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GLOSSARY

Course of study
A specified set of modules/subjects leading to an award.

Tutor reassessment
Opportunity offered to a candidate who, having failed to achieve a mark of 40% in any assessment other than formal examination, may elect on a single occasion for each element of such assessment, to rework and resubmit the piece of assessment in-year. The maximum mark available for an in-year resubmission is the standard pass mark for that piece of assessment.

Pass (module)
Recorded when a student achieves the minimum pass mark for a module.

Deferred (module)
Recorded when either:

- a student has failed to achieve a pass mark in a module and has submitted recognised extenuating circumstances
- or

a student has achieved a pass mark in a module and has submitted recognised extenuating circumstances against a mark of 0NS for an element of assessment as defined in the module specification document

Deferral allows a student to repeat the affected element(s) of assessment for the maximum mark available (if taking the assessment for the first time, the mark awarded for the piece of assessment and the module will be the mark achieved; if taking the assessment or the module for a second time, the mark awarded for the piece of assessment will be the mark achieved and the maximum mark awarded for the module will be the standard module pass mark).

Condonement
Recorded when a student has failed to achieve a pass mark in an eligible module but satisfies the identified criteria. The mark achieved is recorded but the credit for the module is granted without the student having to make good the failed elements of assessment for that module.

Referred
Recorded at the point of first consideration by a CAB when a student has achieved an overall mark within the specified referral range for a module which is not eligible for condonement. Referral allows a student to repeat the failed elements of assessment with the overall module mark being capped at the standard pass mark.

Fail (module): Undergraduate
Recorded when a student has achieved a mark of 39% or below for a module at the point of second consideration by the Assessment Board.

Fail (module): Postgraduate
Recorded when a student has achieved a mark below the specified referral range for a module at the point of first consideration by the Assessment Board or a mark below the specified pass mark at the point of second consideration by the Assessment Board.
**Pend**  
Recorded for a module where information is outstanding.

**May progress**  
Recorded when a student has met the minimum criteria for progression between stages.

**May not progress (decision postponed)**  
Recorded when a student profile is incomplete because decisions on modules are awaited pending the outcome of referral or deferral opportunities being retrieved in the subsequent academic session.

**May not progress (repeat year)**  
Recorded when a student has not met the minimum criteria for progression but has achieved the minimum criteria to remain a current student but is repeating modules in the subsequent academic session.

**Decision postponed**  
Recorded when a student’s profile is incomplete because decisions on modules are awaited pending the outcome of referrals or deferrals.

**Fail (course)**  
Recorded when a student is not able to progress having exhausted his/her rights of re-assessment or module substitution or when a student does not satisfy the minimum criteria to be eligible to continue on his/her course.

**Accumulated failure**  
A module which has been taken and failed on two occasions is deemed to be an accumulated failure. Students who accrue a total of 60 credits of accumulated failure at undergraduate level or 30 credits of accumulated failure at postgraduate level lose their right to count their existing credits towards any award on which they are currently registered.

A student who fails a core module on two occasions may be barred from progressing irrespective of the number of accumulated failed credits.

A student who has failed to again any academic credit in two consecutive sessions will have their registration terminated.

**Trailing module**  
A module being taken by a student which he/she failed in a previous session.

**Initial re-assessment**  
Having taken and failed a module, a student may take the module for a second time – this is classed as an initial re-assessment.

**Substitute module**  
A module chosen by a student to replace an optional module which he/she has failed at the first attempt. The mark awarded for a substitute module is the mark achieved. The module which is not retrieved is deemed to be an accumulated failure.

**Stage of Assessment**

---
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2
120 credits which would normally be deemed to constitute one year of full-time undergraduate study as defined in the Programme Specification Document (excluding any trailed modules) or 180 credits which would normally be deemed to constitute one year of full-time postgraduate study.

**End assessment**
Used when referring collectively to the submission of a thesis and any accompanying documentation and/or material and, where relevant, the oral examination, for the award of a postgraduate research degree.

**Terminology for credit levels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Huddersfield</th>
<th>FHEQ Level</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D (postgraduate)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Doctoral level [eg PhD/Professional Doctorate]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (postgraduate)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Master’s level [eg MA/MSc/Integrated Master’s degrees]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H (undergraduate)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Honours level [eg BA (Hons)/BSc (Hons)/LLB (Hons)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S (undergraduate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervised Work Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (undergraduate)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Intermediate level [eg DipHE/FD/HND]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (undergraduate)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Foundation level [eg CertHE/HNC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (undergraduate)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pre-foundation level [eg IFY/Science Foundation Year]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION A; AWARDS AND PRINCIPLES

A1; Awards covered by the regulations

A1.1; Pre-degree level

Certificate  
Certificate of Higher Education  
Diploma of Higher Education  
Foundation Degree

A1.2; First degree level

Certificate in Education  
Degree and honours degree: BA, BEd, BEng, LLB, BMus, BSc  
Graduate Certificate: GCert  
Graduate Diploma: GDip  
Integrated Master’s Degree: MChem, MEng, MHRM, MPharm, MSci, MLP, MSW, MHSCl)  
Professional Graduate Certificate in Education

Post-experience and postgraduate levels

A1.3; Post-experience

Diploma in Professional Studies  
Certificate in Management Studies  
Certificate in Leadership Studies

A1.4; Postgraduate and post-experience/postgraduate

Diploma in Architecture  
Postgraduate Certificate in Education (QTS)  
Postgraduate Certificate in Education (non QTS)  
Postgraduate Certificate  
Postgraduate Diploma (including Diploma in Management Studies)  
Master’s degree (LLM, MA, MArch MBA, MComp, MDes, MMus, MSc,)

A1.5; Postgraduate Research Awards

Master of Arts by Research (MA (Res))  
Master of Science by Research (MSc (Res))  
Master in Research (MRes)  
Master of Enterprise (MEnt)  
Master of Philosophy (MPhil)  
Professional Doctorates (DAppCrim, DAppLing, DBA, DCouns, DM, DN, DOT, DPA, DPhys, DPod, DSW, EdD)  
Doctor of Enterprise (EntD)  
Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)  
PhD by Publication
A1.6; Higher Doctorates

Doctor of Letters (DLitt)
Doctor of Science (DSc)
Doctor of Music (DMus)
Doctor of Laws (LLD)

Honorary Awards

A1.7; Honorary Doctorate

Doctor of Business Administration (Hon DBA)
Doctor of Civil Laws (Hon DCL)
Doctor of Letters (Hon DLitt)
Doctor of Science (Hon DSc)
Doctor of the University (D.Univ)

A1.8; Honorary Master's

Master of Arts (Hon MA) and Master of Sciences (Hon MSc)

A1.9; Honorary Fellowship of the University

Fellowship of the University

A2; PRINCIPLES

A2.1; Aims and learning outcomes of courses of study

Courses of study must have aims and learning outcomes which the curriculum, structure, teaching methods and forms of assessment are designed to fulfil.

The aims will include the development to the level required for the award of a body of knowledge and skills appropriate to the field of study and reflecting academic developments in that field.

The aims will also include general educational aims: the development of students’ intellectual and imaginative powers; their understanding and judgement; their problem solving skills; their ability to communicate; their ability to see relationships within what they have learned and to perceive their field of study in a broader perspective. Each student’s course of study must stimulate an enquiring, analytical and creative approach, encouraging independent judgement and critical self-awareness.

The learning outcomes will specify in more detail the knowledge and skills to be developed by the course and evaluated in the assessments.

A2.2; Quality of teaching

The quality of teaching on an approved course of study must be maintained and where possible enhanced. The teaching staff must be properly qualified and experienced, and
their teaching must be invigorated and informed by their active participation in research or related scholarly or professional activities.

**A2.3; Peer review**

A decision on whether or not a course of study meets the requirements of the University must be made by a group of responsible and experienced people drawn from:

a) inside and outside the field of study concerned;

b) inside and, as appropriate, outside the institution or other body providing the course;

c) inside and outside higher education.

This group must:

a) be able to make impartial judgements on the comparability of a course, in terms of standard and content, with similar courses of study offered elsewhere in higher education in the UK, and be able to consider the course in a national perspective;

b) include members familiar with current developments in the field of study;

c) usually include at least one member with relevant experience of industry, commerce, public service or the professions;

d) include members with an understanding of current practice and developments in teaching, learning and assessment in higher education;

e) be aware of University’s requirements for the award.

**A2.4; Admission of students**

The admission of a student will be based on a reasonable expectation that the student will be able to fulfil the learning outcomes of the course of study and achieve the standard required for the award.

**A2.5; Assessment of students**

The purpose of assessment is to enable students to demonstrate that they have addressed the learning outcomes of the course of study and achieved the standard required for the award. Assessment must be carried out by examiners who are impartial, and who are competent to make judgements about the performance of individual students in relation both to the cohort and to peers on other comparable courses. The particular responsibilities of the External Examiner are to ensure that the standard of the University’s awards is maintained.

**A2.6; Opportunities for study**

The structure of the University’s awards will embody the principles of credit accumulation and transfer and will provide opportunities for all students who satisfy its educational requirements to gain the highest award of which they are capable. Opportunities to gain awards must be made available to students without any form of discrimination on non-academic grounds.
A3: Regulations for the conferment of awards

A3.1; Titles of award

The University confers the following awards on students who have completed an approved course of study or programme of research:

The awards of Bachelor of Arts (BA), Bachelor of Education (BEd), Bachelor of Engineering (BEng), Bachelor of Laws (LLB), Bachelor of Music (BMus), and Bachelor of Science (BSc) are available as Bachelor’s Degrees with honours.

All other taught awards are available with Merit or Distinction. The first cycle awards of Integrated Master’s Degrees are available as Bachelor’s Degrees with honours.

A Postgraduate Diploma in Legal Practice may also be awarded with Commendation.

Certificate
Certificate of Higher Education (CertHE)
Aegrotat Certificate of Higher Education

Certificate in Education (CertEd)
Higher National Certificate
Higher National Diploma

Diploma of Higher Education (DipHE)
Aegrotat Diploma of Higher Education

Foundation Degree (FdA, FdSc, FdEng)
Aegrotat Foundation Degree

Bachelor’s degree
Aegrotat Bachelor’s degree

Bachelor’s degree with honours, First Class
Bachelor’s degree with honours, Upper Second Class
Bachelor’s degree with honours, Lower Second Class
Bachelor’s degree with honours, Third Class

Graduate Certificate
Graduate Diploma
Professional Graduate Certificate in Education

Integrated Master’s Awards:
Master of Chemistry (MChem)
Master of Engineering (MEng)
Master of Law and Practice (MLP)
Master of Pharmacy (MPharm)
Master of Science (MSci)
Master of Social Work (MSW)
A3.2; Conditions of award

An award will be conferred when the following conditions are satisfied:

a) the candidate was a registered student at the time of his or her assessment for an award;

b) the candidate has completed a course of study or research approved by the University as leading to the award being recommended;

c) in the case of an approved course of study the award has been recommended by an assessment board convened, constituted and acting under regulations approved by the Senate and including all members approved as external examiners for the course;

d) in the case of an approved programme of research the award has been recommended by the examiners approved by the Senate;
e) in the case of an award recommended under E3.9, the candidate has indicated his or her willingness to accept the award.

A3.3; Procedure for Conferment

Conferment is the formal ratification by the University of the recommendations made by the approved examiners. Lists of candidates on whom awards have been conferred will be signed by the Head of Registry on behalf of the Senate.

A3.4; Certificate of award

The certificate of an award conferred by the University shall record:

a) the name of the University together with, if appropriate, the name of any other institution sharing responsibility for the student’s course of study or programme of research;
b) the student’s name as given on the list of recommendations submitted by the approved examiners;
c) the award;
d) the title of the course (if any) as approved for the purpose of the certificate;
e) an endorsement, where appropriate, that the course of study was in the sandwich mode.
f) The certificate shall bear the signatures of the Vice-Chancellor and the Head of Registry.

A4; Discontinued university awards

At University Certificate level

Understanding Connexions Certificate for which the minimum requirement was 20 credits at I level

Diploma for Connexions Personal Advisers for which the minimum requirement is 80 credits at I level

At first degree level

Degree and honours degree: BTech
Integrated Master’s Degree: MInt, MText,

At post-experience and postgraduate levels

Post-experience

Certificate in Management

At postgraduate and post-experience/postgraduate levels

MEd (previously listed under Master’s degree)
MTL (previously listed under Master’s degree)
Discontinued awards of the EDEXCEL foundation (formerly BTEC)

Higher National Certificate
Higher National Diploma
SECTION B; VALIDATION, APPROVAL AND REVIEW

In exercising the power to confer academic awards the University will demonstrate publicly that it has the capacity and resources to establish procedures for the initial validation, approval, and monitoring of its courses and for the regular review and assessment of the quality of its teaching and research and of its support services. In particular it will demonstrate, as a self-critical academic community, its capacity and effectiveness in those matters, including the exposure and responsiveness of its processes and procedures for academic quality assurance to external peer review.

B1; Definitions

B1.1; Validation

Validation is the process whereby a judgement is reached by a group including as appropriate external peers as to whether a course of study designed to lead to an award meets the University’s requirements for that award.

B1.2; Approval

Approval is the outcome of a validation where a course has been judged to meet the University’s requirements.

B1.3; Evaluation

Evaluation is the regular, normally annual, internal process by which the University critically appraises the operation of courses of study and ensures that appropriate standards are maintained.

B1.4; Procedures

The Senate will establish and publish detailed procedures for the validation, approval, and annual evaluation of courses leading to the University’s awards and for the review of academic support services. These procedures must be based on and reflect the principles set out in A3.

B1.5; Awards offered in collaboration with other institutions

Courses leading to the University's awards may be devised and delivered in collaboration with another institution. Alternatively, arrangements may be made under which a course already approved by the University is delivered either partly or wholly by another institution.

In all such cases the University’s concern to maintain the standard and quality of its awards is paramount. The Senate will therefore ensure that in each case it retains control of the arrangements for validation, approval and evaluation of the course and for the assessment of students, and will need to be satisfied that the environment in which the course is to be delivered is appropriate to higher education.

The University may collaborate with another institution of higher education in devising a course of studies leading to an award from each institution. The arrangements for the
validation and evaluation of such courses will be subject to the approval of the Senate and must be designed to safeguard the standards of the University’s awards.

The University may collaborate with another institution in devising a course of studies leading to an award from both institutions - a joint award. The University is empowered to grant an award jointly with another institution provided that the proposed partner institution is also legally empowered to do so.

All arrangements under which awards are offered in collaboration with other institutions will be the subject of a formal agreement in which the duties and responsibilities of the parties are set out and which must cover the relevant academic, administrative and financial issues.
SECTION C: REGULATIONS FOR APPROVED COURSES OF STUDY

C1; General regulations

The University may alter its Assessment Strategy in the interests of students and the maintenance of academic standards. With reference to the process of validation for particular courses of study, one of the main aims is to ensure that courses of study conform to the University’s requirements for the award to which the course will lead.

This section sets out the general regulations applicable to all courses and, the particular regulations for individual awards. The regulations for approved courses of study in this section have been designed to provide a common framework and set of specifications for the drafting of the detailed course regulations, including regulations on admission, progression and assessment, under which students actually study.

C2; DEFINITION OF A COURSE OF STUDY

A course of study is the approved curriculum followed by an individual student. It may be identical with a validated course or it may be unique to the student. In all cases, however, the course of study must satisfy the requirements set out in this section.

All courses of study must be subject to course regulations approved as part of the validation process.

Each approved course of study should be governed by written statements, available to students, setting out as a minimum:

a) the title of the course of study, if any, and the award(s) to which it leads;
b) the planned duration and mode of study of the course;
c) the aims and learning outcomes of the course;
d) the curriculum and structure of the course;
e) regulations on the admission, progression and assessment of students

These specifications may not be changed without reference to the Senate. No such changes may be made to regulations on the progression or assessment of students without formal consultation with the students on the course who may be directly affected by the proposed change, unless it can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Senate that the proposed change does not disadvantage a student. Any such changes which affect the regulations for the assessment of students for an award must involve consultation with the approved External Examiner(s).

C2.1; The title of a course of study

Where the title of a course of study is to appear on the award certificate that title must be approved as part of the validation process and may not be changed without reference to the Senate. The title must be unique, simple, and accurate: it must accord, as a description of content of the course, with the normal expectations of higher education bodies, relevant professional bodies, students and employers about the level of knowledge and skills to be expected from a person holding such a qualification.
Where students study more than one subject, up to three separate fields of study which make a significant contribution to the course may be identified in the title with or without the addition of 'combined studies'. Subjects given equal weight in the course will appear in the form ‘Subject A and Subject B’, while major/minor combinations will be indicated by ‘Subject A with Subject B’, or ‘Subject A with Subject B and Subject C’ or ‘Subject A and Subject B with Subject C’.

Single subject titles may be used where subsidiary studies are not substantial enough to merit special mention; however, if the main subject forms too small a proportion of the course to justify a single subject title, the formula ‘Subject A and/with Combined Studies’ may be used.

C3; THE AWARD(S) TO WHICH A COURSE LEADS

The award(s) to which a course leads must be among the existing awards as listed in the Awards of the University section within this book, and each course must conform to the requirements for the award(s).

C4; THE AIMS AND LEARNING OUTCOMES OF A COURSE

A course of study must have stated aims and learning outcomes which the curriculum, structure, teaching methods and forms of assessment are designed to fulfil.

The aims will include the development, to the level required for the award, of a body of knowledge, competencies and skills appropriate to the field of study and reflecting academic developments in that field. In addition, each course of study will incorporate relevant subject benchmarks.

The statement of learning outcomes must show how student achievement on the course will fulfil the aims. Learning outcomes for each course will include knowledge and understanding, ability outcomes and qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment.

Holders of a Certificate of Higher Education will have a sound knowledge of the basic concepts of a subject, and will have learned how to take different approaches to solving problems. Students will be able to communicate accurately, and will have the qualities needed for employment requiring the exercise of some personal responsibility.

Knowledge and Understanding
a) Knowledge of the underlying concepts and principles associated with their area(s) of study.

Ability Outcomes
a) Interpret the knowledge and understanding within the context of the area(s) of study;
b) Present and interpret qualitative and quantitative data;
c) Develop lines of argument;
d) Make sound judgements in accordance with basic theories and concepts of their subject(s) of study;
e) Evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems related to their area(s) of study and/or work;
Communicate the results of their study/work accurately and reliably, with structured and coherent arguments.

Holders of a Diploma of Higher Education will have developed a sound understanding of the principles in their field of study, and will have learned to apply those principles more widely. Through this, they will have learned to evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems. Their studies may well have had a vocational orientation enabling them to perform effectively in their chosen field. They will have the qualities necessary for employment in situations requiring the exercise of personal responsibility and decision making.

Knowledge and Understanding
a) Critical understanding of the well-established principles of their area(s) of study and of the way in which those principles have developed;
b) Knowledge of the main methods of enquiry in their subject(s);
c) An understanding of the limits of their knowledge.

Ability Outcomes
a) Apply underlying concepts and principles outside the context in which they were first studied, including, where appropriate, the application of those principles in an employment context;
b) Evaluate critically the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems in the field of study;
c) Use a range of established techniques to initiate and undertake critical analysis of information, and to propose solutions to problems arising from that analysis;
d) Effectively communicate information, arguments, and analysis, in a variety of forms, to specialist and non-specialist audiences; and deploy key techniques of the discipline effectively.

Holders of an Honours degree will have developed an understanding of a complex body of knowledge, some of it at the current boundaries of an academic discipline. Through this, the graduate will have developed analytical techniques and problem solving skills that can be applied in many types of employment. The graduate will be able to evaluate evidence, arguments and assumptions, to reach sound judgements, and to communicate effectively. An honours graduate should have the qualities needed for employment in situations requiring the exercise of personal responsibility and decision-making in complex and unpredictable circumstances.

Knowledge and Understanding
a) A systematic understanding of key aspects of their field of study, including acquisition of coherent and detailed knowledge, at least some of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of defined aspects of a discipline;
b) Appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge.

Ability Outcomes
a) Deploy accurately established techniques of analysis and enquiry within a discipline;
b) Devise and sustain arguments, and/or solve problems, using ideas and techniques, some of which are at the forefront of a discipline;
c) Describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research, or equivalent advanced scholarship, in the discipline;
d) Manage their own learning, and make use of scholarly reviews and primary sources (e.g. referenced research articles and/or original materials appropriate to the discipline);

e) Apply the methods and techniques that they have learned to review, consolidate, extend and apply their knowledge and understanding; and to initiate and carry out projects;

f) Critically evaluate arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and data (that may be incomplete), formulate judgements, and frame appropriate questions to achieve a solution – or identify a range of solutions – to a problem;

g) Communicate information, ideas, problems, and solutions to both specialist and non-specialist audiences.

