



Academic & Assessment Regulations

2018-2019

Governing Undergraduate and Postgraduate Programmes Validated by the University of Sussex and, as applicable, any other relevant programmes at Level 4 or higher, delivered by University Centre Croydon (HNC, HND, DET)

This page has been left intentionally blank.

PART ONE: GENERAL ACADEMIC REGULATIONS		Page
A	OVERVIEW	1
	A1 Background	1
B	ADMISSIONS	2
	B1 Background	2
	B2 Application Stage	2
	B3 Interview Stage	2
	B4 Non-certificated entry at standard entry point (not with advanced standing)	2
	B5 Undergraduate Certificated Minimum Entry Requirements	3
	B6 Post Graduate Diploma or Certificate Minimum Entry Requirements	4
	B7 Applicants re-applying following a previous termination of studies at UCC	4
C	ADMISSION WITH ADVANCED STANDING AND ACCREDITATION OF PRIOR (EXPERIENTIAL) LEARNING	6
	C1 Background	6
	C2 Credits required to be undertaken at University Centre Croydon post registration for an award	6
	C3 Assessment requirements and exemption from programmes / admission with advanced standing	7
	C4 Overarching considerations for admission with advanced standing and accreditation of prior learning	8
	C5 Accreditation (or credit transfer) of Prior Learning which is certificated (APL)	9
	C6 Accreditation of Prior Experiential Learning which is not certificated (APEL)	10
	C7 The AP(E)L Committee	11
D	ACADEMIC STRUCTURE	13
	D1 Background	13
	D2 Levels of Study	13
	D3 Undergraduate Levels of Study	13
	D4 Post Graduate Levels of Study	14
	D5 Modular Credit Structure	14
	D6 Credit Accumulation	15
	D7 Module Size	15
	D8 Module Types : Core, Mandatory, Designate Modules	15
	D9 Foundation Degrees Modules and Work Related Learning	16
	D10 Undergraduate Modes of Study	17
	D11 Post Graduate Modes of Study	17

PART TWO: ASSESSMENT REGULATIONS

E	ASSESSMENT, MARKING AND FEEDBACK	18
E1	Background	18
E2	Formative Assessment	18
E3	Summative Assessment	18
E4	Disability	19
E5	Foundation Degree Work Experience Assessment	19
E6	Summative Module Assessments	20
E7	Marking Process	20
E8	Feedback	22
F	ASSESSMENT SCHEME FOR FOUNDATION, UNDERGRADUATE AND POST GRADUATE AWARDS	23
F1	Background	23
F2	Aggregations and Weightings	23
F3	Mandatory Modules and Components	23
F4	Student Responsibilities	24
F5	Undergraduate Module Outcomes	25
F6	Award of Undergraduate Credit	26
F7	Retrieval of Failure in order to Progress or Receive Award (UG)	29
F8	Postgraduate Diploma in HRM Module Outcomes	32
F9	Award of Postgraduate Diploma in HRM Credit	32
F10	Postgraduate Diploma in HRM Retrieval of Failure	32
F11	Postgraduate Diploma in HRM Progression	33
G	AWARDS	35
G1	Background	35
G2	Exit Awards and Named Awards	35
G3	Calculation of Award Classification	37
G4	Termination of Studies on the grounds of academic failure	38
H	ASSESSMENT BOARDS AND EXTERNAL EXAMINERS	39
H1	Background	39
H2	External Assessment Boards	39

H3	External Examiners	41
H4	Internal Assessment Boards	43
H5	Recording of Assessment Outcomes	44
H6	Awards for Withdrawn Students	46
H7	Publication of Results	47

PART THREE: ACADEMIC PROCEDURES

J	PROCEDURE GOVERNING ALLEGATIONS OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT	48
J1	Background	48
J2	Underlying Considerations	48
J3	General Principles	49
J4	Definitions	49
J5	Identifying and Classifying Academic Misconduct	51
J6	Investigating Officer	51
J7	Procedures for Reporting Allegations of Academic Misconduct	51
J8	Written Report into Suspected Academic Misconduct	52
J9	Determination of Minor and Major Cases of Misconduct	53
J10	Minor Misconduct	54
J11	Major Misconduct	54
J12	No Case	55
J13	Investigation of Minor Misconduct	55
J14	Penalties to be Applied: Minor Misconduct	55
J15	Investigation of Major Misconduct	56
J16	Major Misconduct Panel Composition	57
J17	Penalties to be Applied: Major Misconduct	60
J18	External Assessment Board Role in Allegations of Misconduct	61
J19	Appeal Procedure	61
K	INTERMISSION OF STUDIES AND MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES	62
K1	Background	62
K2	Intermission of Studies Procedure	62
K3	Mitigating Circumstances Procedure	62

