) In calculating the weighted average mark for each stage of a degree programme each individual mark shall be weighted by the credit value of the corresponding module and the average recorded to one decimal place.
- (b) Where a candidate registers for more than 120 credits for any stage, the weighted average mark for the stage shall be taken over the marks achieved for all modules on which the candidate is registered.
- (c) Credit which has been accepted towards the programme of study in accordance with Regulation 11 is disregarded for the purposes of calculating stage weighted averages under this Regulation unless that credit was awarded by the University of Hull as a result of a module or modules delivered by the University or one of its Partner Institutions.
- (d) In applying Regulations 34, 35 and 36, the stage average mark **must** be rounded to the nearest integer. Such rounding **must** not see a mark of, for example 49.4, rounded to 50.

*Explanatory note (added Oct 09)*

- Previously reg. 28
- Stage weighted averages are required for determining eligibility for compensation, referral and condonement (below) and, in the case of having progressed to the Honours, for determining degree classification
- (b): reg. 12 provides that all modules registered for must be passed to progress

- (c): credit awarded other than by the University (including on programmes/modules delivered by University partner institutions) is disregarded for purposes of calculating stage weighted averages and for determining degree classification – see reg. 11
- 'partner institutions' – institutions approved under the relevant University Code of Practice (currently QH:15) to deliver programmes leading to University of Hull awards – see the University's Collaborative Provision Register, published at [www.hull.ac.uk/quality](http://www.hull.ac.uk/quality)
- (d): 'rounded to the nearest integer' - .45 is rounded up; .44 is rounded down. Rounding is carried out as soon as the stage average has been calculated.

### **32 Compensation, Referral and Condonement Maxima**

- (a) The following maxima shall apply to the exercise of any combination of compensation, referral or condonement - whether individually or in combination - as specified in the following Regulations:
- (i) no more than 40 credits per stage
  - (ii) no more than 40 credits per Foundation Degree.
- (b) Where a referred module is passed and the candidate allowed to progress to the next stage, the referral ceases to be included in the maxima defined above.
- (c) The maxima in (ii) above shall not include condonement exercised during the Preliminary Certificate stage.

#### *Explanatory note (revised Oct 09)*

- Previously reg. 29
- The maxima are designed 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.
- (a): 'compensation' – allows a module to be treated as a pass and the credits to be awarded in defined circumstances; the raw mark – in the range 35-39 – is not changed – see reg. 34
- 'referral' – allows a failed module to be retaken in its entirety simultaneously with the next stage of the programme – reg. 35
- 'condonement' – allows a failed module in the Honours/Masters stage only to be disregarded in determining eligibility for the award – reg. 36
- (c): added Sep 07 - the Preliminary Certificate stage (reg. 7) is regarded as a special case to which the normal maxima do not apply. See also reg. 36 as to condonement at the Preliminary Certificate stage (max 40 credits).
- (c) no modules at the preliminary certificate stage are deemed compensatable

### **33 Progression and Continuation**

- (a) A candidate who is awarded a pass mark (including pass by compensation) in all modules in the stage shall progress to the following stage or to the Award.
- (b) The Programme Board of Examiners may permit a candidate who has not completed the assessments for all the modules of the stage as a result of medical or exceptional personal circumstances to continue to the following stage of the programme, and thereafter be considered for progression from the former stage once those assessments have been completed.



*Explanatory note (added Oct 09)*

- Previously reg. 30
- (a): 'pass' – defined in reg. 24(a)(c)
- 'pass by compensation' – marks of 35-39 are deemed 'compensatable' (reg. 24(a)); eligibility for compensation is determined by applying reg. 34 but the raw mark (of between 35-39) remains
- (b): minor reword to achieve greater clarity
- 'has not completed' – i.e. been granted an extension or absence for good cause under reg. 22
- 'medical or exceptional personal circumstances' – consideration of a case should be based on the same criteria as claims for mitigating circumstances under reg. 25 above. This is the one case where it would be appropriate to consider the same mitigation twice – for example allowing a fresh attempt at module(s) affected by exceptional circumstances and then allowing the candidate to continue because of those circumstances
- 'continue' – this is a special category where the candidate is allowed to progress to the next stage but must complete the outstanding assessments to complete the previous stage; those outstanding assessments and therefore progression from that stage must be considered by the next appropriate Programme Board and the consequences of any subsequent failure addressed

### **34 Compensation**

- (a) Excluding any module declared in the programme of study to be non-compensatable, any module awarded a mark of 35-39, shall be passed by compensation (subject to Regulation 32) with no change being made to the mark awarded provided that:
- (i) the weighted average of all the marks for the stage is 40 or greater, and
  - (ii) no mark for the stage is below 35.
- (b) A candidate may waive the right to pass a module or modules by compensation and choose instead to be reassessed. If the reassessment is subsequently failed then the original pass by compensation shall be reinstated.