Holders of a Master’s degree will have originality in the application of knowledge and they will understand how the boundaries of knowledge are advanced through research. They will be able to deal with complex issues both systematically and creatively, and they will show originality in tackling and solving problems. They will have the qualities needed for employment in circumstances requiring sound judgement, personal responsibility and initiative in complex and unpredictable professional environments.

Knowledge and Understanding

a) A systematic understanding of knowledge, and a critical awareness of current problems which is at, or informed by, the forefront of their academic discipline, field of study or area of professional practice;

b) A comprehensive understanding of techniques applicable to their own research or advanced scholarship;

c) Originality in the application of knowledge together with a practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline.

Ability Outcomes

a) Evaluate critically current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline;

b) Evaluate methodologies and develop critiques of them and, where appropriate, propose new hypotheses;

c) Deal with complex issues both systematically and creatively, make informed judgements in the absence of complete data and communicate their conclusions clearly to specialist and non-specialist audiences;

d) Demonstrate self-direction and originality in tackling and solving problems and act autonomously in planning and implementing tasks at a professional or equivalent level;

e) Continue to advance their knowledge and understanding and to develop new skills to a high level.

Holders of a Doctoral degree will have the qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring the exercise of personal responsibility and largely autonomous initiative in complex and unpredictable situations, in professional or equivalent environments.

Knowledge and Understanding

a) The creation and interpretation of new knowledge, through original research or other advanced scholarship, of a quality to satisfy peer review, extend the forefront of the discipline, and merit publication.
b) A systematic acquisition and understanding of a substantial body of knowledge which is at the forefront of an academic discipline or area of professional practice.

c) The general ability to conceptualise, design and implement a project for the generation of new knowledge, applications or understanding at the forefront of the discipline, and to adjust the project design in the light of unforeseen problems.

d) A detailed understanding of applicable techniques for research and advanced academic enquiry.

Ability outcomes

a) Make informed judgements on complex issues in specialist fields, often in the absence of complete data, and be able to communicate their ideas and conclusions clearly and effectively to specialist and non-specialist audiences.

b) Continue to undertake pure and/or applied research and development at an advanced level, contributing substantially to the development of new techniques, ideas or approaches.

C5; THE CURRICULUM AND STRUCTURE OF A COURSE

The curriculum, like the title, must be appropriate to the aims of the course and to the level of the award. The structure must provide for the progression of the student from the level of knowledge and skills required at admission to the level required for the award.

C6; REGULATIONS ON THE ADMISSION OF STUDENTS TO A COURSE

The admission regulations must describe the basis on which a student will be admitted to the beginning or to subsequent stages of a course of study by:

a) identifying the knowledge and skills required at admission and relating these to the length, content and learning outcomes of the course;

b) describing the way in which these arrangements will accord with the requirements relating to the standard of the award, as set out in the Regulations for Awards section of this book;

c) setting out the criteria and means by which the suitability of the student for admission will be judged;

d) setting out, where appropriate, the procedures to be used in assessing for the purposes of Honours classification any relevant previous work of students admitted with specific credit.

C7; REGULATIONS ON PROGRESSION

Progression regulations must set out the way(s) in which students progress through the course, and identify the elements that are compulsory, core, optional or alternative.

Where attendance is not only compulsory and monitored but is required at a certain level for the student to pass the module/course, the regulations must give details of the attendance requirements to be met by students.

The regulations must give details of any formal arrangements designed to monitor students’ progress and warn students of possible failure.
C8; REGULATIONS ON ASSESSMENT

The assessment regulations for a course of study must state the basis on which students will be assessed for an award, relating the assessment requirements to the general educational aims and learning outcomes, the aims and learning outcomes of the course, the standard of the award, and any special assessment requirements associated with the award.

The assessment regulations must cover all assessments, at whatever point in the course they are undertaken, which formally contribute to the recommendation of an award. Subject to the provision of G2.5, External Examiners are associated with all intermediate and honours assessments for an award. In addition, where foundation modules form the majority of the final award (not including interim awards such as the Certificate of Higher Education), the External Examiners are also associated with these assessments. External Examiners have the right to be associated with all postgraduate level assessments for an award.

Regulations on assessment for an award must:

a) identify all the elements that will be assessed including any assessed supervised work experience;

b) specify which or how many elements must be passed to obtain an award and what weighting each carries in the assessments;

c) identify any elements that may in no circumstances be the subject of condonement under F2.4;

d) state the criteria for the recommendation of each award or level of award to which the course may lead, in accordance with the provisions of D4;

e) set out the composition (including the minimum number of External Examiners) and terms of reference of the Course Assessment Board.
SECTION D; REGULATIONS FOR AWARDS

D1; The accreditation system

The University’s awards are normally gained through the accumulation of credits within approved courses of study and each award is defined in terms of the number and levels of credit which are required to attain it. Credit submitted as part of one award may not normally be re-presented as credit towards another award at the same level.

Credit will be awarded on the basis of evidence that high quality learning has taken place. This evidence will be drawn primarily from the assessment of learning outcomes.

The University’s academic courses are built up from modules. Each 10 credit points awarded at either undergraduate or postgraduate level corresponds to 100 hours of learning experience.

A module on an undergraduate course may not be less than 20 credits or greater than 40 credits. A module on a postgraduate course may not be less than 15 credits and should not be greater than 60 credits. The normal multiplier for the size of an undergraduate module is 10 credits and for a postgraduate module is 15 credits.

Specific, and written, approval for undergraduate 10 credit modules must be sought from the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning). Submission must be made via the Head of Registry.

Each module attracts credits at a defined level. The University’s scheme for the accumulation and transfer of credit embraces the following levels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Equivalent to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Pre-foundation</td>
<td>‘Access’ level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Foundation level</td>
<td>First year full-time degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Intermediate level</td>
<td>Post-foundation study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Supervised work experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Honours level</td>
<td>Post-intermediate study at honours degree level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Postgraduate level</td>
<td>Post-honours degree level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Doctoral level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case of S level credits a 48 week period of supervised work experience is rated at 120 credits. Shorter periods are rated pro rata.

The standard model for undergraduate courses is as follows:

a) Stage 1 120 Foundation level credits
b) Stage 2 120 Intermediate level credits  
c) Stage 3 120 Honours level credits

**D2; University guidelines on managing APL claims**

The University’s Handbook of Regulations for Awards makes provision for taught courses to recognise prior learning. The credit is awarded by the University and will be shown a student’s transcript/diploma supplement as APL credit.

Applicants may be admitted with credit for prior learning to courses at both first degree and postgraduate level.

Recognition takes two forms:

a) Accreditation of Prior Learning Achievement (APLA): a process through which a student can claim academic credit for prior certificated learning achieved from an accredited course.

b) Accreditation of Prior Experiential Learning (APEL): a process through which a student can claim academic credit for prior learning gained through experience gained (for example) on the workplace.

Accreditation can only be sought against whole modules – mapping is undertaken on the basis of an individual or against a group of modules (including against a full year of a course). No more than two thirds of the award being conferred can be achieved through accreditation.

Accreditation for SWE credit is not permitted.

In cases where APL is awarded, the student will receive the credit but no mark will be recorded.

Schools should make it clear to all APL candidates what, if any, charge is to be levied for the process before the student starts collating the evidence for a claim.

**D2.1; Certified and Uncertificated prior learning**

An applicant may claim credit towards an award following successful completion of a relevant course of study at higher education level or on the basis of other certificated learning, which may include professional or company training.

An applicant may seek to demonstrate that uncertificated previous work or life experience has resulted in the acquisition of skills or knowledge equivalent to learning arising from higher education.

**D2.3; The assessment of prior learning achievement for specific credit**

An applicant seeking credit within the structure of a proposed course of study leading to an award may claim specific credit for learning which is equivalent to that arising from relevant modules of study. Such claims will be examined by assessing the comparability of certificated learning or by conducting a form of assessment to show the equivalence of
uncertificated learning. In general, such assessment will seek to show that the applicant is equipped to undertake subsequent study.

**D2.4; Limitation on credit for prior learning**

Accreditation for prior learning is limited to a maximum of 66% of the value of the award to be conferred (excluding S level credit), with no more than 20 credits of accreditation being awarded at H level. Schools submitting proposals for validation are free to stipulate percentages less than 66% and to record this in the appropriate documentation.

Accreditation is not permitted for credit which has been previously counted as part of an award which is at the same level as the award for which the student is now aiming.

Accreditation on top-up degree courses is not permitted.

**D2.5; Study at institutions other than the University of Huddersfield**

Students undertaking study outside the University of Huddersfield can claim credit towards the University’s awards.

Such study may be at recognised institutions of higher education in the UK, Europe or the United States of America which are members of credit consortia whose regulations govern accreditation and exchange of credit. In this case the credit rating of the originating institution will be accepted and counted in full towards general credit.

Concurrent formal study outside the University may also take place at other institutions or through work-based learning. In these cases the credit rating of study will be established by negotiation between the relevant School Committee, University subject specialists and the study supervisor or company training manager.

Claims may be considered for previously obtained credit to be used as APL towards a new award where the previously obtained credits;

a. Were awarded by the University of Huddersfield
b. Match core credit(s) that form part of the new award
c. Are not used to APL more than one third of the total credit of the new award.

**D2.6; Claims and evidence**

The regulations require any credit used towards a University qualification to have been awarded within 6 years of the qualification being conferred. This applies to APLA credit and any experience being presented for APEL. Exceptionally, if a student can demonstrate how they have been able to keep both the subject knowledge and the academic skills updated, the SAVP may allow an extension to the standard 6 year regulation.
D2.7; APLA

A student wishing to make an APLA claim should be asked to complete a School-based APLA claim form and provide accompanying evidence. This would typically include some or all of the following:

- relevant course certificates and/or letters confirming grades and courses completed
- copies of course materials, handbooks, timetables or other related documents
- marking schemes and feedback sheets for assessments
- transcripts of accredited training

Coursework and other assessed work is not acceptable evidence.

D2.8; APEL

A student wishing to make an APEL should be asked to complete a School-based APEL claim form and provide accompanying evidence. This would usually take the form of a portfolio comprising a collection of evidence to demonstrate how the experience claimed maps against the learning outcomes of the modules for which credit is sought. This would typically include some or all of the following:

- Letters of support from current and/or previous managers
- A personal statement describing the student’s experience and why it is relevant in terms of the learning outcomes of the modules for which APL is being claimed. This will demonstrate the learning, knowledge and skills appropriate to the academic credit that being claimed
- Evidence that supports the statement – such as copies of presentations, reports or projects undertaken in a previous employment.

In discussion with the student, a tutor may conclude that a format other than a portfolio is appropriate – such as a reflective account of the learning achieved or a performance-based assessment. In such cases, the proposed format should be agreed by the Chair of the SAVP before being confirmed with the student.

D2.9; Timing of claims

A claim may be submitted at any point during the application process or while the student is registered for an award. Applications for credit can be considered and approved by Schools in advance of a student’s registration.

It is important that any claim for credit which will permit advanced entry to the course for the student is concluded promptly so that a student can be confident that they have entered the course at the correct point. UTLC expects all Schools to have received the full set of documentation for advanced entry claims by the third week of teaching and for all such claims to have been processed as soon as possible thereafter. The recording of associated credit should be undertaken not later than the end of the student’s first term of study.
D2.10; Production of claim

Students who wish to make an APL claim should be allocated a tutor to advise them on and support them through the process.

In the case APLA, this support may require only one meeting to examine the equivalency and legitimacy of the qualification in terms of:

- the level of the previous study
- the content of the curriculum and its learning outcomes
- the effort required of the student in completing the award
- the currency of the award
- confirmation of that the award has been conferred (certificate and transcript)

In the case of APEL, it is likely that the support will take the form of a short series of tutorials where the student presents their evidence and discusses their experiences in the context of the learning outcomes of the modules for which credit is being sought. The claim should take the form of a portfolio which can be assessed in the same way as any other summative submission. This will involve the student in identifying appropriate skills, knowledge and understanding acquired from their prior experience and expressing this learning in a way which can be assessed for academic credit.

D2.11; Confirmation of credit

The SAVP is the body responsible for considering APL claims and confirming the award of credit.

School-based forms should be completed and a recommendation made by the tutor who has supported the student through the process. The form and the recommendation are submitted for approval to the SAVP and the student should be informed in writing of the outcome – in the case of claims for APEL the University’s standard guidelines in feedback should apply.

In cases where an APL claim is ejected, the SAVP must clarify if a resubmission of the claim would be permitted.

Credit must be recorded in the student record system promptly.

D2.12; Monitoring

SAVPs should submit an annual report to UTLC of all APL activity – including rejected claims.

D3; Awards of the University

In determining eligibility for all awards of the University (including those in collaboration with Edexcel Foundation), credits at a higher level can, where appropriate, be substituted for credits at a lower level.

The following awards are available through credit accumulation:
Certificate of Higher Education, for which the minimum requirement is 120 credits F level, subject to the provisions of F2.4.

Certificate in Education, which is associated with a course designed to cover the theory and practice of teaching and for which the minimum requirement is 120 credits at F level, subject to the provisions of F2.4.

Certificate in Professional Studies, which is associated with a course designed to cover specialist areas of the allied health professions for which the minimum requirement is 60 credits at H level, subject to the provisions of F2.4.

Diploma of Higher Education, for which the minimum requirement is 240 credits of which at least 120 must be I and/or H level, subject to the provisions of F2.4.

Foundation degree, for which the minimum requirement is 240 credits of which at least 120 must be I level, and include a minimum of 60 credits located in work-based learning.

Bachelor’s degree, for which the minimum requirement is 300 credits of which no more than 120 credits should be at F level and at least 60 should be at H level subject to the provisions of F2.4. With the exception of students who have received their prior relevant credits from this University, for the award of a degree as an interim award of a standalone top-up degree, a minimum of 100 credits at H level is required - any exception to this would need the explicit approval of the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning). For the award of a degree in the sandwich mode there is an additional requirement of sufficient S level credits to satisfy C1.3.2.

Bachelor’s degree with honours, for which the minimum requirement is normally 360 credits of which no more than 120 credits should be at F level and at least 120 credits should be at H level subject to the provision of F2.4. For the award of an honours degree in the sandwich mode there is an additional requirement of sufficient S level credits to satisfy C1.3.2.

Graduate Certificate, for which the minimum requirement is 40 credits at H level.

Graduate Diploma, for which the minimum requirement is 80 credits at H level.

Integrated Master’s Degrees, for which the minimum requirement is 480 credits of which no more than 120 credits should be at F level and at least 240 credits at H or M level with no less than 120 being at M level subject to the provision of F2.4. For an award to be made in the sandwich mode there is an additional requirement of sufficient S level credits to satisfy C1.3.2. The award of an Integrated Master’s Degree normally requires an overall average mark of at least 50% in H and/or M level modules totalling between 120 and 180 credits. The modules which will be used for this purpose must be identified in the course regulations.

Professional Graduate Certificate in Education, for which the minimum requirement is 120 credits at least 20 of which must be at H level, subject to the provisions of F2.4.

Diploma in Professional Studies, which is reserved for courses of study related to specific professions and designed to build on professional experience and for which the minimum requirement is 120 credits at I level, subject to the provisions of F2.4.
Diploma in Architecture, which is reserved for a course designed to meet the requirements of the architectural profession and which requires an additional 120 credits at H level beyond those which have contributed to the award of an honours degree plus 120 credits at M level, plus a further 60 M level credits for the RIBA professional award of MArch.

Postgraduate Certificate in Education (non-QTS), for which the minimum requirement is 60 credits at M level.

Postgraduate Certificate in Education (with QTS), for which the minimum requirement is 120 credits of which at least 60 must be at M level.

Certificate in Management Studies, Certificate in Leadership Studies which is reserved for a course designed to meet the requirements for entry to a postgraduate certificate or diploma in management or management studies.

Postgraduate Certificate, for which the minimum requirement is 60 credits at M level.

Diploma in Management Studies, for which the minimum requirement is 105 credits at M level.

Postgraduate Diploma, for which the minimum requirement is 120 credits at M level.

Postgraduate Master’s degree, for which the minimum requirement is 180 credits at M level.

The Senate may give special dispensation for a course of study which is not based on the principle of credit accumulation to be offered for any of the awards described in D3. In such cases the criteria for the award must be demonstrated to be the equivalent of those in D3.

A Certificate may be awarded for a course of study which is validated by the University and is formally assessed, but which does not satisfy the requirements for any of the awards described in D3.

With the exception of the Bachelor’s degree with honours and the first cycle award associated with Integrated Master’s Degrees, any of the University’s taught awards may be conferred with Distinction or with Merit. The Bachelor’s degree with honours and the first cycle award of the Integrated Master’s Degree is awarded with a classification, namely First Class, Upper Second Class, Lower Second Class, or Third Class. At the discretion of the School, the second cycle award associated with the Integrated Master’s Degree may be awarded with Distinction or with Merit.

D3.1; Sandwich degrees

a) A designated sandwich course leads to an award ‘in the sandwich mode’, and these words appear on the award certificate. A course of study approved as leading to a degree or a degree with honours in the sandwich mode must normally include not less than 48 weeks of supervised work experience in addition to the period required for the full-time award.
b) The period of supervised work experience must form a compulsory element of the course of studies. Its learning outcomes must be specified and related to the learning outcomes of the whole course, the performance of students must be assessed, and satisfactory completion of and performance in the period of supervised work experience must be a requirement for the award.

D3.2; Aegrotat/posthumous awards

The cumulative nature of assessment under these regulations would normally ensure that sufficient evidence would be available to determine an award irrespective of illness. Where, exceptionally, an Assessment Board is satisfied that, but for illness or other valid cause, a candidate would have qualified for the award of either a Bachelor's degree or a Foundation degree or a Diploma of Higher Education or a Certificate of Higher Education an Aegrotat award may be made. An Aegrotat Bachelor’s degree is unclassified and a student who accepts such a degree cannot subsequently be reassessed to satisfy the requirements for a degree with honours.

No other Aegrotat awards are available.

Any award listed under Section A from within this book may be conferred posthumously and accepted on the student’s behalf by a parent, spouse or other appropriate individual. The normal conditions of award must be satisfied. For the posthumous conditions governing research degrees, please refer to Section G1.7 within this book.

D3.3; Interim awards

Courses designed to lead to the award of the Bachelor’s degree with honours will normally incorporate the interim awards of Certificate of Higher Education, Diploma of Higher Education, and Bachelor’s degree. Similarly, courses designed to lead to the award of a Foundation degree will normally incorporate the interim award of Certificate of Higher Education. Courses designed to lead to the award of postgraduate Master’s degree will normally incorporate the interim awards of Postgraduate Certificate and Postgraduate Diploma. Students entering such courses will normally register for the highest award available and an interim award for which they have qualified will be conferred by the Assessment Board at the point when the student’s registration for that level of award is discontinued.

Students transferring between courses without taking a break in study will not normally be eligible to claim an interim award. Where a student transfers courses and the credit obtained to date is not to be used for the purposes of contributing to the award of the course transferred to then the student will be entitled to the interim award for which they are eligible.

Students who do not achieve the award to which they aspire retain the right to apply for any other award for which they have qualified for a period of up to five years after the date at which they became eligible for that award. Thereafter the award may be conferred only at the discretion of the appropriate Assessment Board. Acceptance of such an award does not preclude subsequent registration in order to progress to a higher award, provided there is a break in registration of at least one full academic session.
D4; Titles of Foundation Degrees, Bachelor's Degrees, Integrated Master's Degrees and Postgraduate Master's Degrees

Foundation degrees, Bachelor’s degrees and Bachelor’s degrees with honours are awarded with a title which reflects the subject balance of the course. The following titles are available:

Foundation degree (FdA), which is for art and design, the arts and humanities, combined studies in the arts and social sciences, and for areas of social or business studies where it is appropriate,

Bachelor of Arts (BA), which is for art and design, the arts and humanities, combined studies in the arts and social sciences, and for areas of social or business studies where it is appropriate,

Bachelor of Education (BEd), which is reserved for courses of teacher education,

Foundation Degree (FdEng), which is reserved for courses which provide a technologically broad education with an emphasis on engineering applications

Bachelor of Engineering (BEng), which is reserved for courses which provide a technologically broad education with an emphasis on engineering applications and may lead to registration with the Engineering Council,

Bachelor of Laws (LLB), which is reserved for courses of specialised study in law,

Bachelor of Music (BMus), which is reserved for courses of specialised study in music,

Foundation degree (FdSc), which is for courses that are substantially based on mathematics or one or more of the sciences, including their application,

Bachelor of Science (BSc), which is for courses that are substantially based on mathematics or one or more of the sciences, including their application,

Integrated Master’s Degrees are awarded with a title which reflects the subject balance of the course. The following titles are available:

Master of Chemistry (MChem), which is reserved for courses of specialised study in chemistry,

Master of Engineering (MEng), which is reserved for courses that focus on engineering and its application,

Master of Pharmacy (MPharm), which is reserved for courses that focus on pharmacy and its application,

Master of Science (MSci), which is reserved for courses that focus on science and their application,

Master of Law and Practice (MLP), which is reserved for courses of specialised study in Law.
Master of Social Work (MSW), which is reserved for courses of specialised study of social work

Master of Health and Social Care Leadership (MHSCL), which is reserved for courses of specialised study of health and social care leadership

Postgraduate Master’s degrees are awarded with a title which reflects the subject balance of the course. The following titles are available:

Master of Architecture (MArch), which is reserved for courses of specialised study in the practice of architecture,

Master of Arts (MA), which is for the arts and humanities and for other areas of study where the use of a more specialised title is not appropriate,

Master of Business Administration (MBA), which is reserved for courses that focus on the general principles and functions of management and on the development of management skills,

Master of Computing (MComp), which is reserved for courses that focus on the computing and its application,

Master of Design (MDes), which is reserved for courses of study that focus on the practice of design,

Master of Enterprise (MEnt), which is reserved for courses of specialised study in enterprise,

Master of Laws (LLM), which is reserved for courses of specialised study in law,

Master of Music (MMus), which is reserved for courses of specialised study in music.

Master of Science (MSc), which is reserved for courses that are substantially based on science or mathematics and their applications, and for other areas of study where the use of a more specialised title is not appropriate.
SECTION E: THE ADMISSION OF STUDENTS TO COURSES OF STUDY

E1; Principles of admission

E1.1; Requirements

The admission of an individual applicant is subject to:

a) a reasonable expectation that the applicant will be able to fulfil the learning outcomes of the course and achieve the standard required for the award;
b) the general requirements for the award to which the course leads;
c) the regulations for the particular course of study, which will describe the knowledge and skills required for admission;
d) the normal expectation that the applicant will be at least 18 years of age by 30 September in the academic year of entry.

E1.2; General considerations

Those considering individual applicants for admission to a course of studies should seek evidence of personal, professional and educational experiences that provide indications of ability to meet the demands of the course.

E1.3; Admission with academic credit

Where it is established that the applicant has fulfilled some of the progression and assessment requirements of the course by means other than attendance on the planned course, and will be able by completing the remaining requirements to fulfil the learning outcomes of the course and attain the standard required for the award, that student may be admitted to any appropriate point in the course, subject to the provisions of D2.5.

E2; Requirements for admission

E2.1; Courses of study at first degree level

The minimum levels of attainment described below represent a benchmark. Individual applicants may be admitted on the basis of a wide range of qualifications and/or experience provided the principles of admission in E1 are observed.

This regulation covers courses designed to lead to one or more of the following awards:

Certificate of Higher Education
Certificate in Education
Diploma of Higher Education
Bachelor’s degree
Bachelor’s degree with honours
Integrated Master’s Degree

The minimum level of attainment required for entry to the start of such courses is:
a) Passes in five subjects at GCE/VCE/GCSE which must include 12 units of study at A2 level with at least one 6 or 12 unit award.*
b) A Scottish Certificate of Education with passes in five subjects, three at the Higher Grade or passes in four subjects at the Higher Grade.

c) Advanced Diploma

d) An Access to HE Diploma

e) A National Certificate or Diploma awarded by Edexcel Foundation (formerly BTEC).

f) A National Certificate of GSVQ at level 3 awarded by the Scottish Qualifications Authority.

g) A European Baccalaureate.

h) An International Baccalaureate.

i) The Irish Leaving Certificate with grade C or above in four subjects at Higher Level.

*Note The minimum level of attainment must not include an Advanced Subsidiary GCE in the same subject as an Advanced GCE.

Courses leading to the award of the Diploma in Professional Studies do not normally include F level modules. In such cases applicants will be required to satisfy the criteria set out above and, additionally, to demonstrate other learning equivalent to 120 credits at F level.

The minimum level of attainment required for entry to the start of courses designed to lead to the award of a Foundation Degree is:

a) Relevant achievement or performance in a workplace or community setting that demonstrates outcomes consistent with those expected at level three of the Qualifications and Credit Framework.

b) Passes in four subjects at GCE/VCE/GCSE which must include six units of study at A2 level.*

c) A Scottish Certificate in Education with passes in five subjects, of which two are at Higher Grade

d) Advanced Diploma

e) An Access to HE Diploma

f) A National Certificate or Diploma awarded by Edexcel Foundation (formerly BTEC).

g) A National Certificate or GSVQ at level 3 awarded by the Scottish Qualifications Authority.

h) The Irish Leaving Certificate with grade C or above in two subjects at Higher Level and three at Ordinary level

*Note The minimum level of attainment must not include an Advanced Subsidiary GCE in the same subject as an Advanced GCE.

E2.2; Postgraduate courses of study

The admission requirements for taught postgraduate programmes shall normally be a good honours degree of a recognised university or comparable institution or qualifications regarded by the University as equivalent. Other qualifications or experience which demonstrate that a candidate possesses appropriate knowledge and skills at honours degree standard may be acceptable.

The normal entry requirement for Postgraduate Certificate or Diploma is an honours degree or other qualification at equivalent level. A lower level qualification together with
appropriate experience or, exceptionally, substantial related experience alone, may be acceptable.

Candidates for the *Professional Graduate Certificate in Education or the Postgraduate Certificate in Education* should hold either a degree of the CNAA or of a UK university, or a recognised degree equivalent qualification. A degree equivalent qualification should be based on the minimum of three year’s full-time study at undergraduate level or its part-time equivalent.

An applicant’s prior uncertificated learning may be assessed for entry to postgraduate courses.

Those holding a master’s degree without additional honours level qualifications may be considered for admission to the University's Professional Graduate Certificate in Education and Postgraduate Certificate in Education courses and, subject to their general suitability, may be accepted if they are able to satisfy the University that their breadth of subject expertise is appropriate with regard to their current (for in-service provision) or intended field of employment as a teacher.
SECTION F - THE ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS ON COURSES OF STUDY

F.1; General principles

F1.1; Course outcomes

The purpose of assessment is to enable students to demonstrate that they have addressed the learning outcomes of the course of study and achieved the standard required for the award they seek. All courses of study are subject to regulations which relate the assessment requirements of the course to its learning outcomes, and it is within these assessment regulations that examiners make their judgements on student performance.

F1.2; Grading scales

The following module grading scales and award classification bands shall apply in connection with the grading of modules and the determination of award classifications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Undergraduate modules</th>
<th>Postgraduate modules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honours awards</td>
<td>Non-Honours awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer</td>
<td>0-39%</td>
<td>0-39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Module Grading Bands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>70% +</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>70% +</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>70% +</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>70% +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>50-59%</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>50-59%</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>50-59%</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>50-59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>40-49%</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>40-49%</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>40-49%</td>
<td>R***</td>
<td>35-49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R/F*</td>
<td>0-39%</td>
<td>R/F*</td>
<td>0-39%</td>
<td>R/F**</td>
<td>30-39%</td>
<td>F***</td>
<td>0-49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F**</td>
<td>0-39%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Award Classification Bands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>69.5%</th>
<th>Distinction</th>
<th>69.5%</th>
<th>Distinction</th>
<th>69.5%</th>
<th>Distinction</th>
<th>69.5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:1</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>Merit</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>Merit</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>Merit</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:2</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Initial CAB consideration allows referral between 0% and 39%
CAB consideration following referral will conclude fail between 0 and 39%

** Initial CAB consideration allows referral between 30% and 39%
CAB consideration following referral will conclude fail between 0 and 39%
*** Initial CAB consideration allows referral between 35% and 49%
CAB consideration following referral will conclude fail between 0 and 49%

F1.3; Confirmation of standard

Assessment must reflect the achievement of the individual student in addressing course learning outcomes, and at the same time relate that achievement to a consistent national standard of awards. It must therefore be carried out by competent and impartial examiners, and by methods which enable them to assess students fairly. In order to achieve this end, External Examiners must be associated with all assessments which may count towards an award; their particular role is to ensure that the standard of awards is maintained.

F1.4; Examiners’ judgement

Assessment is a matter of judgement, not simply of computation. Marks, grades and percentages are not absolute values but symbols used by examiners to communicate their judgement of different aspects of a student’s work, in order to provide information on which the final decision on a student’s fulfilment of course learning outcomes may be based. It is particularly important for students to understand the nature of examiners’ discretion and judgement when details of individual marks are available to them.

Within the constraints imposed by the requirements of F1 and subject to guidance issued by the Senate, examiners have discretion in reaching decisions on the awards to be recommended for individual candidates. They are responsible for interpreting the assessment regulations for the course if any difficulties arise, and their academic judgements cannot, in themselves, be questioned or overturned.

F1.5; Moderation and Marking

The University believes that second or blind double marking is an example of best practice, but recognises that, for practical reasons, the single marking or the team marking of a piece of assessment will be the norm for the majority of scripts unless there are reasonable grounds, in the opinion of the course leader, for either second or blind double marking to take place.

In cases where a module of 40 credits or more is assessed by a single piece of assessment, unless the process has involved a model of collaborative marking, it is considered good practice to apply either second or blind double marking.

Moderation as outlined below should take place such that the assessment processes for the work of a minimum of 15% of the student cohort or 10 students (whichever is the greater but normally not more than 30 students) normally covering high, medium, low attainment and failed assessments should be made available to the External Examiner. It is expected that where multiple markers have been used across a cohort of submissions that the sample size normally includes assessments moderated by all markers who contributed.
A pro-forma for this moderation should be used and kept as evidence for the process having been undertaken.
F1.5.1; Moderation

For each delivery of a module, the module leader is required to ensure that it can be demonstrated that the assessment for that cohort has been subject to the appropriate moderation. This must include evidence that those responsible for moderation have confirmed their satisfaction with the standards and processes applied to the assessment of that delivery.

It is an activity which allows an academic not involved in the initial assessment to confirm that:

a) the marking has been undertaken appropriately against the assessment criteria
b) the marking was fair, valid and reliable

c) appropriate feedback has been provided
d) standards have been consistently and appropriately applied for the level of study being assessed.

It is not a further mark of the piece of work in question.

Disagreements with the standard applied are referred back to the initial marker for review. If the matter cannot be reconciled between the two, a separate sample is identified for moderation by a third member of academic staff.

F1.5.2; Single marking

Single Marking is an activity where a piece of assessment is marked in its entirety for the whole cohort by a single member of academic staff.

Work which has been single marked will still be subject to the moderation process.

F1.5.3; Team Marking

Team Marking is an activity where a piece of assessment is marked by a team of markers amongst whom responsibility for the marking of the assessment has been distributed. Team marking may refer to distribution by groupings of students (so that a member of academic staff marks the entire assessment for an identified subgroup of students) or by elements of the assessment (for example tutor A marks all of question 1 for all students while Tutor B marks all of question 2 for all students) – or a combination of the two.

Work which has been team marked will still be subject to the moderation process which should ensure that marked work from all markers in included in the sample to be moderated.

F1.5.4; Blind Double Marking

Blind Double Marking is an activity where two markers mark independently with no knowledge of the other’s marks or comments. Discrepancies in the mark allocated are reconciled between the two markers after the initial marking is complete.

Work which has been double marked will still be subject to the moderation process.
F1.5.5; Second Marking

Second Marking is an activity where the second marker marks the work in full with sight of the first marker’s marks/comments. Discrepancies in the mark allocated are reconciled between the two markers after the initial marking is complete.

Work which has been second marked will still be subject to the moderation process.

F1.5.6; Collaborative Marking

Collaborative Marking is an activity where an initial unconfirmed mark for a piece of assessment is reached through discussion between two or more markers.

Work which has been collaboratively marked will still be subject to the moderation process.

F1.5.7; Sight by an external examiner

A sampling of the assessment process of 15% or 10 students (whichever is the greater but normally not more than 30 students) normally covering high, medium and low attainment and failed assessments should be made available to the External Examiner. It is expected that where multiple markers have been used across a cohort of submissions that the sample size normally includes assessments moderated by all markers who contributed. A pro-forma for this moderation should be used and kept as evidence for the process having been undertaken. This applies irrespective of whether second or double marking has taken place.

For each delivery of a module at post-Foundation level, the module leader is required to ensure that it can be demonstrated that the assessment process for that cohort has been subject to appropriate scrutiny by an External Examiner. The purpose of engagement with the External Examiner is to allow him/her appropriate opportunity to confirm satisfaction with the standards and processes applied to the overall assessment of that delivery - the External Examiner has no responsibility to reach or review decisions on individual pieces of work.

Work presented for sight by the EE must have been part of the internal moderation sample. The role of the EE is not to mark or adjudicate on individual pieces of assessment; it is to confirm independently that processes have been followed with consistent application of standards that are typical of the sector as a whole.

F1.6; Information for students

The University will ensure that the assessment requirements for courses of study are made known to students. The assessment scheme of an individual course of study is subject to both institution-wide regulations and regulations specific to that course, and students will be made aware of the detailed requirements of both sets of regulations.

The University will make available to students information about the grounds on which they may request that Assessment Boards be asked to review their decisions and about the arrangements for dealing with any such requests.
F1.7; Responsibilities of students

It is the responsibility of students to attend examinations and submit work for assessment by the agreed submission date and to provide the examiners in advance of their meeting with any relevant information on personal circumstances which may have affected performance and which they wish the examiners to take into account. By attending the examination, a student is confirming that he or she is fit to undertake that examination.

If a student fails to attend examinations or submit work for assessment without good cause, the examiners have authority to deem the student to have failed the assessments concerned. The submission of work is receipted. In cases of dispute over submission, claims by students to have submitted work will only be considered in cases where the student provides a copy of the receipt to demonstrate submission.

Assessed work which is submitted late but within five working days of the agreed submission date will be accepted and the maximum mark available for that piece of assessment will be the standard pass mark for that piece of assessment. This facility does not apply to the submission of assessed work relating to Tutor Reassessment, referral or deferral requirements but does apply to previously agreed extended or renegotiated deadlines.

If a student fails, without good cause, to provide the examiners in advance of their meeting with information about any personal circumstances that may have affected performance in assessments, the Senate or other body authorised by it to consider appeals against an examiner’s decision has authority to reject the appeal on those grounds.

If a student is found to have cheated or acted in a way which may have resulted in an unfair advantage, the Academic Integrity Officer, Deputy Academic Integrity Officer and the Academic Integrity Committee have authority to deem the student to have failed part or all of the assessments and the authority to determine whether or not the student shall be permitted to be reassessed.

F1.8; Extenuating Circumstances

Where a student has failed to secure a pass mark for the module(s) concerned, remedial action is to permit another attempt at the assessment(s) for which an EC claim has been approved. The results of this reassessment will be considered at the next scheduled Course Assessment Board.

Where the student has secured a pass in the module(s) concerned but has not submitted work for one or more element(s) of assessment (as defined in the module specification) for which an EC claim has been approved, remedial action for this/these element(s) of assessment is to permit another attempt at the assessment(s) concerned. The results of this reassessment will be considered at the next scheduled Course Assessment Board. No further discretion will be applied against this/these element(s) of assessment.

Where the student has secured a pass in the module(s) concerned and has submitted work for one or more element(s) of assessment (as defined in the module specification) for which an EC claim has been approved, remedial action for this/these element(s) of assessment will be for the Course Assessment Board to take the approved EC claim into account when deciding a candidate’s classification in accordance with University
guidelines. Submission against an element of assessment includes either partial or full submission. No further attempts at this/these element(s) of assessment will be granted.

If a student suffers from a short-term illness or experiences serious personal difficulties which warrant a request for an extension of course work submission dates, he or she must submit a written request for such an extension as soon as possible and no later than two working days after the agreed submission date (other than in exceptional circumstances agreed by the Course Assessment Board). Extensions cannot be applied to deadlines set for Tutor Reassessment or work that has been formally referred or deferred by an Assessment Board.

Students who wish to claim that either

a) failure to attend an examination, or
b) failure to submit work by the agreed submission or extension date, or

c) poor performance in any element of the coursework assessment

was due to illness or other extenuating circumstances must make such a claim in writing within five working days of the submission or examination date. The written claim must be submitted to the School Office of the School responsible for the course.

The claims that are submitted will first be considered by the Extenuating Circumstances Panel. That panel will consider the claims and submit its decisions to the Course Assessment Board.

F2; REGULATIONS GOVERNING ASSESSMENT IN THE CREDIT ACCUMULATION AND TRANSFER SCHEME (CATS)

F2.1; The award of credit

Candidates are awarded credit at an appropriate Course Assessment Board for each module that they pass, including a condoned pass. Where a student is an associate student and is not linked to a named course, Schools must make arrangements to assign responsibility for the award of credit to such students to an appropriate Course Assessment Board.

Candidates are not normally permitted to retake a module or component of assessment which they have passed with a view to obtaining a higher mark.

F2.2; Graded and non-graded modules

Each module must have the status either of being graded or of being non-graded.

All Honours level modules contributing to a classified award must be graded. A maximum of 40 Intermediate level credits may be ungraded. An exception to this rule will be permitted in the case of existing ungraded placement Intermediate level modules.

Candidates who obtain the minimum pass mark or more on a graded module will be deemed to have passed that module, unless additional criteria have been explicitly approved as part of the validated module specification. Candidates studying health or social work related modules with a professional practice component, and for which
Professional and Statutory Bodies have set a requirement that these be passed the following rule will apply:

a) Where the theory and practice components reach the minimum pass mark or above and the practice element has been passed, the credit will be awarded with the appropriate full mark and grade;

b) Where the theory component reaches the minimum pass mark or above and the practice component has been referred the credit will not be awarded until the practice component has been passed and the full theory mark and grade will be awarded.

c) Where the theory component is referred and the practice component has been passed the credit will not be awarded until the theory component has been passed, and the mark and grade will be capped at the minimum pass mark.

d) Where either the practice and/or theory component is failed after referral the standard University regulations for retaking modules will apply or the mark and grade will be capped at the minimum pass mark.

F2.3 Tutor re-assessment, Condonement, Referral, and Failure

The decision as to whether the result should be declared as deferred, referred, condoned or failed lies with the Course Assessment Board. These decisions apply to graded and ungraded modules. The nature of the assessment to retrieve a referred or deferred module is at the discretion of the Assessment Board and may reflect whether or not the student submitted the original attempt. The maximum mark available for a graded module following referral is the minimum pass mark.

Subject to the provisions of F1.7, if a student fails to attend an examination or to submit assessed work by the agreed submission date (after allowing for any extension that might have been granted) the Course Assessment Board will record a mark of zero, leading to failure in that examination or assessed work, unless it is satisfied that there are good grounds for treating the student differently.

In calculating the mark for a module following a referral or deferral, the higher of the marks achieved for each element of assessment will be the mark used in the calculation of the overall mark.

Assessments other than formal examinations and end assessments as identified in the Assessment and Feedback Strategy should be marked and made available for return to candidates within three term-time weeks of the submission date – in cases of extensions or renegotiated deadlines, the return date should be within three term-time weeks of the revised submission date.

Other than in the case of a Tutor Re-assessment, deferred or referred work can only be considered after the initial result has been formally published as a deferral or referral by a Course Assessment Board. Assessment of deferred or referred modules must be completed by a standard time as specified in the University’s assessment timetable published by the Head of Registry. Where a candidate is deferred or referred in a pre-requisite module the work should normally be assessed before the candidate starts the post-requisite module. Where a piece of work submitted for Tutor Re-assessment attains
a mark less than the minimum pass mark and the candidate’s overall mark for the module is less than the minimum pass mark, the Course Assessment Board will follow the regulations set out in F2.3.

F2.3.1; Tutor Reassessment

Tutor Re-assessment is where a candidate is given the opportunity to resubmit once a piece of work and for it to be re-marked prior to the meeting of the Course Assessment Board at which the module is to be considered. In calculating the mark for a module following a Tutor Re-assessment, the higher of the marks achieved for the assessment will be the mark used in the calculation of the overall module mark. Tutor Reassessment is not available for formal examinations but may be available for in-class tests.

A Tutor Re-assessment may only be applied when:

a) A candidate achieves a mark within the specified referral range in an assessment which is conducted under coursework protocols;
b) It is possible for the candidate to complete the work and for it to be marked and moderated before the Assessment Board meets.

A Tutor Re-assessment will not normally be offered to a candidate who fails to submit a piece of work for the original assessment.

The maximum mark for a successful Tutor Re-assessment will be the minimum pass mark. An EC claim cannot be submitted for an assessment that has been offered as a Tutor Reassessment.

F2.3.2; Condonement of a module

Condonement is not permitted on ungraded modules or pre-foundation modules or awards.

In all cases where a module has been condoned, the credit for the module will be awarded, and the actual mark achieved will be recorded.

Where a module has been condoned, the module will be accepted as a prerequisite for subsequent relevant modules.