*Explanatory note (added Oct 09)*

- Previously reg. 31
- (a): 'declared in the programme of study' – this must be included when the programme is approved/re-approved and also be stated in the appropriate student handbook; otherwise compensation is applicable to all stages of Honours programmes
- 'subject to Regulation 31' – the compensation maxima
- Note that provided the conditions in (a) are satisfied compensation is automatic; it is **not** a matter of discretion for the Programme Board (*cf* referral and condonement below)
- no modules at the preliminary certificate stage are deemed compensatable (i): 'weighted average ... for the stage' – see reg. 31 for calculating stage weighted averages, including rounding; 40 will therefore include marks of 39.45 and above
- (ii): 'no mark ... below 35' – this situation is addressed in reg. 35
- (b): 'waive the right' – following the Programme Board the candidate should be advised (at least in writing) of the option and implications of either choice (bearing in mind the compensation maxima in reg. 32), and be provided with the opportunity to exercise the waiver. The decision to waive must be confirmed by the candidate in writing; silence would not constitute waiver
- 'original pass' – in this situation the credits would then count towards the compensation maxima

### **35 Referral and Compensation**

- (a) A candidate at the Certificate stage who has not achieved a pass mark in all modules after reassessment or exceptionally before reassessment may, at the

discretion of the Programme Board of Examiners, be referred in any module or modules with a mark of less than 35 provided that:

- (i) the weighted average of all the marks for the stage is 40 or greater, and
  - (ii) the total number of credits to be referred is not greater than 20.
- (b) A candidate referred before reassessment may reject the referral and exercise any right of re-assessment provided by Regulation 25(a).
- (c) Where such discretion to refer is exercised, any other module - excluding any module declared in the programme of study to be non-compensatable - awarded a mark of 35-39 shall be compensated (subject to Regulation 32) with no change being made to the mark awarded.
- (d) Other than at the Intermediate stage a candidate who is referred under paragraph (a), or who is so referred and awarded compensation under paragraph (b) shall progress to the following stage of the programme and be required to complete the full process of attendance and assessment for the module(s) referred or another module or modules selected from within the programme by the candidate by way of substitution. Such module or modules shall be taken concurrently with the following stage of the programme, but shall be subject to the availability of the module in the light of timetabling and other constraints.
- (e) The mark achieved for the referred or substituted module(s) shall be substituted for the original failed mark after which the candidate must be reconsidered for progression from the former stage under Regulation 33. The mark obtained for a referred module does not form part of the assessment of the stage of the programme taken at the same time as the referred or substituted module.
- (f) Subject to Regulation 25(a) above, a candidate who fails a referred or substituted module shall have the right to be reassessed and thereafter re-considered for progression from the former stage under Regulation 33.

*Explanatory note (added Oct 09)*

- Previously reg. 32
- (a): minor change to improve clarity. Candidates at the Pre Certificate and Intermediate stages are eligible for condonement under reg. 36 and not referral
- 'exceptionally' – this is a matter of discretion for the Programme Board, but the workload implications for the candidate should be considered
- 'at the discretion of' – unlike compensation, even if the criteria for referral are satisfied the Programme Board has a choice; it must treat all students equitably and therefore prior to the meeting should have determined how it will approach such cases, e.g. as to what factors will be considered relevant in making the decision. If a candidate's attendance and submission record is to be taken into account accurate records must be available to the board. While referral provides a form of 'safety net' it should be remembered that the candidate will have to attempt a total of 140 credits in the following session and this may not be appropriate in the case of weaker students. In all cases the decision, and the factors which influenced it, must be recorded in the minutes (see further QH:D2, paras. 89-90 regarding minuting boards of examiners meetings)
- 'mark of less than 35' – note that in the event of a mark being between 35 and 39 compensation will apply (see reg. 34)
- Note that even where a module has been declared 'non-compensatable' it can be referred (because ultimately the candidate still has to pass the module)

- (ii): 'not greater than 20' – notwithstanding the compensation etc maxima in reg. 32, the limit of 20 credits applies specifically in the case of referral
- (b): 'referred before reassessment' – the candidate may choose to undertake the reassessment; this choice must be explained to the candidate and be confirmed by him/her in writing.
- (c): this allows a module failed with a mark of 35-39 to be compensated at the same time as the referral provided the compensation etc maxima in reg. 32 are not exceeded. This overcomes the 'no mark of less than 35' limitation in reg. 34(a). Thus a candidate with e.g. 33 and 37 could be referred in the 33 and compensated in the 37. There is no discretion to allow referral in one but deny the compensation in the other
- The selection of another module by 'substitution' resolves the case where the candidate made an inappropriate choice of optional/student elective module
- (e): 'mark achieved' – currently the mark awarded after the referred module has been completed is not capped – this will be reviewed by QSC in 2009-10 – but counts toward the stage to which the original module related
- (f): a module failed when taken as a referred module can be reassessed (subject to the exercise of Reassessment Not Permitted – see reg. 25(a)) and the mark will be capped at 40 under reg. 24(c)). Currently a module can be referred twice (subject to the maxima) although this should be very exceptional, as the Programme Board would be unlikely to consider that a candidate who has failed a module up to four times (including reassessment) is likely to pass it at the fifth or even sixth attempt

### 36 Condonement

- (a) A candidate at the Preliminary Certificate or 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 (subject to Regulation 32) in any module or modules with a mark of less than 35 provided that:
- (i) the weighted average of all the marks for the stage is 40 or greater, and
  - (ii) for candidates on the 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 programme of study to be non compensatable.

Boards of Examiners **should** only exercise condonement in cases where all programme learning outcomes have been achieved.

- (b) A candidate so condoned may reject the condonement and exercise any right of re-assessment provided by Regulation 25(a).
- (c) Where such discretion to condone is exercised under this Regulation, any other module - excluding any module declared in the programme of study to be non-compensatable - awarded a mark of 35-39 shall be compensated (subject to Regulation 32) with no change being made to the mark awarded.
- (d) A candidate at the Preliminary Certificate stage who is condoned under paragraph (a), or who is so condoned and awarded compensation under paragraph (c) shall progress to the Certificate stage.
- (e) A candidate at the Intermediate stage who is condoned under paragraph (a), or who is so condoned and awarded compensation under paragraph (c) shall progress to the Award.

*Explanatory note (added Oct 09)*

- Previously reg. 33
- (a): The Preliminary Certificate Stage is a special case. Senate approved condonement of up to 40 credits from Sep 07. The compensation etc maxima also do not apply at the Preliminary Certificate stage (reg. 32(c)) and equally are disregarded when applying those maxima in subsequent stages.
- (a)(b): 'completed the assessments' – condonement is not permitted prior to a first attempt (e.g. where a candidate is allowed a fresh first attempt under reg. 26 above); in such cases the progression decision should be deferred until the fresh attempt has been completed. In the case of the Preliminary Certificate stage continuation would not be applicable because that presumes that no modules have been failed
- (b): 'within that stage' – makes explicit that modules from a previous stage (i.e. a previously referred module) cannot be condoned
- (d)(e): split to improve clarity
- Note that a candidate who benefits from condonement at the Intermediate stage of the Fd cannot also benefit from condonement on the Honours stage of the associated Honours degree – reg. 40
- A candidate admitted directly onto the Honours stage from an Fd awarded other than by the University of Hull is not eligible for condonement because of the requirement to achieve 120 credits from the University of Hull.

### 37 Merits and distinctions

- (a) Merits and distinctions shall be awarded on the basis of achievement in credit awarded by the University of Hull only. A minimum of 120 credits **must** be credit awarded by the University of Hull representing the final 120 credits of the award sought in order for a candidate to be eligible for the award of a merit or a distinction.
- (b) The award of merit or distinction applies only to programmes with an Intermediate stage which is comprised of no more than 20 credits' worth of modules designated to be pass/fail.
- (c) The award of Foundation degree with merit applies only to **students commencing the Intermediate stage of a programme on or after 1 September 2013**. A candidate **must** be awarded the Foundation degree with merit provided that the candidate has achieved a weighted average of between 60 and 69 over all marks assigned in the Intermediate stage.
- (d) The award of Foundation degree with distinction applies only to **students commencing the Intermediate stage of a programme on or after 1 September 2013**. A candidate **must** be awarded the Foundation degree with distinction provided that the candidate has achieved a weighted average of 70 or greater over all marks assigned in the Intermediate stage.
- (e) A candidate who does not satisfy the conditions for the award of a merit under paragraph (c) above, or distinction under paragraph (d) above may be awarded a merit or distinction at the discretion of the Programme Board of Examiners only where the Board is satisfied that the candidate has under-performed as a result of properly documented mitigating circumstances referred to it by the Module Board(s) under Regulation 25.