Candidates on undergraduate awards who at any point in their studies fail to achieve a pass in a single 20 credit module or a single 30 credit module or in two 10 credit modules but who have passed all other modules in that level of award (i.e. Foundation, Intermediate or Honours level) will be awarded a condoned pass in the module(s) in question provided that:

a) the mark achieved in the module(s) in question is in the range of 30% to 39%
b) the module has not been identified as compulsory for that course
c) the candidate has achieved the learning outcomes, educational aims and all other modules of the level as a whole
d) the student would otherwise have been referred, remained referred (through deferral) or failed the module in question
e) the overall average achieved by the candidate for all modules at that level exceeds 40%  
f) the module is not currently subject to a proven allegation that the student has failed to abide by the academic integrity regulations  
g) the total condoned credits for the candidate do not exceed 60 credits across a 360 credit honours award (pro rata for awards of fewer credits)  

Candidates on postgraduate awards who at any point in their studies fail to achieve a pass in a single module, which does not exceed 30-credits or two 15-credit modules, but who have passed all other modules will be awarded a condoned pass in the module/s in question provided that:

a) the overall mark achieved in the module(s) in question is in the range of 45% to 49%  
b) the module has not been identified as compulsory for that course  
c) the candidate has achieved the learning outcomes and educational aims  
d) the student would otherwise have been referred, remained referred (through deferral) or failed the module in question  
e) the overall average achieved by the candidate for all modules at that level  
g) exceeds 50%  
h) the module is not currently subject to a proven allegation that the student has failed to abide by the academic integrity regulations  
i) the module does not form part of a ‘top-up’ stage  
j) the module does not incorporate the major project or dissertation  
l) there are not any professional body requirements preventing condonement  

Condoned modules should not be used as APL.  

**Note:** Core modules are modules available for condonement  
Compulsory modules cannot be condoned.  

**F2.3.3; Referral in a module**  
Candidates who achieve an overall mark within the specified referral range in a graded module or who fail to secure a pass in an ungraded module will normally be referred by the Course Assessment Board in the first instance, unless the module has satisfied the condonement criteria in section F2.3.2. The maximum mark available for a graded module following referral will be the minimum pass mark.  

**F2.3.4; Approved referral**  
Subject to the provisions of F2.3, candidates on a postgraduate module who achieve an overall mark below the specified referral range will normally be failed by the Course Assessment Board. In the light of a candidate’s good overall performance, a Course Assessment Board may require that a candidate who has achieved a mark below the specified referral range in the first instance should be referred provided that:

a) the module in question has not been identified as ‘not open for Approved Referral’  
b) the module in question carries a value of 30 credits or below  
c) the profile of Approved Referral for an individual student does not exceed a total of 30 credits across the 180 of a full MA/MSc (pro rata for PGDip or PGCert or other), or
30 credits across the 120 M level credits within the M level stage of an integrated masters award
d) the student’s profile to date does not include a breach of the academic integrity regulations at master’s level
e) all other modules taken to date on the course have been passed at a minimum of the specified pass mark plus 10%

This should be recorded as an Approved Referral. The nature of the re-assessment is at the discretion of the Course Assessment Board. The maximum mark available for the module following approved referral is the minimum pass mark.

F2.3.5; Failure in a module

Subject to the provisions of F1.7, candidates who fail to achieve the specified pass mark in a graded module or who fail to secure a pass in an ungraded module will normally be failed by the Course Assessment Board in the second instance, unless the module has satisfied the condonement criteria in section F2.3.2. The maximum mark available for a graded module taken for the second time is the minimum pass mark.

F2.4; Nature of reassessment following an initial failure in a module

Subject to the provisions of F2.3.3, where a candidate fails an undergraduate module, the nature of the assessment to retrieve a failed module is normally the re-submission in the subsequent academic session of the component(s) of assessment in which the candidate has failed to secure a pass. The maximum mark available for a graded module taken for the second time is the minimum pass mark.

Subject to the provisions of F2.2, where a candidate fails a postgraduate module the candidate will have to undertake a new and different full set of assessment activities, normally when the module is next offered in a subsequent academic session. The maximum mark available for a graded module taken for the second time is the minimum pass mark.

Exceptionally and for postgraduate dissertation or postgraduate project modules only, an Assessment Board may require a candidate who has failed a dissertation or project module to rework the original assessment rather than undertake a new and different assessment. The maximum mark available for a module taken for a second time is the minimum pass mark.

F2.5; Progression

F2.5.1; Full-time undergraduate awards

At all times, progression shall be subject to the provision that it is still possible for the candidate to complete the course within the maximum specified period.

Candidates at the point of initial consideration by the Assessment Board shall have the right to be referred in any module where credit has not been awarded.

Candidates at the point of initial consideration by the Assessment Board who have been awarded a total of 120 credits for the current stage of assessment may progress.
Progression decisions for all other candidates at the point of initial consideration by the Assessment Board will be deferred pending the outcome of referral assessments.

Candidates at the point of second consideration or subsequent by the Assessment Board who have been awarded a total of 120 credits for the current stage of assessment may progress.

Candidates at the point of second consideration or subsequent by the Assessment Board who have been awarded a minimum total of 90 credits for the current stage of assessment may progress with any failed modules to be retrieved in the subsequent session.

Candidates at the point of second or subsequent consideration by the Assessment Board who have been awarded a total of 80 credits for the current stage of assessment may progress with a failed module to be retrieved in the subsequent session provided that the failed 40 credits is a single module in which the candidate has achieved a minimum overall mark of 30%.

Candidates at the point of second or subsequent consideration by the Assessment Board who have been awarded a total of 80 credits for the current stage of assessment may progress with incomplete modules to be retrieved in the subsequent session provided that the profile of incomplete modules includes a decision of deferral (from either the first or second instance of consideration by the Assessment Board).

Candidates at the point of second or subsequent consideration by the Assessment Board who have been awarded at least 50 credits for the current stage of assessment but who do not fall into one of the categories outlined in the three points above may not progress but will be permitted to return in the subsequent session to retrieve failed modules.

Candidates at the point of second consideration or subsequent by the Assessment Board who have been awarded 40 or fewer credits for the current stage of assessment shall be deemed to have failed the course and lose any opportunity for further reassessment.

F2.5.2; Part-time undergraduate

Candidates shall be subject to the same progression principles outlined above, taking account of the maximum number of credits permitted for registration by a part-time candidate.

F2.5.3; All awards

Subject to relevant progression regulations, candidates at whatever point in their course of study shall have the right, following a first failure, to repeat and be reassessed once only (including, where appropriate, Tutor Reassessment and referral) in the failed module, provided that it is still possible to complete the course within the maximum specified period.

Candidates may, following a first failure in an optional module (and in accordance with the appropriate course regulations), choose to substitute a different optional module in preference to exercising their entitlement to reassessment. For the purpose of these regulations, such modules will be termed substituted modules. Candidates who elect to
study substituted modules will not be capped at the minimum pass mark upon successful completion of the substituted module but will, in so doing, sacrifice their entitlement to a second attempt in their failed module(s).

Timing of initial reassessments of failed modules
A second attempt at a failed module will normally take place in the subsequent session or in the case of postgraduate awards, when the module is next offered.

Subject to the provisions of F2.2, in graded modules, the grade awarded for the module on reassessment should be no higher than the minimum pass mark regardless of the actual grade achieved. The candidate’s transcript will record the grade awarded on the second attempt of the module.

Failure to achieve an award
a) Candidates who, after exercising their entitlement to a second attempt at a failed module, fail to achieve a pass in undergraduate modules totalling 60 credit points at any level or combination of levels, shall normally lose their right to count their existing credits towards any award on which they are enrolled and for which they have not yet become eligible.

b) Candidates who, after exercising their entitlement to a second attempt at a failed module, fail to achieve a pass in modules totalling 30 credit points at postgraduate level, shall normally lose their right to count their existing credits towards any award on which they are enrolled and for which they have not yet become eligible.

c) A candidate’s registration for an award of the University will be terminated if two academic years (including standard resit periods) elapse without the award of credit. The Assessment Board will confer any interim award to which the student is entitled.

F2.6; Subsequent reassessment of modules following a second failure in a module

Exceptionally and with the approval of the relevant Course Assessment Board, a candidate may be permitted, following failure in a second attempt at a failed module, to undertake a third attempt at the module in question. This does not apply to modules on some professional courses.

Where a candidate has failed a second attempt at a core or compulsory module, the relevant Course Assessment Board may refuse an application for a third attempt even though the candidate has not yet reached the limits of failure laid down in F2.5.3.

F2.7; Changed modules

F2.7.1; Undergraduate awards
Module assessment requirements may change from year to year. An undergraduate candidate who is undertaking a module for a second time should normally expect to be assessed using the same evidence and criteria which were current at the point of assessment on the first attempt. In cases where it is not practicable for candidates to be reassessed using the same assessment requirements as at the first attempt, the
appropriate assessment board may, at its discretion, make such special arrangement as it
deems appropriate.

F2.7.2; Postgraduate awards
A candidate who is undertaking a module for a second time may not demand
reassessment using evidence and criteria which are no longer current in the module. The
appropriate assessment board may, at its discretion, make such special arrangement as it
deems appropriate in cases where it is not practicable for candidates to be reassessed
using the same assessment requirements as at the first attempt.

F2.8; Registration for modules

Full-time undergraduate students will normally register for tuition in no more than 120
credit points each year. Full-time postgraduate students will normally register for tuition in
no more than 180 credits.

Full-time students shall be progressed from one stage to the next provided 90 credit points
have been recorded in the earlier stage.

In exceptional circumstances, at the discretion of the Course Assessment Board, a student
may be registered for tuition in 160 credit points.

Part-time undergraduate students will normally register for tuition in no more than 80 credit
points per academic session except at the explicit and recorded discretion of the Course
Assessment Board. Part-time postgraduate students will normally register for tuition in no
more than 90 credit points per academic session.

The responsibility for ensuring that module choices have been made and correctly
recorded rests with the student.

The Head of Registry will publish an annual timetable by which continuing and new
students must record their modules for the academic session.

Students do not have the right to change their module choices. Exceptionally, a student
may be allowed to change up to the end of the third week of the academic session.
However, to make such exceptional module changes, the student will need to obtain the
express permission of the course leader and to complete all the necessary paperwork.
Students must note that any agreed change(s) can only be accommodated within the
timetable slot(s) as originally allocated.

A student is entitled to be assessed only in those modules on which he or she is formally
enrolled. If a student changes modules without seeking approval and/or without changing
registration, any work in connection with such module(s) will not be formally assessed.

If a student fails to confirm his or her recorded module choices, he or she will only be
assessed in those modules which have been registered.

If a student enrols for a module which is subsequently not taken, the Course Assessment
Board will record a fail in that module.
REGULATIONS FOR AWARDS

F2.9; Registration for awards

Any specific credit accumulated by a candidate shall normally be deemed to be general credit if the candidate has not converted that specific credit into an award of the University within a period of six years following the award of the specific credit.

F2.10; The classification of Bachelor’s degrees awarded with honours

In a course leading to the award of a Bachelor’s degree with honours, classification will be based on a weighted numerical average of marks awarded in graded I and H level credits undertaken in a student’s course of study, with the best marks totalling 100 credits at each level being included in the calculation. Subject to the provisions of F2.4, candidates must have achieved a pass mark in all modules. For candidates returning to complete an honours degree having previously accepted an interim award, classification will include those intermediate and honours level modules which formed part of the interim award.

In calculating the weighted numerical average for the Bachelor’s degree with honours, the calculation shall be conducted on a pro rata basis with H level credits counting to the calculation carrying a weighting of two and graded I level credits counting to the calculation carrying a weighting of one (subject to the provisions of F2.2).

The Integrated Master’s Degree comprises a first and second cycle award. In calculating the numerical average for the classified first cycle award of Bachelor’s degree with honours, all H level credits counting to the calculation will carry a weighting of two and all graded I level credits counting to the calculation will carry a weighting of one (subject to the provisions of F2.2). Confirmation of the first cycle award is recorded by the Course Assessment Board on the completion of H level modules but its conferment is deferred until the conclusion of the student’s registration for the course or the conferment of the second cycle award.

In the case of a designated sandwich course, weighted marks attached to S level credits may also play a part in determining the classification of a degree with honours. Such S level credits will be weighted at one.

In a course leading to the award of a Bachelor’s degree with honours where the student has received accreditation for prior learning, the classification will be based on a numerical average of marks awarded in up to 100 graded I and 100 H level credits undertaken in the student’s course of study as a registered student of the University. Subject to the provisions of F2.4, candidates must have achieved a pass mark in all modules.

F2.11; The classification of foundation degrees

In a course leading to the award of foundation degree, classification will be based on a numerical average of the overall marks awarded at intermediate level, with the best marks totalling 100 credits at intermediate level being included in the calculation. Subject to the provisions of F2.4, candidates must have achieved a pass mark in all modules.

F2.12; The classification of non-honours qualifications

In a course leading to an award other than an honours qualification or a foundation degree, classification will be based on a numerical average of the overall marks awarded.
When calculating the classification average for merit or distinction for an interim award, the average to be used must be drawn from the marks achieved for the required modules at the level of study of the award.

F2.13; The classification discretion band

Course Assessment Boards must be guided by the relevant classification bands in assigning classifications. Within a 0.5% discretion band below a higher classification banding and subject to the published criteria, a Course Assessment Board may exercise academic judgement (including that relating to poor performance due to recognised extenuating circumstances) in determining classifications, and may also take account of a profile of the marks that have contributed to the overall numerical average. In cases where a student profile includes a module with an unretrieved approved extenuating circumstance, a 1.5% discretion band will apply provided that at least one other criterion is satisfied.

F2.14; Failure to meet the requirements for an Integrated Master’s Degree

Where a candidate fails to meet the requirements for an Integrated Master’s Degree, the candidate will be considered for the award of a bachelor’s degree with honours. This award will be subject to the provisions of F2.10 and will exclude marks awarded in modules taken in the final year of the Integrated Master’s Degree course.
SECTION G; EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES AND COURSE ASSESSMENT BOARDS

G1; EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES

An Extenuating Circumstances (EC) Panel is responsible to the UTLC for overseeing all matters relating to the approval of EC claims and onward reporting to the relevant Assessment Board. Authority to make decisions on EC claims in accordance with processes and criteria prescribed and monitored by the EC Panel is delegated to Registry. The EC Panel’s specific responsibilities are:

a) To establish and oversee procedures for the submission and receipt of EC claims by students in accordance with the University’s regulations.
b) To develop and ensure the dissemination of a strategy for ensuring that staff and students are aware of their rights and responsibilities in relation to processes for the submission of EC claims.
c) To oversee procedures for the consideration and conclusion regarding the acceptability of submitted EC claims in accordance with the University regulations.
d) To oversee the establishment of criteria regarding the required supporting evidence*.
e) To monitor recommendations to the CAB regarding appropriate submission dates which may be in excess of the standard resit period in cases where the grounds presented for the EC claim are ongoing.
f) To oversee processes for keeping full and accurate records of the decisions taken in respect of EC claims.
g) To ensure the maintenance of the confidentiality of all submitted claims and evidence.
h) To ensure effective and timely notification to the student and, where relevant, the Assessment Board of the outcome of the consideration of an EC claim.

* On very rare occasions and in exceptional circumstances only (such as situations involving extreme abuse or severe domestic violence) independent documentary evidence may not be available, although the normal expectation would be for a medical or counselling note to be forthcoming. In such cases, direct communication between the chair of the EC Panel (or nominee) and the student concerned may result in a written statement to the EC Panel by the chair (or nominee) confirming the existence of confidential circumstances that justify the approval of an EC claim.

G1.1; Valid reasons for poor performance

If it is established to the satisfaction of an assessment board that a student’s performance has been adversely affected by authenticated extenuating circumstances, the Board shall act under the below (subject to the provisions of F1.8).

A student in this situation has the right to be reassessed as if for the first time in any or all of the elements of assessment, as specified by the Assessment Board. If an assessment was itself a second attempt the student shall be permitted to resit as if for the second time.

Where a Course Assessment Board is satisfied that there is sufficient evidence of the student’s achievement, or this evidence is subsequently obtained, the student may be recommended for the award for which he or she is a candidate, with or without honours,
classification or Distinction as appropriate. In order to reach a decision a Board may assess the candidate by whatever means it considers appropriate.

An Aegrotat award may be recommended, where it is available, when the Course Assessment Board does not have enough evidence of the student’s performance to recommend the award for which the student was a candidate or a lower award specified in the course regulations, but is satisfied that but for illness or other valid cause the student would have reached the standard required.

Before an award resulting from a recommendation under the above is conferred, the student must have signified that he or she is willing to accept the award and understands that this implies waiving the right to be reassessed.

G2; COURSE ASSESSMENT BOARDS

The Course Assessment Board will not change moderated marks brought before it but is responsible for:

a) reaching decisions about the performance of candidates (passed, referred, deferred, condoned or failed) in modules based on the moderated marks brought forward to the Board;
b) confirming moderated marks;
c) making decisions (where appropriate) on extenuating circumstances relating to student performance both in particular modules and across an entire course;
d) (where appropriate) exercising quality control within modules and across courses to review the comparability and fairness of marks;
e) making decisions about student progression between stages;
f) deciding on classifications and making recommendations for the conferment of awards;
g) exercising various discretionary powers.

No other body has authority to recommend conferment of an award, nor to amend the decision of an approved and properly constituted Course Assessment Board acting within its terms of reference and in accordance with the regulations for the courses of study. A Course Assessment Board may, however, be required to review a decision or may have that decision annulled under the terms of G2.6.

The Chair has the authority to act on behalf of the Assessment Board except in the cases of the conferment of an award. The action must be recorded and reported to the next meeting of the Assessment Board.

Queries from students relating to unconfirmed marks should be addressed in accordance with the regulations pertaining to a student’s request for a re-mark situated in the Students’ Handbook of Regulations.

Course Assessment Boards may be responsible for either a single course or for two or more closely related courses which have a similar structure and a high proportion of common modules.
The membership of each Course Assessment Board will normally comprise the Chair nominated by the Dean of School and who will be independent of the course being considered, the course leader(s), module leader(s) as necessary and the Course External Examiner(s). Any members who have a private relationship with any candidate to be considered must declare their interest at the start of the Assessment Board and may be required to leave the Board at the point of consideration of that candidate or that candidate’s cohort.

The Chair, course leader and External Examiner should be in attendance for the Course Assessment Board to be quorate. If the External Examiner cannot attend a module leader should attend in place of the External Examiner. Where a University award is to be conferred an External Examiner must be in attendance. Where for very good reason this is not possible the External Examiner must confirm any awards to be made in writing. The Board may not proceed in cases where it is not quorate.

Course Assessment Boards may exercise their right to take remedial action if the Extenuating Circumstances Panel is satisfied that a student’s absence from an examination, or failure to submit work for assessment by the agreed submission date, or failure to pass one or more elements of the course work assessment can be attributed either to illness or to other circumstances of a personal nature. By attending an examination it will be assumed that the student has declared that he or she is fit to sit that examination and a claim for extenuating circumstances will not normally be accepted.

When considering an approved claim for extenuating circumstances, the Course Assessment Board will not attempt to judge how a student might have performed in different circumstances with a view to awarding extra marks.

G2.1; Appointment of Course Assessment Boards

For every course of studies approved as leading to an award there must be an Assessment Board whose constitution and terms of reference accord with the approved regulations for the course and which includes the External Examiner(s) approved by the Senate. The constitution of the Board may include provision for the appointment of subsidiary examination committees and the same Board may be responsible for more than one course of study.

The assessment boards are appointed in accordance with procedures determined by the Senate and are accountable to that body for the fulfilment of their terms of reference.

G2.2; Secretary of assessment boards

The Senate shall ensure that arrangements are made to appoint a secretary to each assessment board and shall require the secretary to maintain detailed and accurate records of the board’s proceedings.

G2.3 Student membership of Course Assessment Boards

No student may be a member of an Assessment Board or attend an examiners’ meeting other than as a candidate for assessment.
G2.4; Module Leaders responsibilities for Course Assessment Boards

The responsibility for managing the assessment of modules which are completed shall lie with the designated Module Leader.

The Module Leader will be responsible for:

a) the collation of marks,
b) oversight of all second marking and other moderation procedures required to ensure the full and proper assessment of student performance,
c) authorisation and arrangements for Tutor Reassessments in appropriate units of reassessment;
d) ensuring that the External Examiner has access to all necessary information and scripts to enable him or her to carry out full and proper moderation of students’ work on the module,
e) ensuring that the External Examiner has detailed knowledge of the moderation processes undertaken by the module teaching team,
f) confirming a final and complete set of marks with the agreement of the External Examiner.

Each School shall be responsible for ensuring that mechanisms are in place for ensuring that Module Leaders perform the tasks laid out above in G2.4.

G2.5 External Examiners responsibilities for Course Assessment Boards

External Examiners will be appointed in the first instance to modules on the basis of the relevance of their academic expertise. External Examiners will also be assigned to one or more Course Assessment Boards. As members of Course Assessment Boards, External Examiners will exercise both an oversight of students’ overall performance and carry out a responsibility for monitoring the comparability and fairness of the assessment processes for all the modules which comprise the Course.