#### *Explanatory note (revised November 12)*

- (a): While up to 180 credits can be transferred into a Foundation degree (reg. 11), transferring more than 120 will exclude candidates from being considered for a merit or distinction
- 'Credit awarded by the University of Hull' includes credit earned at a Partner Institution on a programme leading to a University of Hull award as well as on-campus University of Hull awards.
- (b): 'pass/fail' modules – reg. 8
- (b) (c) (d) 'Intermediate stage' – defined in reg. 7

- (c) (d): 'weighted average' – defined in reg. 31. The stage average mark is rounded to the nearest integer - .45 is rounded up; .44 is rounded down.
- 'all marks assigned' – excluding those modules designated in the published programme as pass/fail – reg. 8
- (e): this allows a merit or distinction to be awarded where the candidate is judged by the Programme Board to have under-performed as a result of mitigating circumstances; under no other circumstances can the merit or distinction be awarded – there is no concept of borderlines for Foundation degrees. The award of merit and the award of distinction apply only **to students commencing the Intermediate stage of a programme on or after 1 September 2013.**
- 'referred to it by the Module Board' – this ensures that the circumstances have not been considered and acted upon by the board, thus ensuring there is no double counting of the circumstances

### **38 Consequences of Ineligibility to Progress**

- (a) A candidate ineligible to progress from the Preliminary Certificate to the Certificate stage shall be failed, but is entitled to the credits for the modules passed.
- (b) A candidate ineligible to progress from the Certificate to the Intermediate stage:
- (i) with at least 120 credits will be awarded a Certificate in Higher Education, or
  - (ii) with less than 120 credits will be failed, but is entitled to the credits for the modules passed.
  - (iii) with 120 credits at the Preliminary Certificate stage will be awarded a Foundation Certificate
- (c) Any award under this Regulation shall be subject to a minimum of 60 credits having been awarded by this University.
- (d) Any award under this Regulation shall be made provided that Certificates in Higher Education for professional programmes shall not be awarded in a named subject which implies that the candidate is entitled to practise that profession.

#### *Explanatory note (added Oct 09)*

- Previously reg. 34
- (c): 'this University' – refers to the University as the awarding body and therefore includes (collaborative) provision delivered by partner institutions
- (d): this power is designed to ensure that a candidate is not awarded a certificate/diploma which implies s/he is entitled to practise a particular profession (such as Social Work) where this is not the case. The Programme Board of Examiners is responsible for recommending the title of the award for approval by SPC

## PROGRESSION TO THE ASSOCIATED BACHELORS DEGREE

### 39 Progression to an associated Bachelors degree

- (a) Subject to paragraph (b), a candidate who has satisfied the requirements for the award of the Foundation Degree may be admitted to the Honours stage of an associated Bachelors degree, with the approval of the School responsible for the delivery of that associated Bachelors degree.
- (b) A candidate shall not be admitted as described in paragraph (a) where s/he commenced the Foundation Degree six or more years from the date on which s/he would now be admitted to the Honours stage.
- (c) A candidate admitted under paragraph (a) shall undertake 120 credits, a minimum of 100 of those credits being at level 6.
- (d) The accumulation of credits on the Honours stage shall be subject to the same Regulations as for the Certificate and Intermediate stages set out above.

#### *Explanatory note (added Oct 09)*

- Previously reg. 38
- This governs the admission of a candidate who has been awarded the Fd under the above Regulations, to the Honours degree related to the Fd
- (a): 'requirements for the award' – as defined in regs. 31 et seq.
- 'Bachelors' – rather than 'Honours' to show that progression is only possible to a Bachelors degree and not an Integrated Masters degree
- (b): this is the equivalent of the nine year rule for Honours degrees (QH:B4)
- (c): raised to 100 credits (from 90) to match the Honours degree regs (QH:B4)

### 40 Progression to the award of the Honours degree

Progression to the award shall be considered in accordance with Regulations 28 – 31 and 33, save that:

- (i) A candidate shall not benefit from any combination of compensation, referral or condonement which exceeds a total of 60 credits for the Certificate, Intermediate and Honours stages taken together
- (ii) A candidate who has benefited from condonement in the Intermediate stage shall not further benefit from condonement in the Honours stage
- (iii) Subject to Regulation 36 and paragraph (iv) below any award of the Honours degree shall be subject to a minimum of 120 credits from the Honours stage having been awarded by this University.
- (iv) A candidate admitted directly to the Honours stage from a Foundation Degree awarded other than by the University of Hull shall not be entitled to condonement at the Honours stage

#### *Explanatory note (added Oct 09)*

- Previously reg. 39
- (i): consistent with Honours degree Regulations
- (iii): 'subject to reg. 36' – a candidate is permitted condonement (if meeting the criteria for condonement) notwithstanding the requirement to achieve 120 credits from the Honours stage

- (iv): a candidate who has not completed the Fd awarded by Hull cannot benefit from condonement at the Honours stage and must achieve (be awarded) the full 120 credits; condonement does not involve the award of the credits

#### 41 Honours Classification

- (a) Honours degrees shall be awarded with Honours in the first class, second class (division 1), second class (division 2), or third class, according to the following scale:

100 – 70	First class
69 – 60	Upper second class
59 – 50	Lower second class
49 – 40	Third class

- (b) The class awarded shall be determined by the Programme Board of Examiners subject to the following Regulations:
- (i) A candidate's performance in the Preliminary Certificate, Certificate and Diploma stages of a Foundation degree programme shall not count towards the classification.

#### *Explanatory note (added September 15) Implementation*

- Transitional arrangements: **Students registered on the Intermediate stage, or on the Honours stage of the articulated Honours degree, in the academic session 2014-15**, are entitled to be awarded the best outcome of the new regulation and the previous regulation (version 2 06)

- (ii) A candidate must be awarded a class at least equal to that indicated by the candidate's performance at the Honours stage.
- (v) Candidates who have not met the average requirement (reg 41a) but who have submitted an application for mitigating circumstances where supported by valid evidence, may, on the recommendation of the Mitigating Circumstances Committee, be considered for the higher classification provided that the same circumstances have not already been considered by one or more module boards.

#### *Explanatory note (added Oct 09)*

- Previously reg. 40
- (b)(ii): new exemptions are only likely to be approved where this is explicitly required to meet professional, statutory or regulatory body requirements
- (vi): reworded for clarity – 'considered' means: 'determined that the application is valid and decided to make a decision based on the circumstances (offered fresh attempt or changed mark), or decided not to act (e.g. because the impact of the circumstances is deemed too limited)' (see further QH:D2, paras. 51-52)
- 'Mitigating Circumstances Committee' – see QH:D2, paras. 16 et seq.

#### **42 Consequences of ineligibility to progress to the Award**

- (a) A candidate who is ineligible to progress to the award of the Honours degree shall:
- (i) With at least 300 credits from the Certificate, Intermediate and Honours stages, including a minimum of 60 credits at level 6, be awarded an Ordinary degree
  - (ii) Otherwise be awarded any credits gained during the Honours stage.
- (b) Any award under paragraph (a) shall be subject to a minimum of 60 credits having been awarded by this University.

*Explanatory note (added Oct 09)*

- Previously reg. 41
- (a)(ii): the candidate has previously been awarded the relevant Fd
- (b): 'this University' – refers to the University as the awarding body and therefore includes (collaborative) provision delivered by partner institutions

### **RESULTS AND AWARDS**

#### **43 Notifications of Results and Transcripts**

All candidates shall be given access to their own marks after the completion of each assessment process and - provided they are not in debt to the University for payment of tuition fees - to a full transcript of all credits awarded and marks obtained on completion of their period of registration at the University.

*Explanatory note (added Oct 09)*

- Previously reg. 7
- 'assessment process' – reference should be made to each school's/faculty's feedback on assessment policy (QH:F1); results that the end of a stage are notified only by Registry Services
- 'tuition fees' – other fees, such as accommodation, are deemed irrelevant and therefore cannot bar the issuing of the transcript
- 'full transcript' – this now includes the European Diploma Supplement
- Note that modules repeated in accordance with reg. 18 are not included on the transcript
- Academic Misconduct penalties are only included where the candidate's programme is terminated as a result of academic misconduct – see QH:F8 reg. 30