The External Examiner will not comment on the marks awarded to individual students when seen as part of a sample selection but will:

a) undertake moderation of student performance within modules,
b) assure and comment on the comparability of marks between the modules ascribed to him or her,
c) monitor the effectiveness of the processes used to moderate scripts, and, where necessary, make recommendations to improve or develop these processes.

External Examiners need not be associated with the assessment of performance at foundation level or pre-foundation level with the following exceptions:

a) where foundation level or pre-foundation level modules lead to a University award – an External Examiner must be appointed to the course
b) in the case of foundation level modules, when examining modules on foundation degrees.

External Examiners must attend the Course Assessment Boards ascribed as their responsibility at which awards are due to be conferred.
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No recommendation for the conferment of an award may be made without the written consent of the approved External Examiner(s).

On any matter which the External Examiner(s) have declared a matter of principle, the decision of those examiner(s) shall either be accepted as final by the Course Assessment Board or shall be referred to the Chair of University Teaching and Learning Committee. Any unresolved disagreement between External Examiners shall be referred to the Senate.

G2.6; Appeal against a decision of a Course Assessment Board

The Senate, or a body authorised by it to act as an Appeals Committee, may in the following circumstances require an assessment board to reconsider its decision:

a) if a candidate requests such a reconsideration and establishes to the satisfaction of the Senate or Appeals Committee that his or her performance in the assessment was adversely affected by illness or other factors which he or she was unable, or for valid reasons unwilling, to divulge before the assessment board reached its decision. The candidate’s request must be supported by medical certificates or other documentary evidence acceptable to the Senate or Appeals Committee;

b) if the Senate or Appeals Committee is satisfied on evidence produced by a candidate or any other person that there has been a material administrative error, or that the assessments were not conducted in accordance with the current regulations for the course, or that some other material irregularity relevant to the assessments has occurred.

Disagreement with the academic judgement of an assessment board in assessing the merits of an individual piece of work or in reaching any assessment decision based on the marks, grades and other information relating to a candidate’s performance cannot in itself constitute grounds for a request for reconsideration by a candidate.

If after reconsideration, in the circumstances detailed in G2.6, the assessment board does not modify its decision, the Senate may annul that decision if in its opinion due and proper account has not been taken of those circumstances.

In cases of procedural or other irregularity, or where it is not possible to reconvene an assessment board, the Senate shall have power to annul a decision of the assessment board without making a prior request for reconsideration. If an error or irregularity is found to have affected more than one candidate, the Senate may annul the whole assessment or any part of it.

When a decision has been annulled it is the responsibility of the Senate to take action, including if necessary the appointment of new External Examiners, to ensure that recommendations are made to it in respect of the candidate(s) concerned by an approved assessment board.

The Senate shall ensure that adequate permanent arrangements are established for dealing with any requests by candidates or with other evidence which may lead to the reconsideration or annulment of a decision.
G2.8; Students identified as having a disability

If a student is unable, through disability, to be assessed by the normal methods, examiners may vary the methods as appropriate, bearing in mind the learning outcomes of the course and the need to assess the student on equal terms with other students.

G2.9 Regulations relating to a breach of Academic Integrity

The Senate will establish procedures under which allegations that students have committed an offence relating to academic integrity will be investigated fairly and impartially with a view to establishing the facts.

Where a case of a breach of the University’s academic integrity regulations is suspected the assessment board will not reach a decision on the student’s performance until the facts have been established.

Where it is established that a student has committed an offence relating to a breach of the University’s academic integrity regulations or otherwise sought to gain an unfair advantage the Academic Integrity Officer or Academic Integrity Committee shall assign the appropriate penalty in accordance with the University of Huddersfield Penalties Tariff in the Students’ Handbook of Regulations.
SECTION H; REGULATIONS ON EXTERNAL EXAMINERS

External Examiners are appointed to ensure that all students are treated fairly and equitably, that appropriate standards of assessment are maintained, and that assessments are conducted in accordance with approved regulations.

H1; The rights and responsibilities of External Examiners in relation to modules

The role of the External Examiner(s) is to advise the subject group with regard to standards and fairness of assessment and, when appropriate, to consider the results of individual students in the context of the University’s current regulations.

In order to carry out these responsibilities, the External Examiner(s) will:

a) attend the University External Examiner’s Induction briefing prior to or following appointment. Where this is not possible, a signed acknowledgement for receipt of the induction pack must be supplied;
b) offer advice impartially without being influenced by previous association with the staff or any of the students;
c) compare and comment on the standard of assessments with that of similar modules in higher education elsewhere;
d) comment on the set of assessment activities for any particular module, in the light of the need to ensure that all students are assessed fairly in relation to the module specifications;
e) have the right to inspect all forms of assessed work in line with paragraph C8;
f) see the work of all students proposed for failure, and samples of the work of students proposed to each other grade, in order to ensure that each student is placed fairly in relation to the rest of the cohort. In cases where 5 or fewer students are proposed for the highest grade, the work for all of the students in that grade must be included in the sample sent;
g) have the right to make recommendations with regard to the moderation of marks/grades awarded by internal examiners;
h) comment on the way assessments are conducted, and share in developmental discussions with module teams where appropriate;
i) complete the external examiner’s template report in full, following the course assessment board or more frequently if appropriate, which reflects upon their duties;
j) maintain confidentiality of all course materials and student results;
k) report to the Chair of the University Teaching and Learning Committee on any matters of serious concern arising from the assessments, which put at risk academic standards.

To carry out these responsibilities the External Examiner(s) will be:

a) expert in the field of study concerned;
b) competent in assessing students’ knowledge and skills at higher education level;
c) impartial in judgement;
d) fully briefed on their role, in line with the University’s procedures having attended the University’s External Examiner Induction Programme.
H2; THE RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF EXTERNAL EXAMINERS IN RELATION TO COURSES

The role of the External Examiner(s) is to advise the Course Assessment Board with regard to standards and fairness of assessment and, when appropriate, to consider the results of individual students in the context of the University’s current regulations.

In order to carry out these responsibilities, the External Examiner(s) will:

a) attend the University External Examiner’s Induction briefing prior to or following appointment;
b) offer advice impartially without being influenced by previous association with the course, the staff, or any of the students;
c) compare in overall terms the performance of students with that of their peers on similar courses of higher education elsewhere;
d) be consulted and will respond about any proposed changes to the approved Course assessment regulations which will directly affect students currently on the Course(s);
e) offer advice on progression and awards based on the agreed module grades and in the light of discussion at the Course Assessment Board;
f) attend the meetings of the Course Assessment Board at which decisions on recommendations for award are made and ensure that those recommendations have been reached in line with the University’s regulations and normal practice in higher education;
g) participate as required in any reviews of decisions about individual students’ results during the examiner’s period of office;
h) complete the external examiner’s template report in full, following the course assessment board or more frequently if appropriate, which reflects upon their duties;
i) maintain confidentiality of all course materials and student results;
j) report to the chair of the University Teaching and Learning Committee on any matters of serious concern arising from the assessments, which put at risk the standard of the award.
k) make reference to benchmark standards (subject benchmark statements or professional benchmark statements) in their evaluation of student work.

To carry out these responsibilities the External Examiner(s) will be:

a) expert in one of the fields of study associated with the course;
b) competent in assessing students’ knowledge and skills at higher education level;
c) impartial in judgement;
d) briefed on their role, in line with the University’s procedures; having attended the University’s External Examiner Induction Programme.
e) an External Examiner for a group of modules involved in the Course.

All recommendations for the conferment of awards must be signed by the Chair of the Course Assessment Board and all External Examiner(s) present at the meeting.

H2.1 Courses which lie outside the CATS framework

The Senate may exceptionally give approval for the design of courses of study leading to awards of the University which lie outside the CATS framework. In such cases an External
Examiner(s) will be appointed and the functions of the Course Assessment Board will be discharged by a Board of Examiners for the course.

H3; THE APPOINTMENT OF EXTERNAL EXAMINERS

All External Examiner appointments must be approved by the Teaching and Learning Committee acting on behalf of the Senate. An assessment board which does not include approved External Examiners is not authorised, subject to G2.4 and G2.5, to assess students for an award or to recommend the conferment of an award upon a student.

The School Board must normally submit External Examiner nominations for approval by the Teaching and Learning Committee at least six months before the date of the first assessments with which the proposed appointee is to be associated.

New External Examiners should take up their appointments on or before the retirement of their predecessors. They should remain available after the last assessments with which they are to be associated in order to deal with any subsequent reviews of decisions.

Normally, appointments will run from the September before the first assessments to the September after the last assessments. The usual term of office will be one which allows the External Examiner to assess four successive cohorts of students; this will normally mean four calendar years but may be longer where, for example, in the case of a new course, the first output will not occur in the first year of appointment.

External Examiners should not normally hold more than the equivalent of two substantial undergraduate appointments at the same time.

In approving the appointment of External Examiners the Senate will be seeking to ensure that they will be competent and impartial.

New External Examiners must be briefed on their task as soon as possible after appointment and must attend the University’s External Examiner Induction Programme. The briefing will cover as appropriate: the dates of meetings, their role in relation to the examining team as a whole, the learning outcomes of the course, the module specifications including the methods of assessment and marking scheme, the regulations for the course, and the University’s assessment regulations and requirements and conditions of award as set out in this handbook.

Any decision to request termination of an appointment prematurely must be referred by the Dean of the School to the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) in writing giving reasons for the request. The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) will advise the School and Registry of his/her decision. Registry will inform the External Examiner.

H3.1; Criteria for appointment of External Examiners

The following criteria and notes for guidance, reflecting the QAA’s UK National Criteria for appointment of External Examiners, were approved by the University Teaching and Learning Committee on 3 July 2012.
a) An External Examiner’s academic/professional qualifications should, in level and subject, be appropriate to the module/course to be examined.
b) External examiners should be fluent in English.
c) An External Examiner should, where appropriate, be able and willing to receive samples of work electronically rather than as paper-based material.
d) An External Examiner should have appropriate and current standing, expertise and experience to maintain comparability of standards across the Higher Education sector. Standing, expertise and breadth of experience may be indicated by:

   i) the present post and place of work;
   ii) exceptionally, an External Examiner may have retired from full or part-time employment, but must demonstrate continuing relevant involvement in Higher Education or the professions;
   iii) the range and scope of experience across Higher Education/the professions;
   iv) current recent active involvement in research/scholarly/professional activities in the field of study concerned;
   v) awareness of current developments in the design and delivery of relevant curricula;
   vi) competence and experience relating to designing and operating a variety of assessment tasks appropriate to the subject and operating assessment procedures;
   vii) competence and experience relating to the enhancement of the student learning experience;
   viii) knowledge and understanding of the UK sector agreed reference points for the maintenance of academic standards and the assurance and enhancement of quality.

In circumstances where a proposed external examiner is drawn from outside of an Higher Education environment (e.g. from business, industry, the professions), and does not possess formal qualifications and/or experience of assessment or quality assurance practices, the University Teaching and Learning Committee may consider these proposals as exceptions to the criteria.

An External Examiner should have enough recent external examining or comparable related experience, at an appropriate level, to indicate competence in assessing students in the Subject Area.

If the proposed External Examiner has no previous external examining experience at the appropriate level, the application should be supported by either:

   a) other external examining experience;
   b) extensive internal examining experience;
   c) other relevant and recent (i.e. normally within the previous three years) experience likely to support the external examiner role.

Proposed External Examiners without experience as Externals must join an experienced team of External Examiners, and must not be the sole External Examiner.

External Examiners should not be over-extended by their external examining duties. The External Examiner should normally hold no more than two External Examiner appointments for taught courses/modules at any point in time.
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There should be an appropriate balance and expertise in the team of External Examiners and the proposed External Examiner should complement the external examining team in terms of expertise and examining experience.

The range of academic perspectives necessary to the course should be represented in the external examining team.

If the course is associated with or may lead to a professional award, at least one practitioner with appropriate experience should be in the team (where a PSRB has express requirements in relation to the appointment of external examiners, the course team must ensure that these are met).

The external examining experience in the team as a whole must be sufficient and wide-ranging.

H3.2; Conflicts of Interest

External Examiners should be drawn from a wide variety of institutional/professional contexts and traditions in order that the module/course benefits from wide-ranging external scrutiny. The following arrangements are not permissible:

a) more than one External Examiner from the same institution in the team of External Examiners;

b) reciprocal external examining of modules/courses between the University of Huddersfield and any external institution;

c) replacement of an External Examiner by an individual from the same institution;

d) an External Examiner from an institution which has been the source of examiners for similar subject areas in the preceding five years;

e) where there is a single External Examiner for a course, that Examiner must be from an academic, rather than practice-based context;

f) no School should, at any given time, have more than six External Examiners employed by the same Institution.

External Examiners must be impartial in judgement and must not have previous close involvement with the institution which might compromise objectivity. Over the previous five years, the proposed External Examiner should not have been:

a) a member of staff, governor or student of the University of Huddersfield or one of its collaborative partners, or be a near relative of a member of staff of the University in relation to the course;

b) an examiner in a cognate course in the institution;

c) involved as an External Examiner for the course when it was approved by another validating body.

The following are recognised conflicts of interest which will normally disqualify an External Examiner as the proposed External Examiner should not be:

a) personally associated with the sponsorship of students;

b) required to assess colleagues who are recruited as students to the course;
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c) in a position, or knows they will be in a position, to influence significantly the future employment of students on the course;
d) significantly involved in recent or current substantive collaborative research activities with a member of staff closely involved in the delivery, management or assessment of the of the course(s) or modules in question;
e) anyone with a close professional, contractual or personal relationship with a member of staff or student involved with the course;
f) likely to be involved with student placements or training in the examiner’s organisation.

H3.3; External Examiner Terms of Office

External Examiners will be appointed for an initial term of office of up to four years. Under certain exceptional circumstances, the University Teaching and Learning Committee may sanction a once-only extension of an External Examiner’s term of office by one year, up to a maximum term of office of five years. Multiple extensions of an External Examiner’s term of office are not permissible.

The exceptional circumstances in which the University Teaching and Learning Committee may sanction a once-only extension of an External Examiner’s term of office by one year will include the following:

a) in the event of an unplanned vacancy arising from the loss of an External Examiner who had not reached the end of his or her term of office;
b) if the subject is highly specialised, with a known shortage of expertise;
c) if there is a specific and pressing operational or academic need. This circumstance should be described in detail on the application form;
d) if the course had only run sporadically during the retiring External Examiner’s term of office.

H4; TERMINATION OF AN EXTERNAL EXAMINER’S CONTRACT

An External Examiner’s contract may only be terminated prematurely in exceptional circumstances, through the following procedure:

Any decision to terminate an appointment prematurely must be referred by the Dean of School to the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) in writing giving reasons for the request.

The grounds for premature termination will be limited to the following areas:

a) failure to submit an annual report;
b) failure to participate in Course Assessment Boards;
c) serious transgression of the University’s regulations and policies;
d) if a conflict of interest arises which cannot be satisfactorily resolved.

H5; REPORTS OF EXTERNAL EXAMINERS

External Examiners are required to report promptly to the Senate at the end of each academic year on the conduct of the assessments and on issues related to assessment, including:
a) the overall performance of the students in relation to their peers on similar courses/modules;
b) the quality of knowledge and skills (both general and subject specific) demonstrated by the students;
c) the overall standard of assessments;
d) the overall approach to teaching, learning and assessment as indicated by student performance;
e) any other recommendations arising from the assessment.

Reports will be made in accordance with a standard proforma which is available from the External Examiner section of Registry’s website. They should be returned to Registry, preferably in electronic format, within four weeks of the main Course Assessment Board. Registry will forward copies of the report to the Dean and appropriate Administrative Assistant for transmission onwards to other relevant staff.

The purpose of the report is to enable the Senate to judge whether the course is meeting its stated learning outcomes and to make any necessary improvements, whether immediately or at the next review as appropriate.

External Examiners have authority to report direct to the chair of the Senate if they are concerned about standards of assessment and performance, particularly where they consider that assessments are being conducted in a way that jeopardises either the fair treatment of students or the standard of awards.

**H5.1; Feedback and Response to External Examiner Reports**

Prompt feedback must be given to External Examiners about action proposed and taken in response to their reports, in accordance with the process described below. Form EE3 (Action Plan) is attached to these guidelines.

The External Examiner’s report must be considered so that an initial response can be given, within one month of receipt of the Examiner’s report. The issues raised by the External Examiner must be identified and an action plan proposed to deal with them. It is acknowledged that, in view of the requirement to complete this element of the form within one month of receipt of the External Examiner’s report and of the normal timings of the submission of those reports and of Course Committee meetings, it may be completed by the Course Leader and subsequently reported to the Course Committee.

Examples of good practice identified by the External Examiner should be recorded on the form, with specific proposals for their dissemination within the University.

The completed form should be sent to the External Examiner for comment and approval and should then be attached to the External Examiner’s report, which itself must be attached to the relevant annual evaluation report. The annual evaluation report should refer to the issues and actions identified in the form.

The External Examiner’s report and the partly completed Form EE3 (Action Plan) should be considered at the first available Course Committee meeting subsequent to receipt of the External Examiner’s report.
Form EE3 (Action Plan) should be completed in full and approved by the Course Committee within six months of receipt of the External Examiner’s report or following consideration at annual evaluation, and sent for comment and approval by the External Examiner. The statement of action outcomes should inform the completion of the subsequent year’s annual evaluation report.

When completed and fully signed off, Form EE3 (Action Plan) should be retained by the Course Leader so that the contents may be included in the following year’s annual evaluation report. There is no requirement to send copies of the forms to Registry.

Subject Reviews will pay particular attention to the outcome of these processes in making judgements about the manner in which the Subject Area is monitoring academic standards.

Annual evaluation reports will make reference to standards of students’ work and will determine whether sufficient attention has been paid to benchmark standards. Subject reviews will examine External Examiners’ reports and minutes of Course Assessment Boards to form judgements about standards being achieved in the Subject Area in question, including particular areas of strength and weakness.
SECTION I: REGULATIONS GOVERNING RESEARCH DEGREES
To be read in conjunction with sections J-N, which are the individual programme regulations.
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I1 AVAILABLE AWARDS

I1.1 The Awards
The University awards the following degrees to candidates who have successfully completed approved programmes of supervised research:

- Master of Arts by Research (MA (Res))
- Master of Science by Research (MSc (Res))
- Master in Research (MRes)
- Master of Enterprise (MEnt)
- Master of Philosophy (MPhil)
- Professional Doctorates (DAppCrim, DAppLing, DBA, DCouns, DM, DN, DOT, DPA, DPhys, DPod, DSW, EdD)
- Doctor of Enterprise (EntD)
- Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)
- PhD by Publication

I1.2 Named Awards
All research awards may be offered as named awards with the approval of the University Research Committee and the Senate. Named awards will be assessed and conferred in line with standard regulations, which are outlined in sections J-N of the Regulations for Awards.

I1.3 Programme Scope
Programmes of research may be proposed in any field of study. All proposals must have the potential to lead to a programme of scholarly research which meets the learning outcomes for the programme the candidate is following.

All proposed research programmes will be considered on their academic merits and without reference to the concerns or interests of any associated supervising or funding body.

I1.4 Taught Modules within Research Degrees
Research degrees will not normally include a taught element which extends over more than one third of the standard period of enrolment.

Confirmation of the satisfactory completion of any compulsory taught element is a requirement for progression to the research phase of that programme.

I1.5 Non-Standard Programmes
Non-standard programmes may include (but are not limited to):

- Awards where the thesis presented for examination is in a non-standard format
- PhD by Publication
- PhD by Practice or Performance

Any programme which does not conform to the standard rules for award may only be offered in schools where published guidelines exist, that have been through validation and subsequently been approved by the University Research Committee and the Senate.

Published guidelines must detail the regulations for acceptance, presentation, submission and examination of work.
Work will be examined according to the same criteria as a conventional thesis, including the volume and quality of original research: the thesis should make an original contribution to knowledge; it must locate the research in context; establish the contribution; and should include extensive critical discussion with conclusions, indicating directions for future work.

I1.6 Collaborating Establishments
The University encourages co-operation with industrial, commercial, professional or research establishments for the purposes of research leading to research degree awards.

Formal collaboration normally involves the candidate’s use of facilities and other resources, including supervision, which are provided jointly by the University of Huddersfield and an external body. For the purpose of the research degree regulations, these are referred to as Collaborating Establishments.

Co-operation may be formalised with one or more external bodies.

Delivery of programmes involving a Collaborating Establishment, whether ad hoc or through an ongoing partnership, must go through the appropriate approval process and will be assessed and conferred in line with standard regulations.

Where a research degree project is part of a funded research project, the Senate, or the University Research Committee acting on its behalf, will establish to its satisfaction that the terms on which the research is funded do not detract from the fulfilment of the objectives and requirements of the candidate’s research degree.

I1.7 Posthumous Awards
All of the University’s research degrees may be awarded posthumously. In such cases, the University Research Committee will consider evidence showing that the candidate was likely to have been successful, had the viva examination taken place.

Evidence comprising any written material that is available (for example, draft chapters; published work; work prepared for publication; presentations to conferences / seminars; progress reports by the candidate) will normally be supplied by the candidate’s supervisor.

The supervisor will submit an accompanying report for consideration by the Research Committee. The supervisor’s report should have the support of the School Director of Graduate Education and the Dean of the Graduate School. The following criteria should be satisfied:

- Enough of the research project must have been completed to allow a proper assessment to be made of the scope of the thesis
- The research work completed must be of a standard normally required for the award of the degree and must demonstrate the candidate’s grasp of the subject
- The written material available must demonstrate the candidate’s ability to write a thesis of the required standard.
I2 ADMISSIONS AND ENROLMENT

I2.1 Admission to a Research Degree Programme

In order to be eligible for admission to a research degree programme, an applicant must be:

- suitably qualified in terms of their ability and experience to undertake research in the proposed field
- embarking on a viable research programme
- able to demonstrate at least a minimum level of attainment in English language equivalent to IELTS 6.0 (Candidates may also be required to complete formal English language assessment and training in advance of, or as an outcome of, progression monitoring).

Applications from candidates holding qualifications other than those specified in the rules for award will be considered on their merits and in relation to the nature and scope of the programme of work proposed.

Such candidates must include in the application the names of two suitable persons who can be consulted concerning the candidate's academic attainment and fitness for research.

In accepting a candidate, the University will ensure that supervision is adequate and likely to be sustained, and that the research environment is suitable.

The Senate or University Research Committee acting on its behalf, may permit a candidate to enrol for another course of study concurrent with the research degree, provided that, in its opinion, the dual enrolment will not detract from the research.

I2.2 Recognition of Prior Research

Where a candidate has previously undertaken research as a candidate for a research degree, the Dean of the Graduate School and Director of Graduate Education may approve a shorter than usual enrolment period which takes account of all or part of the time already spent by the candidate on such research.

In some cases, transfer from another institution may be possible. This must have the agreement of both institutions involved.

In considering an application for the recognition of prior research for a candidate from another institution, the Dean of the Graduate School and Director of Graduate Education will normally require:

- a letter of agreement and confirmation of release from the previous institution
- a statement of rationale from the applicant for the proposed transfer from another institution
- the title of the research project and the names and contact details of supervisors at the previous institution
- a copy of the original approved research project
- the date of original enrolment and anticipated date of completion
- a progress report from the previous institution, which should confirm that the applicant has been progressing in accordance with the standard timescales for completion
REGULATIONS FOR AWARDS

- in the case of international applicants, confirmation from the International Office that the applicant meets Home Office visa requirements

12.3 Annual Re-registration
Following enrolment with the University, candidates must re-register annually for the duration of their period of study.

A candidate who is eligible to enrol or re-register that fails to do so will be contacted by an authorised officer of the University. If the candidate does not respond positively to this approach within one month of the expected enrolment / registration, s/he will be administratively withdrawn from the programme.

Candidates who have been withdrawn will be notified in writing.

12.4 Appeal against Withdrawal for Failure to Re-register
Candidates may, in the circumstances set out in the Students’ Handbook of Regulations, request a review of the decision to withdraw them.

12.5 Change of Degree Programme
Candidates seeking a change of research degree programme must apply to the Director of Graduate Education in their School for approval.

International candidates must also have the approval of the International Office.

Changes are only available where a route is specified in the regulations for the programme the candidate is changing from.
I3 MODE AND PLACE OF STUDY
I3.1 Mode of Study
Candidates may enrol on a full-time or part-time basis.

Full-time candidates are expected to devote on average 35 hours per week to their research; part-time candidates should spend on average 17.5 hours per week.

Where candidates change from full-time to part-time study, or vice versa, their enrolment period is calculated on a pro rata basis.

I3.2 Place of Study
Candidates are expected to be based at the University of Huddersfield for the completion of their research degree, except as provided for under the arrangements agreed with Collaborating Establishments.

In exceptional circumstances, the University may accept applications from students who are proposing to work outside the UK, provided they meet the following conditions:

- the candidate is UK-based or establishes close links with the University;
- there is satisfactory evidence that the candidate will have access to the facilities needed to carry out the research in the country where they will be based

Candidates not based at the University are required to spend at least ten working days a year at the University of Huddersfield. These ten days are in addition to times when candidates may be on campus for enrolment or progression monitoring assessments.

The University must be satisfied that the candidate and his / her supervisor at the University of Huddersfield will be able to maintain frequent contact.
# I4 SUPERVISION

## I4.1 The Supervisory Team

A candidate shall have one main supervisor who must be a full-time or part-time member of University of Huddersfield staff and must have successfully completed a qualification at least equivalent to the level of the award being supervised.

Under no circumstances should non-permanent members of staff be appointed as main supervisor if their contract of employment is due to expire within the candidate’s standard enrolment period.

The supervisor will normally be part of a supervisory team comprising up to three members.

At least one member of the supervisory team must have successfully supervised a completed award at the appropriate level.

At least one member of the supervisory team must be currently engaged in research in the relevant discipline(s) so as to ensure that the direction and monitoring of the candidate’s progress is informed by up-to-date subject knowledge and research developments.

In addition to the supervisors, an associate (who is not a member of University of Huddersfield staff or employed at a Collaborating Establishment) may be proposed to contribute some specialised knowledge or to provide a link with an external organisation.

Proposals for a change in supervision arrangements should be made to the Director of Graduate Education. For international students, any change must be notified to the International Office.

## I4.2 Requirements of the Supervisors

The supervisors shall have responsibility to supervise the candidate on a regular and frequent basis.

- The minimum requirement is that main supervisors will meet the candidates they are supervising at least once a month (once every two months for part-time students). In practice they may meet with candidates more frequently. This time should include at least an hour of one-to-one supervision with each candidate.

- Supervisors will remain in regular contact with candidates throughout any submission-pending period; candidates may have a reasonable expectation that their supervisors will be available to review drafts of their work at least once every two months (note: it is the candidate’s responsibility to send the work to her/his supervisor in good time, so that s/he has time to read the work and make comments ahead of any submission date).

- The supervisory team as a whole must meet with the candidate at least four times a year.
• Supervision meetings must be recorded using the University online supervision system.

• Supervisors are expected to be available to attend viva examinations at progression monitoring and end assessment points for all candidates they are supervising.

• Supervisor training is compulsory and staff are required to attend a training session or supervisor forum at least once every three years.

• Anyone who has not supervised at the University of Huddersfield previously, and all staff new to supervision, must complete training during their first year of employment and/or supervision.

• Staff who do not attend training will not be eligible to take on additional supervision.
EXAMINATIONS AND ASSESSMENTS

I5.1 Candidate Responsibilities
It is the responsibility of the candidate to attend examinations and submit work for assessment by the submission date.

The submission of work for assessment is at the sole discretion of the candidate.

Candidates must ensure that the format of work submitted for assessment is in accordance with the relevant University guidelines.

It is the candidate’s responsibility to make sure that all work that will contribute to the final assessment is backed up. Candidates are strongly advised to use the electronic storage system provided by the University to keep copies of all of their work.

I5.2 Thesis Length
These word counts prescribe the maximum allowable length for theses, not necessarily the preferred length. In many instances supervisors may wish to recommend a shorter length. Supervisors should be able to advise on the usual length of theses in their subject area or topic.

Where a candidate exceeds the maximum word count, examiners may require the thesis to be revised to the appropriate length as a resubmission prior to viva taking place. Following resubmission of the edited thesis in these circumstances, the work will be examined as a referred submission (i.e. a second submission) and the outcomes available will be those allowed following a referral.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended Award</th>
<th>Word count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEnt</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA / MSc by Research</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPhil</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Doctorate Thesis</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRes (exit route)</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD by Publication</td>
<td>Publications plus commentary of 15,000 (NB: this is a minimum length)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I5.3 Language of Submission
All assessment and submission must be in English. Any deviation from this must be approved by the Dean of the Graduate School.
I5.4 The Submission

Candidates are required to submit work for examination in accordance with the criteria specified by the University Research Committee.

The candidate must confirm, through the submission of a declaration form, that the work has not been submitted for a comparable academic award. However, the candidate is not precluded from incorporating a submission covering a wider field work which has already been submitted for a degree or comparable award, provided that it is indicated on the declaration form and also in the thesis.

Candidates are required to make a statement at the start of their submission of any publications that have arisen from the thesis, whether they have been published or are still being considered for publication.

Where a candidate’s research programme is part of a collaborative group project or is based on work done jointly with others, the work submitted must indicate clearly the candidate’s individual contribution and the extent of the collaboration.

The copyright of the work is vested in the candidate, except for the abstract, for which copyright rests with the University.

At the University’s discretion, following the award of the degree, the thesis will be lodged in the University repository or, where necessary, in the library of both the University and any Collaborating Establishment.

Where a candidate or the Collaborating Establishment wishes the thesis and any accompanying documents and/or material to remain confidential for a period of time after the degree has been awarded, this must normally be requested when the candidate submits the work for examination.

Where the Senate, or the University Research Committee acting on its behalf, has agreed that the confidential nature of the candidate’s work is such as to preclude the work being made freely available in the library, it shall be held on restricted access and only be available to those who were directly involved in the project for a time not exceeding the approved period.

I5.5 Arrangements for the Submission and Examination of the Final Thesis

The arrangements for the candidate’s examination, including the proposed examiners, must be approved by the School’s Director of Graduate Education and the University Research Committee (or nominee) before the examination takes place.

Candidates must take no part in the arrangement of their examination and have no contact with the examiner(s) in connection with their research between the appointment of the examiners and the viva examination.

In the period between the first examination and any resubmission, the examiners must maintain independence from the work before it is resubmitted. For this reason, examiners must not take on a supervisory role during this period.
Where a candidate requests clarification of required amendments, s/he should consult either the supervisor or Registry, who may contact the examiners on her/his behalf.

Normally, one member of the candidate's supervisory team will attend the viva examination, but this person must withdraw prior to the deliberations of the examiners on the outcome of the examination.

Viva examinations are normally held at the University. However, in special cases approval may be given for the examination to take place elsewhere in the UK or abroad.

Viva examinations may be held by video link, subject to the approval of all participants.

In cases where a viva examination is required, where for reasons of sickness, disability or comparable valid cause, the University Research Committee is satisfied that a candidate would be under serious disadvantage if required to undergo a viva examination, an alternative form of examination may be approved. Such approval shall not be given on the grounds that the candidate’s knowledge of the language in which the work is presented is inadequate.

In any instance where the University Research Committee is made aware of a failure to comply with all the procedures of the examination process, it may declare the examination null and void and appoint new examiners.

I5.6 The Examination Team
The examination team will be appointed in line with the published criteria established by the University Research Committee.

Normally, an examining team will consist of one internal examiner who has undergone University training for the role, and one external examiner.

In the following instances, a second external examiner will be appointed:
- where the candidate is a current member of University staff;
- where the candidate has approval to present a thesis in a non-standard format (for example in the case of PhD by Publication);
- where the balance of experience and appropriate subject knowledge is difficult to achieve on the team with a single external examiner.

In line with criteria established by the University Research Committee, the Director of Graduate Education or University Research Committee may require the appointment of an independent chair.

No member of a candidate’s supervisory team, including associates, may act as an examiner for either progression monitoring or examination of the final thesis.

I5.7 Examination
Candidates will be examined in accordance with the regulations in force at the time when they submit their final thesis or amended submission for examination (except in cases where this would disadvantage the candidate).
Each examiner shall read and examine the work submitted and present an independent preliminary report on it before any viva examination is held.

In completing the preliminary report, each examiner must consider whether the work provisionally satisfies the requirements of the degree and make an academic assessment of the quality of the work.

Following any viva examination, the examiners shall, where they are in agreement, present a joint report and recommendation relating to the award of the degree.

For awards where a viva examination is not required, the internal examiner will liaise with the external examiner(s) to produce a joint final report (following the submission of the initial independent reports).

In all cases where a candidate is referred to complete further work or amendments, the examiners must indicate to the candidate in writing any deficiencies of the work and/or what amendments and corrections are required.

Where the Senate, or the University Research Committee acting on its behalf, decides, on the recommendation of the examiners, that the degree should not be awarded and no re-examination should be permitted, the examiners must prepare an agreed statement of the deficiencies of the work and the reason for their decision, which will be forwarded to the candidate.

15.8 Disagreement between Research Degree Examiners
Where the examiners are unable to agree on a recommendation, separate reports and recommendations shall be submitted. In this case, the Dean of the Graduate School on behalf of the University Research Committee may:

- accept a majority recommendation;
  or
- accept the recommendation of the external examiner;
  or
- require the appointment of an additional external examiner whose appointment must be proposed in the normal way.

Following consideration by an additional external examiner, if deemed necessary, a further viva examination may be required.

15.9 Research Misconduct (including plagiarism)
*The Students’ Handbook of Regulations* sets out the process that will be invoked when it is alleged that a candidate has acted dishonestly or unethically or otherwise conducted research in an inappropriate manner. This includes allegations of academic misconduct (including but not limited to falsification or plagiarism) in the preparation of work submitted for assessment, or other irregularities in the conduct of any examination which come to light subsequent to the recommendation of the examiners or the University.
I5.10 Appeal against the Outcome of an Assessment
Candidates may, in the circumstances set out in the Students’ Handbook of Regulations, request a review of the outcome of an assessment activity.
I6 FINAL SUBMISSION DATE AND EXTENSION OF TIME

Note: Candidates submitting for the award of PhD by Publication may not apply for extensions or additional submission pending time.

I6.1 Programmes where Extensions may be Allowed
Candidates enrolled on the programmes detailed below may apply for additional time at the end of the standard enrolment period for their award:

- Master's by Research (MA / MSc (Res) / MEnt)
- Master in Research (MRes)
- Professional Doctorate
- Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) / Doctor of Enterprise (EntD)

I6.2 Options at the End of the Standard Enrolment Period
No later than three months before the end of the standard enrolment period, candidates must:

- notify the School of their intention to submit their final thesis; OR
- apply to enrol for the submission pending period, which allows candidates additional time to complete the writing of the thesis; OR
- apply for an extension to the standard enrolment period, which allows for additional time to complete the research.

I6.3 Application to Enrol for the Submission Pending Period
The purpose of the application process is to determine the eligibility of a candidate to enrol for the submission pending period.

Candidates are required to submit any application that they wish to make no later than three months prior to the end of the standard enrolment period for the award on which they are registered.

An application to enrol for the submission pending period must be supported by:

- a brief written report outlining progress to date, including progress made with writing-up
- explicit confirmation that all primary research/laboratory work has been completed;
- a detailed plan for submission within the maximum period permitted.

Following receipt of the full application, the supervisory team will review it and submit it to the Director of Graduate Education for approval.

The Director of Graduate Education will confirm whether or not the candidate has demonstrated satisfactory progress to be enrolled for the submission pending period. The Director of Graduate Education may recommend:

- that the candidate be allowed to enrol for the submission pending period
- that the candidate not be allowed to enrol for submission pending, but may have the option to apply for an extension to time

The candidate will normally be advised of the decision within 10 working days of application.
During the submission pending period, candidates can expect minimal supervision, usually meeting once every two months.

Students will not be allowed access to laboratories / specialist equipment during the submission pending period.

The fee is set at a lower rate for this period to reflect the reduced access to facilities and academic support.

At the end of the submission pending period, no further extension of time will be allowed and candidates must submit their work.

The maximum submission pending for University of Huddersfield research degree awards is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Type</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master’s by Research (MA / MSc (Res) / MEnt)</td>
<td>4 months FT &amp; PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master in Research (MRes)</td>
<td>4 months FT &amp; PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Doctorate</td>
<td>12 months FT &amp; PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)</td>
<td>12 months FT &amp; PT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### I6.4 Application for an Extension

Candidates may apply for an extension to study at the end of the standard enrolment period.

The purpose of the application process is to make sure that the candidate is on track to complete their research and to determine how much additional time the candidate will need.

The supporting documentation must include a plan for completing the research, as well as a summary of the work completed.

Candidates are required to submit any application that they wish to make no later than three months prior to the end of the standard enrolment period for the award on which they are registered.

It should be noted that, following the approval of an extension, a candidate will become liable to pay full fees (calculated pro-rata according to the length of extension agreed).

Candidates should continue with regular supervision during this period and will have full access to University facilities.

Following receipt of the full application, the supervisor will review the submission and submit the application to the Director of Graduate Education.

The Director of Graduate Education will confirm whether or not the candidate has demonstrated satisfactory progress to be enrolled for an extension to study.

The candidate will normally be advised of the decision within 10 working days of application.

At the end of the extension period, candidates may either:

- apply for a further extension, up to the maximum time allowed;
• apply to enrol for submission pending to complete the writing of their degree.

The maximum extension to study for University of Huddersfield research degree awards is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Type</th>
<th>Maximum Extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master’s by Research (MA / MSc (Res) / MEnt)</td>
<td>4 months FT &amp; PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master in Research (MRes)</td>
<td>4 months FT &amp; PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPhil</td>
<td>4 months FT &amp; PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Doctorate</td>
<td>12 months FT &amp; PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) / Doctor of Enterprise (EntD)</td>
<td>12 months FT &amp; PT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I7 DISRUPTION TO ACADEMIC PROGRESS

The period of study for research degrees will normally be continuous. However, the University understands that some candidates will encounter events or circumstances which disrupt their academic progress. Examples may include:

- ill-health
- personal difficulties
- equipment breakdown
- unavoidable delay in external body ethical approval
- difficulties obtaining and analysing data

In most cases, it is expected that candidates will work with their supervisor(s) to recover any time that is lost during their candidature. However, where difficulties are sufficiently disruptive, this may not be possible.

The University mitigates against the difficulties encountered, to ensure candidates are not disadvantaged, through the following mechanisms:

- short school extensions for period of up to four weeks against a progression monitoring report submission deadline (not available against the final thesis submission deadline)
- periods of suspension of study
- an extension to the standard enrolment period

The circumstances in which candidates may apply for a short extension or a suspension of studies are set out in the Students’ Handbook of Regulations.

All students may apply for an extension to the standard enrolment period, according to section I6 above. (This does not apply to candidates enrolled for the award of PhD by Publication)
I8 FAILURE TO SUBMIT WORK BY THE AGREED DEADLINE

In the absence of an approved extension or suspension request, if a candidate fails to attend a viva examination or submit work by the agreed submission date, the University will conclude that the candidate has failed the assessment concerned. This will lead to termination of the candidate’s enrolment and withdrawal from their research degree programme, subject to consideration of any extenuating circumstances.

Candidates who have been withdrawn due to failure to attend a viva examination or submit work will be notified in writing.

I8.1 Appeal against Withdrawal for Failure to Attend an Examination or to Submit Work

Candidates may, in the circumstances set out in the Students’ Handbook of Regulations, request a review of the decision to withdraw them for failure to attend an examination or to submit work by the agreed submission date.
SECTION J REGULATIONS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER BY RESEARCH (INCLUDING MA, MSC & MENT)

The following regulations govern the specific rules for award for the degrees of Master’s by Research. These should be read in conjunction with the General Regulations Governing all Research Degrees, described in section I.
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J1 The Awards

Master's degrees are awarded to students who have demonstrated:

- a systematic understanding of knowledge, and a critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, much of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of their academic discipline, field of study or area of professional practice

- a comprehensive understanding of techniques applicable to their own research or advanced scholarship

- originality in the application of knowledge, together with a practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline

- conceptual understanding that enables the student:
  - to evaluate critically current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline
  - to evaluate methodologies and develop critiques of them and, where appropriate, to propose new hypotheses.

Typically, holders of the qualification will be able to:

- deal with complex issues both systematically and creatively, make sound judgements, often in the absence of complete data, and communicate their conclusions clearly to specialist and non-specialist audiences

- demonstrate self-direction and originality in tackling and solving problems, and act autonomously in planning and implementing tasks at a professional or equivalent level

- continue to advance their knowledge and understanding, and to develop new skills to a high level.

The MA by Research and MSc by Research

The MA by Research or MSc by Research is awarded to a candidate who, having successfully completed an approved programme of training and research which
combines advanced study, research methodology and a substantial research project, or series of research projects in a chosen field, has presented work to the satisfaction of the examiners.

**The MEnt**
The MEnt is awarded to a candidate who, having successfully completed an approved programme of enterprise research which combines advanced study, research methodology and a substantial research project, or series of research projects in a chosen field, underpinning a new business, social enterprise or service innovation, has presented work to the satisfaction of the examiners.

**J2 Thesis Length**
The text of the thesis should not normally exceed 25,000 words (excluding references and appendices).

This is the maximum allowable length for theses, not necessarily the preferred length. In some instances supervisors may recommend a shorter length. Supervisors should be able to advise on the usual length of theses in their subject area or topic.

**J3 Admission Criteria**
In addition to the general criteria, normally the minimum level of attainment required for entry is an upper second class honours degree from a UK university or a qualification of an equivalent standard, in a discipline appropriate to that of the proposed programme to be followed.

**J4 Enrolment Periods**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of Study</th>
<th>Master's Enrolment</th>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>24 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No later than three months before the end of the standard enrolment period, candidates must:
- notify the School of their intention to submit their final thesis; **OR**
- apply to enrol for the submission pending period, which allows candidates additional time to complete the writing of the thesis; **OR**
- apply for an extension to the standard enrolment period, which allows for additional time to complete the research.

Section I of the *Regulations for Awards* details the options available at the end of the standard enrolment period and how to apply.

**J5 Programme Timeline and Milestones**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Month 1</strong></td>
<td>Registration and Induction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### REGULATIONS FOR AWARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Every month (minimum)</th>
<th>Supervision meeting: complete online log</th>
<th>Every second month (minimum)</th>
<th>Supervision meeting: complete online log</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Month 2</strong></td>
<td>Research Support Plan complete</td>
<td><strong>Month 4</strong></td>
<td>Research Support Plan complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Month 9</strong></td>
<td>Submit: Notification of Intention to Submit&quot; OR Application for Submission Pending Period OR Apply for an extension to the standard enrolment period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Month 21</strong></td>
<td>Submit: Notification of Intention to Submit&quot; OR Application for Submission Pending Period OR Apply for an extension to the standard enrolment period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Month 12</strong></td>
<td>Submit thesis OR Enter submission pending OR Complete active research during extension period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Month 24</strong></td>
<td>Submit thesis OR Enter submission pending OR Complete active research during extension period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Examination Phase:** see *Thesis Examination* below

#### J6  Research Support Plan

The Research Support Plan is a formal requirement of the programme. It must be reviewed and signed off by the candidate’s supervisory team:

- 2 months after enrolment for full-time candidates
- 4 months after enrolment for part-time candidates

The candidate and the supervisor must document the proposed research support plan. This plan must set out the programme of related studies necessary for the attainment of competence in research methods and of knowledge related to the subject of the work.

Failure to complete the research support plan satisfactorily by the required deadline may lead to the termination of a candidate’s registration.

The plan may include registration for a maximum of 30 credits of master’s level modules.

#### J7  Transfer from Master’s to PhD

Candidates who enrolled initially for an MEnt, MA or MSc by Research and who wish to transfer to PhD must apply to transfer when they have made sufficient progress on the work to provide evidence of the development to PhD. For candidates enrolled on the MEnt, transfer to the EntD may also be available.
In support of the application, the candidate shall prepare a full progress report on the work undertaken. The progress report should typically:

- be 3,000 to 6,000 words in length
- include a brief review and discussion of the work already undertaken
- include a statement of the intended further work, including details of the original contribution to knowledge which is likely to emerge.

The application should normally be made directly to the School’s Director of Graduate Education and should be concluded no later than 12 months after initial enrolment for full-time candidates or 24 months after enrolment for part-time candidates.

When approving the application, the School’s Director of Graduate Education must be satisfied that the candidate has made sufficient progress and that the proposed programme provides a suitable basis for work at PhD standard which the candidate is capable of pursuing to completion.

J8 Thesis Examination

For master’s awards, an external examiner(s) may act as examiner for the whole cohort of candidates within an academic session but may not then return to act as an examiner until one year has elapsed.

The examination usually consists of the assessment of the written thesis alone. The requirement for a viva examination of the work is at the discretion of the examiners.

J8.1 Recommendations Following Examination

a) Award (without amendments)

b) Award subject to the completion of editorial and minor presentational corrections.

The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner normally within two weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

c) Award subject to minor amendments.

The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner within six weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

d) Referral to complete major amendments.
The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of all examiners within four months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

On receipt of the resubmitted work, the examiners reserve the right to require a viva examination.

e) **Referral to re-write the submission.**

The resubmission must be completed to the satisfaction of all examiners within 6 months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

On receipt of the resubmitted work the requirement for a viva examination is at the discretion of the examiners.

f) **Fail** so that the candidate is not awarded a degree.

**J8.2 Recommendations Following the Submission of Minor Amendments:**

a) **Award**

b) **Award subject to the completion of editorial and minor presentational corrections.**

The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner normally within two weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

No award will be conferred until the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

c) **Fail so that the candidate is not awarded a degree.**

Where a candidate who has been required to complete minor amendments resubmits work that is not to the satisfaction of the internal examiner, the work must be presented for consideration by all examiners before a recommendation can be made.

**J8.3 Recommendations Following the Submission of Referred Work**

Only one opportunity for referral is permitted.

Following the examination of referred work (including a viva examination where required), the examiners may recommend:

a) **Award** (without amendments)

b) **Award subject to the completion of editorial and minor presentational corrections.**
The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner normally within two weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

No award will be conferred until the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

c) Award subject to minor amendments.

The resubmission, addressing all amendments, must be completed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner within six weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

No award will be conferred until the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

d) Fail so that the candidate is not awarded a degree.
SECTION K REGULATIONS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

The following regulations govern the specific rules for award for the degree of Master of Philosophy. These should be read in conjunction with the General Regulations Governing all Research Degrees, described in section I.
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K1 The Award

Master's degrees are awarded to students who have demonstrated:

- a systematic understanding of knowledge, and a critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, much of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of their academic discipline, field of study or area of professional practice
- a comprehensive understanding of techniques applicable to their own research or advanced scholarship
- originality in the application of knowledge, together with a practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline
- conceptual understanding that enables the student:
  - to evaluate critically current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline
  - to evaluate methodologies and develop critiques of them and, where appropriate, to propose new hypotheses.

Typically, holders of the qualification will be able to:

- deal with complex issues both systematically and creatively, make sound judgements, often in the absence of complete data, and communicate their conclusions clearly to specialist and non-specialist audiences
- demonstrate self-direction and originality in tackling and solving problems, and act autonomously in planning and implementing tasks at a professional or equivalent level
- continue to advance their knowledge and understanding, and to develop new skills to a high level.

Master of Philosophy

The MPhil is awarded to a candidate who, having critically investigated and evaluated an approved topic and demonstrated an understanding of research methods appropriate to the chosen field, has presented and defended work by viva examination, to the satisfaction of the examiners.
K2  **Thesis Length**
The text of the thesis should not normally exceed 40,000 words (excluding references and appendices)

This word count is the maximum allowable length for theses, not necessarily the preferred length. In many instances supervisors may wish to recommend a shorter length.

Supervisors should be able to advise on the usual length of theses in their subject area or topic.

K3  **Enrolment Periods**
A candidate who is unable to complete the approved programme of work for a doctoral degree may transfer to the MPhil award. This may be either as an outcome of a progression monitoring exercise or following a formal application prior to the submission of work for assessment.

The precise enrolment period for the completion of this award in these cases will be determined by the candidate’s supervisor(s) or Progression Monitoring Panel (as appropriate), following an assessment of the candidate’s progress to date.

Normally, the following maximum enrolment periods will apply:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Course</th>
<th>MPhil Enrolment Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 12 months</td>
<td>9 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 24 months</td>
<td>6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 36 months</td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 24 months</td>
<td>18 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 48 months</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 72 months</td>
<td>6 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

K4  **Programme Timeline**
No later than three months before the end of the standard enrolment period, candidates must:
- notify the School of their intention to submit the final thesis; OR
- apply to enrol for the submission-pending period, which allows candidates additional time to complete the writing of the thesis; OR
- apply for an extension to the standard enrolment period which allows for additional time to complete the research.

Section I6 of the Regulations for Awards details the options available at the end of the standard enrolment period and how to apply.
K5 Examination of the Final Thesis
The examination for MPhil has two stages:
- The submission and preliminary assessment of the written thesis
- Defence of the work by viva examination.
The examiners may not recommend that a candidate fail outright without holding a viva examination.

Where the examiners are of the opinion that the work is so unsatisfactory that no useful purpose would be served by conducting a viva examination, they may recommend that the viva examination is dispensed with and that the candidate be referred to re-write the submission. Following resubmission of the thesis, the work will be examined as referred submission.

In this case, the resubmission must be completed within 6 months to the satisfaction of all examiners. Examination of work referred in this way must include a viva examination, because no previous viva examination will have taken place.

K5.1 Recommendations Following Examination
(These do not apply where the MPhil is being examined as the outcome of a doctoral examination - see Sections L and M).

Following examination, including a viva, the examiners may recommend:

a) Award (without amendments)

b) Award subject to the completion of editorial and minor presentational corrections.

The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner normally within two weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

c) Award subject to minor amendments.

The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner within six weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

d) Referral to complete major amendments.

The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of all examiners within 4 months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

On receipt of the resubmitted work the examiners reserve the right to require a further viva examination.
e) **Referral to re-write the submission.**

The resubmission must be completed to the satisfaction of all examiners within 6 months.

On receipt of the resubmitted work the requirement for a viva examination is at the discretion of the examiners.

f) **Fail** so that the candidate is not awarded a degree.

### K5.2 Recommendations Following the Submission of Minor Amendments:

a) **Award**

b) **Award subject to the completion of editorial and minor presentational corrections.**

The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner normally within two weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

c) **Fail** so that the candidate is not awarded a degree.

Where a candidate has been required to complete minor amendments and resubmits work that is not to the satisfaction of the internal examiner, the work must be presented for consideration by all examiners before a recommendation can be made.

### K5.3 Recommendations following the Submission of Referred Work

Only one opportunity for referral is permitted.

Following the examination of referred work (including a viva where required), the examiners may recommend:

a) **Award** (without amendments)

b) **Award subject to the completion of editorial and minor presentational corrections.**

The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner normally within two weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

e) **Award subject to minor amendments.**
The resubmission, addressing all amendments, must be completed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner within six weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

f) **Fail** so that the candidate is not awarded a degree.
SECTION L REGULATIONS FOR THE AWARD OF PROFESSIONAL DOCTORATE, INCORPORATING THE MASTER IN RESEARCH (MRES) AWARD

The following regulations govern the specific rules for award for the degree of Professional Doctorate and Master in Research. These should be read in conjunction with the General Regulations Governing all Research Degrees, described in section I.
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L1 The Award

Professional doctorates are rooted in an academic discipline as well as in a profession. Doctoral degrees are awarded to students who have demonstrated:

- the creation and interpretation of new knowledge, through original research or other advanced scholarship, of a quality to satisfy peer review, extend the forefront of the discipline, and merit publication
- a systematic acquisition and understanding of a substantial body of knowledge which is at the forefront of an academic discipline or area of professional practice
- the general ability to conceptualise, design and implement a project for the generation of new knowledge, applications or understanding at the forefront of the discipline, and, where necessary, to adjust the project design in the light of unforeseen problems
- a detailed understanding of applicable techniques for research and advanced academic enquiry.

Typically, holders of the qualification will be able to:

- make informed judgements on complex issues in specialist fields, often in the absence of complete data, and be able to communicate their ideas and conclusions clearly and effectively to specialist and non-specialist audiences
continue to undertake pure and/or applied research and development at an advanced level, contributing substantially to the development of new techniques, ideas or approaches.

The Professional Doctorate Award
A Professional Doctorate is awarded to a candidate who has:
- successfully completed an approved taught programme of study;
- critically investigated and evaluated an approved topic, resulting in an independent and original contribution to knowledge in a relevant professional discipline;
- demonstrated an understanding of research methods appropriate to the chosen field;
- presented and defended work by viva examination, to the satisfaction of the examiners.

L2 Thesis Length
The text of the thesis for these awards should not normally exceed 50,000 words (excluding references and appendices).

This word count is the maximum allowable length for theses, not necessarily the preferred length. In many instances supervisors may wish to recommend a shorter length.

Supervisors should be able to advise on the usual length of theses in their subject area or topic.

Candidates registered for a professional doctorate may register for a maximum of 60 credits of master’s level modules during the research-phase of their degree.

L3 Admission Criteria
In addition to the general criteria, normally the minimum level of attainment required for entry is:
- a postgraduate diploma from a UK university (or equivalent) in a discipline appropriate to the proposed programme to be followed (NB: EdD requires minimum of a master’s degree from a UK university – or equivalent – in an appropriate discipline); and
- a recognised professional qualification or equivalent for the title award; and
- a minimum of three years’ postgraduate professional experience directly relevant to the named professional doctorate degree for which enrolment is sought.

L4 Enrolment Period
The standard and minimum enrolment periods of enrolment, including the taught element, for the award of professional doctorate is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of Study</th>
<th>Prof Enrolment</th>
<th>Doc Standard</th>
<th>Prof Enrolment</th>
<th>Doc Minimum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>36 months</td>
<td>24 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>72 months</td>
<td>48 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No later than three months before the end of the standard enrolment period, candidates must:

- notify the School of their intention to submit their final thesis; OR
- apply to enrol for the submission pending period, which allows candidates additional time to complete the writing of the thesis; OR
- apply for an extension to the standard enrolment period, which allows for additional time to complete the research.

Where a candidate fails to secure approval to enrol for the submission pending period or an extension to the standard enrolment period, the candidate must submit work for examination no later than the end of the standard enrolment period for the award. Failure to do so will lead to a termination of the candidate’s registration on the grounds of non-submission.

L5 Programme Timeline and Milestones

The programme handbook for specific professional doctorates outlines the modules that candidates will follow during the taught-phase of their programme. The taught phase will typically cover the first year of the programme (or two years for part time), though this may vary between programmes.

Candidates may only progress to the research phase when they have successfully completed the taught element.

At the end of the taught phase, candidates may:

- progress to the doctoral research phase of the programme; OR
- progress to complete a shorter research project and submit for the Master of Research (MRes) award; OR
- accept the interim awards appropriate to the completed taught element (PGDip / PGCert), where available.

The relevant programme handbook will detail specific progression requirements for candidates from the taught element to the research element. The timeline for the research phase of professional doctorate degrees is also outlined in the programme handbook.

During the research phase of all professional doctorates, candidates will be required to successfully complete at least one progression monitoring assessment. Specific programme handbooks may stipulate additional compulsory progression assessments, and where they do, candidates must successfully complete these to be allowed to progress.

In addition to progression monitoring assessments, the following deadlines apply:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part-time</th>
<th>Submit:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By the end of month 69</td>
<td>Notification of Intention to Submit OR Application for Submission Pending Period OR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Apply for an extension to the standard enrolment period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By end of month 72</th>
<th>Submit thesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enter submission pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue active research during extension period</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part-time candidates will have a minimum of one formal supervision meeting every two months and must complete and online supervision log.

### Full-time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By end of month 33</th>
<th>Submit:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Notification of Intention to Submit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Application for Submission Pending Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apply for an extension to the standard enrolment period</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By end of month 36</th>
<th>Submit thesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enter submission pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue active research during extension period</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full-time candidates will have a minimum of one monthly formal supervision meeting and must complete and online supervision log.

### L6 Change of Programme

If a professional doctorate candidate is unable to complete the approved programme of work, s/he may, at any time prior to the submission of the work for examination, apply for the enrolment to be changed to that for the degree of MPhil.

Candidates who are enrolled for a professional doctorate are not permitted to transfer enrolment to submit for PhD.

### L7 Progression Monitoring

The purpose of progression monitoring is to determine the suitability of a candidate to remain registered on a research award.

Candidates will have a minimum of one progression monitoring assessment during the research phase of their programme. Individual professional doctorates may specify additional compulsory progression points. Candidates should refer to the relevant programme handbook.

Normally at least one member of the supervisory team will be present at the viva examination, but supervisors must withdraw prior to the deliberations of the progression monitoring panel on the outcome.
Candidates who fail to submit progress reports on the required schedule will be administratively withdrawn, subject to consideration of any extenuating circumstances.

Failure to complete progression monitoring satisfactorily will lead to the termination of the candidate’s registration.

**Assessment of Progression**
Satisfactory completion of progression monitoring is demonstrated by:

- a progress report completed by the candidate and submitted for assessment by a progression monitoring panel.
- satisfactory engagement with the research support plan
- the defence of the progress report by viva examination in front of the progression monitoring panel
- confirmation by the progression monitoring panel that the candidate is able to proceed to the subsequent year of study.

**The Progression Panel**
The panel will comprise two members that are independent of the student and the supervisory team

Where the candidate is a member of staff, the progress report (at both initial consideration and following any amendments) must also be submitted for assessment to an external examiner, who satisfies the published criteria for appointment.

The external examiner will complete a preliminary written report for consideration by the progression monitoring panel. If deemed necessary by the School or the external examiner, the external examiner may join the progression monitoring viva examination via video link or in person.

**The Progression Report**
Supervisors should be able to advise on the usual format of progression reports in their subject area, but typically the report should be equivalent to 3,000 to 6,000 words in length and include:
- a review and discussion of the work already undertaken;
- a brief statement of the intended further work, including an indication of the original contribution to knowledge which is likely to emerge.

**L7.1 Available Outcomes following Initial Assessment (Progression Stage)**
Following the completion of the progression monitoring exercise, including a viva examination, the outcomes available are as follows:

a) that the candidate be permitted to progress;

b) that the candidate required to make amendments and resubmit the progress report no later than six weeks (12 weeks for part-time candidates) from the date of notification of the outcome of the examination.
c) that the candidate be required to complete further work and submit for the award of MA / MSc by Research (following first progression monitoring only), or MPhil (following second progression monitoring only).

The requirement for a further viva examination of the work is at the discretion of the examiners.

L7.2 Available Outcomes following Amendments (Progression Stage)
Where a candidate has been required to complete amendments, the outcomes available following the completion of the examination, including a viva examination where required, are as follows:

a) that the candidate be permitted to progress;

b) that the candidate be required to complete further work and submit for the award of MA / MSc by Research (following first progression monitoring) or MPhil (following second progression monitoring only).

c) that the candidate not be permitted to proceed.

Candidates who do not receive permission to proceed or transfer will be deemed to have failed and their registration will be withdrawn. Any interim award for which the candidate is eligible, based on credits previously achieved as part of the taught element, will be conferred at this point.

L8 Final Thesis Examination
The examination for Professional Doctorate has two stages:

• The submission and preliminary assessment of the written thesis
• Defence of the work by viva examination.

The examiners may not recommend that a candidate fail outright without holding a viva examination.

On referral, the requirement for a viva examination is at the discretion of the examiners.

Where the examiners are of the opinion that the work is so unsatisfactory that no useful purpose would be served by conducting a viva examination, they may recommend that the viva examination is dispensed with and that the candidate be referred to re-write the submission. Following resubmission of the thesis, the work will be examined as a referred submission.

In this case, the resubmission must be completed within one year to the satisfaction of all examiners. Examination of work referred in this way must include a viva examination, because no previous viva examination will have taken place.

L8.1 Recommendations Following Examination
Following examination, including a viva examination, the examiners may recommend:

a) Award (without amendments)

b) Award subject to the completion of editorial and minor presentational corrections.
• The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner normally within two weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

• No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

c) Award subject to minor amendments.

• The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner within three months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

• No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

d) Referral to complete major amendments.

• The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of all examiners within six months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

• On receipt of the resubmitted work the examiners reserve the right to require a further viva examination.

e) Referral to re-write the submission.

• The resubmission must be completed to the satisfaction of all examiners within one year from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

• On receipt of the resubmitted work, the examiners reserve the right to require a further viva examination.

f) Referral to complete amendments to the submission and to re-submit for the award of MPhil.

• All amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of the examiners within six months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination OR in cases where editorial and minor presentational corrections are required, a two-week period of amendment will apply.

• On receipt of the resubmitted work, the examiners reserve the right to require a further viva examination.

g) Award MPhil (without amendments)

h) Fail so that the candidate is not awarded a degree.
L8.2 Recommendations following the Submission of Minor Amendments

a) Award

b) Award subject to the completion of editorial and minor presentational corrections.

The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner normally within two weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

c) Fail so that the candidate is not awarded a degree

Where a candidate has been required to complete minor amendments and resubmits work that is not to the satisfaction of the internal examiner, the work must be presented for consideration by all examiners before a recommendation can be made.

L8.3 Recommendations following the Submission of Referred Work

Only one opportunity for referral is permitted.

Following the examination of referred work (including a viva examination where required), the examiners may recommend:

a) Award (without amendments)

b) Award subject to the completion of editorial and minor presentational corrections.

The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner normally within two weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

c) Award subject to minor amendments.

The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner within three months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

d) Award the degree of MPhil subject to the presentation of the work amended to the satisfaction of all examiners within three months from the date of the notification of
the outcome of the examination **OR** in cases where only editorial and minor presentational corrections are required, a two-week period of amendment will apply.

Where the resubmitted work is not to the satisfaction of the examiners, the candidate will not be awarded the degree.

This outcome is not available where the initial recommendation was a referral to resubmit for MPhil.

e) **Fail** so that the candidate is not awarded a degree.

Any interim award for which the candidate is eligible, based on credits previously achieved as part of the taught element, will be conferred at this point.
Master of Research (MRes)
Master's degrees are awarded to students who have demonstrated:

- a systematic understanding of knowledge, and a critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, much of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of their academic discipline, field of study or area of professional practice
- a comprehensive understanding of techniques applicable to their own research or advanced scholarship
- originality in the application of knowledge, together with a practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline
- conceptual understanding that enables the student:
  - to evaluate critically current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline
  - to evaluate methodologies and develop critiques of them and, where appropriate, to propose new hypotheses.

Typically, holders of the qualification will be able to:

- deal with complex issues both systematically and creatively, make sound judgements, often in the absence of complete data, and communicate their conclusions clearly to specialist and non-specialist audiences
- demonstrate self-direction and originality in tackling and solving problems, and act autonomously in planning and implementing tasks at a professional or equivalent level
- continue to advance their knowledge and understanding, and to develop new skills to a high level.

The MRes Award
The MRes is only available as an exit route from a professional doctorate degree.

It may be awarded to a candidate who, having successfully completed the compulsory taught element of a professional doctorate degree, has additionally presented a thesis to the satisfaction of the examiners.

The requirement for a viva examination of the thesis is at the discretion of the examiners.

The text of the thesis should not normally exceed 15,000 words (excluding ancillary data).

MRes Enrolment Periods
The maximum periods of enrolment following the successful completion of the compulsory taught element, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of Study</th>
<th>MRes Standard Enrolment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>8 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>16 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No later than three months before the end of the standard enrolment period, candidates must:

- notify the School of their intention to submit their final thesis; OR
• apply to enrol for the submission pending period, which allows candidates additional time to complete the writing of the thesis; OR
• apply for an extension to the standard enrolment period, which allows for additional time to complete the research.

Section I of the *Regulations for Awards* details the options available at the end of the standard enrolment period and how to apply.

**L11 MRes Thesis Examination**
For the MRes award only, an external examiner(s) may act as examiner for a whole cohort of students within an academic session but may not then return to act as an examiner until one year has elapsed.

The examination for the MRes usually consists of the assessment of the written thesis alone.

The requirement for a viva examination of the work is at the discretion of the examiners.

**L12 Recommendations Following MRes Examination**

a) **Award (without amendments)**

b) **Award subject to the completion of editorial and minor presentational corrections.**

The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner normally within two weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

c) **Award subject to minor amendments.**

The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner within six weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

d) **Referral to complete major amendments.**

The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of all examiners within four months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

On receipt of the resubmitted work the examiners reserve the right to require a further viva examination.

e) **Referral to re-write the submission.**
The resubmission must be completed to the satisfaction of all examiners within six months.

On receipt of the resubmitted work the requirement for a viva examination is at the discretion of the examiners.

f) **Fail** so that the candidate is not awarded a degree.

**L12.1 Recommendations Following the Submission of Minor Amendments**

a) **Award**

b) **Award subject to the completion of editorial and minor presentational corrections.**

The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner normally within two weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

c) **Fail so that the candidate is not awarded a degree.**

Where a candidate has been required to complete minor amendments and resubmits work that is not to the satisfaction of the internal examiner, the work must be presented for consideration by all examiners before a recommendation can be made.

**L12.2 Recommendations following the Submission of Referred Work (MRes)**

Only one opportunity for referral is permitted.

Following the examination of referred work (including a viva examination where required), the examiners may recommend:

a) **Award** (without amendments)

b) **Award subject to the completion of editorial and minor presentational corrections.**

The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner normally within two weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

c) **Award subject to minor amendments.**
The resubmission, addressing all amendments, must be completed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner within six weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

d) **Fail** so that the candidate is not awarded a degree.

   Any interim award for which the candidate is eligible, based on credits previously achieved as part of the taught element, will be conferred at this point.
SECTION M REGULATIONS FOR THE AWARDS OF PHD AND ENTD (EXCLUDING PHD BY PUBLICATION)

The following regulations govern the specific rules for award for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy and Doctor of Enterprise. These should be read in conjunction with the General Regulations Governing all Research Degrees, described in section I.
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M1 The Awards

Doctoral degrees are awarded to students who have demonstrated:

- the creation and interpretation of new knowledge, through original research or other advanced scholarship, of a quality to satisfy peer review, extend the forefront of the discipline, and merit publication
- a systematic acquisition and understanding of a substantial body of knowledge which is at the forefront of an academic discipline or area of professional practice
- the general ability to conceptualise, design and implement a project for the generation of new knowledge, applications or understanding at the forefront of the discipline, and where necessary, to adjust the project design in the light of unforeseen problems
- a detailed understanding of applicable techniques for research and advanced academic enquiry.

Typically, holders of the qualification will be able to:

- make informed judgements on complex issues in specialist fields, often in the absence of complete data, and be able to communicate their ideas and conclusions clearly and effectively to specialist and non-specialist audiences
- continue to undertake pure and/or applied research and development at an advanced level, contributing substantially to the development of new techniques, ideas or approaches.
The PhD Award
The PhD is awarded to a candidate who, having critically investigated and evaluated an approved topic resulting in an independent and original contribution to knowledge and demonstrated an understanding of research methods appropriate to the chosen field, has presented and defended the work by viva examination, to the satisfaction of the examiners.

The EntD Award
The EntD is awarded to a candidate who, having critically investigated and evaluated an approved topic resulting in an independent and original contribution to knowledge associated with the development of a new business, social enterprise or service innovation, has presented and defended work by viva examination, to the satisfaction of the examiners.

Thesis Length
The text of the thesis for these awards should not normally exceed 80,000 words (excluding references and appendices).

This word count is the maximum allowable length for theses, not necessarily the preferred length. In some instances supervisors may wish to recommend a shorter length.

Supervisors should be able to advise on the usual length of theses in their subject area or topic.

M1.1 Alternative Format Theses
This model of submission is only available to doctoral candidates registered in Schools where published guidelines exist that have been validated by the University Research Committee, as detailed in Section I: General Regulations Governing All Research Degrees.

Where the submission is accompanied by material in other than written form or the research involves creative writing or the preparation of a scholarly edition, the written commentary should normally be a minimum of 15,000 words (excluding references and appendices).

M2 Admission Criteria
PhD Award (excluding the PhD by Publication)
In addition to the general criteria, normally the minimum level of attainment required for entry is:

- a Master's degree from a UK University or equivalent, in a discipline appropriate to the proposed programme to be followed, OR
- an upper second class honours degree from a UK university in a discipline appropriate to that of the proposed programme to be followed, OR
- appropriate research or professional experience at postgraduate level, which has resulted in published work, written reports or other appropriate evidence of accomplishment.

EntD Award
In addition to the general criteria, normally the minimum level of attainment required for entry is:

- Master’s degree from a UK University or equivalent, in a discipline appropriate to the proposed programme to be followed, OR
- an upper second class honours degree from a UK university in a discipline appropriate to that of the proposed programme to be followed, OR
- appropriate research or professional experience at postgraduate level, which has resulted in published work, written reports or other appropriate evidence of accomplishment, or
- appropriate knowledge and experience of business planning and business start-up, and/or experience of starting up a new service requiring substantial project and financial planning.

M3 Enrolment periods

The standard and minimum enrolment periods are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of Study</th>
<th>PhD/EntD Standard Enrolment</th>
<th>PhD/EntD Minimum Enrolment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>36 months</td>
<td>24 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>72 months</td>
<td>48 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No later than three months before the end of the standard enrolment period, candidates must:

- notify the School of their intention to submit their final thesis; OR
- apply to enrol for the submission pending period, which allows candidates additional time to complete the writing of the thesis; OR
- apply for an extension to the standard enrolment period, which allows for additional time to complete the research.

Where a candidate fails to secure approval to enrol for the submission pending period or an extension to the standard enrolment period, the candidate must submit work for examination no later than the end of the standard enrolment period for the award. Failure to do so will lead to a termination of the candidate’s registration on the grounds of non-submission.
## M4 Programme Timeline and Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Month 1</strong></td>
<td>Registration and Induction</td>
<td>Month 1 Registration and Induction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Every</strong></td>
<td>Supervision meeting: complete online log</td>
<td>Supervision meeting: complete online log</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>month (minimum)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Month 3</strong></td>
<td>Research Support Plan complete</td>
<td>Month 6 Research Support Plan complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By end of month 9</strong></td>
<td>Submit progression report 1</td>
<td>By end of month 18 Submit progression report 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By end of month 12</strong></td>
<td>Complete progression viva and any corrections</td>
<td>By end of month 24 Complete progression viva and any corrections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By end of month 21</strong></td>
<td>Submit progression report 2</td>
<td>By end of month 42 Submit progression report 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By end of month 24</strong></td>
<td>Complete progression viva and any corrections</td>
<td>By end of month 48 Complete progression viva and any corrections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By end of month 33</strong></td>
<td>Submit: Notification of Intention to Submit OR Application for Submission Pending Period OR Apply for an extension to the standard enrolment period</td>
<td>By end of month 69 Submit: Notification of Intention to Submit OR Application for Submission Pending Period OR Apply for an extension to the standard enrolment period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By end of month 36</strong></td>
<td>Submit thesis OR Enter submission pending OR Continue active research during extension period</td>
<td>By end of month 72 Submit thesis OR Enter submission pending OR Continue active research during extension period</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Examination Phase: see Thesis Examination below**

## M5 Change of Programme

A candidate who is enrolled for the PhD or EntD and who is unable to complete the approved programme of work, may, at any time prior to the submission of the work for examination, apply for the enrolment to be changed to that for the degree of MPhil.

## M6 Research Support Plan

The Research Support Plan is a formal requirement of the programme. It must be reviewed and signed off by the candidate’s supervisory team.
Submission deadline
- Month 3 for full-time students
- Month 6 months for part-time students

The candidate and the supervisor must document the proposed research support plan. This plan must set out the programme of related studies necessary for the attainment of competence in research methods and of knowledge related to the subject of the work.

The plan should be reviewed by an academic external to the supervisory team.

Failure to complete the research support plan satisfactorily by the required deadline may lead to the termination of the candidate’s registration.

The plan may include registration for a maximum of 60 credits of master’s level modules.

M7 Progression Monitoring
The purpose of progression monitoring is to determine the suitability of the candidate to remain registered on a research award.

Deadlines:

**Full-time students:**
- Submission of report: by the end of month 9 and again by the end of month 21
- Full examination including viva examination and any amendments to be completed by the end of year 1 and again by the end of year 2.

**Part-time students:**
- Submission of report: by the end of month 18 and again by the end of month 42
- Full examination including viva and any amendments to be completed by the end of year 2 and again by the end of year 4

Normally at least one member of the supervisory team will be present at the viva examination, but supervisors must withdraw prior to the deliberations of the progression monitoring panel on the outcome.

Candidates who fail to submit progress reports on the required schedule will be administratively withdrawn, subject to consideration of any extenuating circumstances.

Failure to complete progression monitoring satisfactorily will lead to the termination of the candidate’s registration.

**M7.1 Assessment of Progression**
Satisfactory completion of progression monitoring is demonstrated by:

- a progress report completed by the candidate and submitted for assessment by a progression monitoring panel.
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- satisfactory engagement with the research support plan
- the defence of the progress report by viva examination in front of the progression monitoring panel
- confirmation by the progression monitoring panel that the candidate is able to proceed to the subsequent year of study.

The Progression Panel
The panel will comprise two members that are independent of the student and the supervisory team

Where the candidate is a member of staff, the progress report (at both initial consideration and following any amendments) must also be submitted for assessment to an external examiner, who satisfies the published criteria for appointment.

The external examiner will complete a preliminary written report for consideration by the progression monitoring panel. If deemed necessary by the School or the external examiner, the external examiner may join the progression monitoring viva examination via video link or in person.

The Progression Report
Supervisors should be able to advise on the usual format of progression reports in their subject area, but the progress report should typically be equivalent to 3,000 to 6,000 words in length and include:
- a review and discussion of the work already undertaken;
- a brief statement of the intended further work, including an indication of the original contribution to knowledge which is likely to emerge.

M7.2 Available Outcomes following Initial Assessment (Progression Stage)
Following the completion of the progression monitoring exercise, including a viva examination, the outcomes available are as follows:

a) that the candidate be permitted to progress;
b) that the candidate be required to make amendments and resubmit the progress report no later than six weeks (12 weeks for part-time candidates) from the date of notification of the outcome of the examination.
c) that the candidate be required to complete further work and submit for the award of MA / MSc by Research (following first progression monitoring only), or MPhil (following second progression monitoring only)

The requirement for a further viva examination of the work is at the discretion of the examiners.

M7.3 Available Outcomes following Amendments (Progression Stage)
Where a candidate has been required to complete amendments, the outcomes available following the completion of the examination, including a viva examination where required, are as follows:

a) that the candidate be permitted to progress;
b) that the candidate be required to complete further work and submit for the award of MA / MSc by Research (following first progression monitoring) or MPhil (following second progression monitoring only).
c) that the candidate not be permitted to proceed.

**M8 PhD and EntD Final Thesis Examination**

The examination for PhD / EntD has two stages:
- The submission and preliminary assessment of the written thesis
- Defence of the work by viva examination.

The examiners may not recommend that a candidate fail outright without holding an viva examination.

Where the examiners are of the opinion that the work is so unsatisfactory that no useful purpose would be served by conducting a viva examination, they may recommend that the viva examination is dispensed with and that the candidate be referred to re-write the submission. Following resubmission of the thesis, the work will be examined as a referred submission.

In this case, the resubmission must be completed within one year to the satisfaction of all examiners. Examination of work referred in this way must include a viva examination, because no previous viva examination will have taken place.

**M8.1 Recommendations Following Examination**

Following examination, including a viva examination, the examiners may recommend:

a) **Award** (without amendments)

b) **Award subject to the completion of editorial and minor presentational corrections.**

   The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner normally within two weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

   No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

   **c) Award subject to minor amendments.**

   The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner within three months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

   No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

   **d) Referral to complete major amendments.**

   The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of all examiners within six months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.
On receipt of the resubmitted work the examiners reserve the right to require a further viva examination.

e) **Referral to re-write the submission.**

The resubmission must be completed to the satisfaction of all examiners within one year from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

On receipt of the resubmitted work the examiners reserve the right to require a further viva examination.

f) **Referral to complete amendments to the submission and to re-submit for the award of MPhil.**

All amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of the examiners within six months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination OR in cases where editorial and minor presentational corrections are required, a two-week period of amendment will apply.

On receipt of the resubmitted work the examiners reserve the right to require a further viva examination.

g) **Fail** so that the candidate is not awarded a degree.

**M8.2 Recommendations following the Submission of Minor Amendments**

a) **Award**

b) **Award subject to the completion of editorial and minor presentational corrections.**

The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner normally within two weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

c) **Fail** so that the candidate is not awarded a degree.

Where a candidate has been required to complete minor amendments and resubmits work that is not to the satisfaction of the internal examiner, the work must be presented for consideration by all examiners before a recommendation can be made.

**M8.3 Recommendations following the Submission of Referred Work**

Only one opportunity for referral is permitted.

Following the examination of referred work (including a viva examination where required), the examiners may recommend:

a) **Award** (without amendments)
b) Award subject to the completion of editorial and minor presentational corrections.

The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner normally within two weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

c) Award subject to minor amendments.

The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner within three months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

d) Award the degree of MPhil subject to the presentation of the work amended to the satisfaction of all examiners within three months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination OR in cases where editorial and minor presentational corrections are required, a two-week period of amendment will apply

Where the resubmitted work is not to the satisfaction of the examiners, the candidate will not be awarded the degree.

This outcome is not available where the initial recommendation was a referral to resubmit for MPhil.

e) Fail so that the candidate is not awarded a degree.
SECTION N REGULATIONS FOR THE AWARD OF PHD BY PUBLICATION

The following regulations govern the specific rules for award for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy by Publication. These should be read in conjunction with the General Regulations Governing all Research Degrees, described in section I.

This award may only be offered in Schools where published guidelines exist, that have been through validation and subsequently been approved by the University Research Committee and the Senate.
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N1 The Award

Doctoral degrees are awarded to candidates who have demonstrated:

• the creation and interpretation of new knowledge, through original research or other advanced scholarship, of a quality to satisfy peer review, extend the forefront of the discipline, and merit publication
• a systematic acquisition and understanding of a substantial body of knowledge which is at the forefront of an academic discipline or area of professional practice
• the general ability to conceptualise, design and implement a project for the generation of new knowledge, applications or understanding at the forefront of the discipline, and to adjust the project design in the light of unforeseen problems
• a detailed understanding of applicable techniques for research and advanced academic enquiry.

Typically, holders of the qualification will be able to:

• make informed judgements on complex issues in specialist fields, often in the absence of complete data, and be able to communicate their ideas and conclusions clearly and effectively to specialist and non-specialist audiences
• continue to undertake pure and/or applied research and development at an advanced level, contributing substantially body of work to the development of new techniques, ideas or approaches.

PhD by Publication

The PhD by Publication is awarded to a candidate who has:

• submitted a series of peer-reviewed academic papers, books, cited works or other materials that have been placed in the public domain as articles that have been published, accepted for publication, exhibited or performed, prior to enrolment
• presented a substantial commentary linking the published work, putting it in context and outlining its coherence and significance in terms of knowledge creation
• demonstrated the acquisition and utilisation of research skills equivalent to those of a traditional PhD student
• included a literature review in the submission
• successfully presented and defended the body of work by viva examination to the satisfaction of examiners.

N2 Thesis Length
The work as a whole should be equivalent in length or volume to the work required for a full doctoral thesis.

It is expected that the majority of publications presented will be recent.

Examples of work which might be suitable for PhD by Publication could include:
• Four or five articles which have been published in quality academic journals
• One or more academic books, chapters, monographs, scholarly editions of a text

The text of the commentary should be a minimum of 15,000 words (excluding references and appendices).

N2 Enrolment Periods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of Study</th>
<th>PhD by Publication Maximum Enrolment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Candidates must submit their work at the end of the standard enrolment period. Failure to do so will lead to a termination of the candidate’s registration on the grounds of non-submission.

• There is no submission pending period for this route.
• Candidates may not apply for an extension at the end of the standard enrolment period.
• Suspensions are not normally available on this route but candidates may apply in very exceptional circumstances.

N3 Admission Criteria
In addition to the general criteria, normally the minimum level of attainment required for entry is:

• a body of published work which, prima facie, is appropriate for the award of a doctorate; and,
• a Master's degree from a UK University or equivalent, in a discipline appropriate to the proposed programme to be followed; and
• an upper second class honours degree from a UK university in a discipline appropriate to that of the proposed programme to be followed; and
• appropriate research or professional experience at postgraduate level, which has resulted in published work, written reports or other appropriate evidence of accomplishment.

N4 Thesis Examination

For the award of PhD by the publication route, the candidate shall be examined by at least two external examiners and one internal examiner who has undergone University training for the role.

The examination for PhD by the publication route has two stages

• the submission of the actual publications with a commentary and an abstract;
• its defence by viva examination.

On referral, the requirement for a viva examination is at the discretion of the examiners.

N4.1 Recommendations Following Examination

Following examination including a viva examination, the examiners may recommend:

a) **Award** (without amendments)

b) **Award subject to the completion of editorial and minor presentational corrections.**

The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner normally within two weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

c) **Award subject to minor amendments.**

The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner within three months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

d) **Referral to complete major amendments**
The candidate may be required to make amendments to the commentary and/or possible additions to the publications. Any additions must be from a body of work published prior to enrolment for the award.

The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of all examiners within six months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

On receipt of the resubmitted work, the examiners reserve the right to require a further viva examination.

e) **Fail** so that the candidate is not awarded a degree.

### N4.2 Recommendations Following the Submission of Minor Amendments

a) **Award**

b) **Award subject to the completion of editorial and minor presentational corrections.**

The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner normally within two weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

c) **Fail** so that the candidate is not awarded a degree

Where a candidate has been required to complete minor amendments and resubmits work that is not to the satisfaction of the internal examiner, the work must be presented for consideration by all examiners before a recommendation can be made.

### N4.3 Recommendations Following the Submission of Referred Work

Following the examination of referred work (including a viva examination where required), the examiners may recommend:

a) **Award** (without amendments)

b) **Award subject to the completion of editorial and minor presentational corrections.**

The revised submission must be presented to the satisfaction of the internal examiner normally within two weeks from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.
c) **Award subject to minor amendments.**

The resubmission addressing all amendments must be completed to the satisfaction of the internal examiner within three months from the date of the notification of the outcome of the examination.

No award will be conferred unless the internal examiner is satisfied that all corrections have been made.

d) **Fail** so that the candidate is not awarded a degree.

Where the outcome of an examination (either at initial consideration or following referral) is that the candidate should not be awarded the degree, candidates are not permitted to submit a new application within two years from the date of the original examination.

A second or subsequent application must include evidence of additional work.
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