L	TERMINATION OF STUDIES	69
L1	Background	69
L2	Withdrawal at the Student's Request	69
L3	Withdrawal on Grounds of Academic Failure	69
L4	Withdrawal on Grounds of Poor Attendance	69
L5	Disqualification from Award on Grounds of Academic Misconduct	69
L6	Withdrawal due to Time Lapse	69
L7	Exclusion / Suspension	70
L8	Notification Timescales	70
L9	Appeals against Termination of Studies	70
L10	Financials Obligations and Termination of Studies	70
L11	Return following Termination of Studies	70
M	ASSESSMENT APPEALS PROCEDURE	72
M1	Background	72
M2	Grounds for Appeal	73
M3	The Procedure for Appeal	73
M4	The Function of the Assessment Appeals Panel	75
M5	The Constitution of the Assessment Appeals Panel	76
M6	Convening of Assessment Appeals Panel	76
M7	Conduct of Assessment Appeals Panel Hearings	77
M8	Decisions of the Assessment Appeals Panel	79
M9	Confidentiality	80
M10	Right of Appeal to the Awarding Bodies	80
N	STUDENT COMPLAINTS	82

PART ONE: GENERAL ACADEMIC REGULATIONS

A Overview

A1 Background

A1.1 These regulations have been written in conjunction with the QAA Framework for Higher Education Qualifications, UK Quality Code for Higher Education, and the Foundation Degree Qualification Benchmark Statement.

A1.2 These regulations comprise the rules for the construction, operation and assessment of higher education undergraduate and postgraduate programmes validated by the University of Sussex and delivered at University Centre Croydon. These regulations, or relevant parts thereof, also apply to other relevant Level 4 or higher programmes delivered by University Centre Croydon.

A1.3 Every higher education student must, as part of their studies, familiarise themselves with these regulations as they explain University Centre Croydon's:

- Academic and modular structure
- Assessment regulations
- Procedures for dealing with academic misconduct
- Procedures for applying for intermission
- Procedures for claiming mitigation
- Procedures for academic appeals

To help students understand these procedures, personal tutors must introduce and explain the key points from the Academic Regulations during the induction period. To aid this process, sign-off sheets will be provided with references to relevant sections in the regulations. The students are required to sign the sheets to acknowledge that the relevant topics have been explained to them; a copy of this will be kept in the student's tutorial file.

A1.4 The regulations are binding on University Centre Croydon staff and students (and external examiners) in those matters that the regulations determine. Contravention of them by staff may result in action against the member(s) of staff concerned under University Centre Croydon's Disciplinary Procedure. Contravention of them by students may result in action as outlined by these Regulations.

A1.5 The regulations are also available on the University Centre Croydon student and staff Intranets.

B Admission to University Centre Croydon Higher Education Programmes

B1 Background

B1.1 University Centre Croydon aims to provide the opportunity for access to higher education for all students who have demonstrated the potential to benefit from the programme to which they have applied. 'Potential to benefit' is here used to mean potential to complete an identified programme of study successfully.

B1.2 University Centre Croydon's admissions process is designed to ensure that all applicants, including those from backgrounds with little experience of higher education, have an equal opportunity to demonstrate their potential to benefit educationally.

B1.3 In consultation with the Head of Study Plus and the Admissions Department, University Centre Croydon shall make reasonable adjustments to the admissions process in order to accommodate disabled students.

B2 Application Stage

B2.1 All applications to University Centre Croydon will be reviewed to ascertain if they provide sufficient evidence of 'potential to benefit' in relation to the minimum entry requirements of the programme of study.

B3 Interview Stage

B3.1 Applications that meet the minimum entry requirements of the programme of study applied for proceed to the Interview Stage where University Centre Croydon feels that an interview or another method of assessment would benefit the student. This stage is designed to provide additional opportunities to demonstrate 'potential to benefit' through a range of other methods such as interview, portfolio and admissions tests. The specific details of Interview Stage procedures will vary according to the specific academic subject and level of the programme applied for.

B3.2 The Interview Stage will be required for all applicants who have re-applied following a withdrawal from a University Centre Croydon Programme.

B4 Non-certificated entry at standard entry point (not with advanced standing)

B4.1 Applications that seek to demonstrate 'potential to benefit' through non-certificated prior

experiential learning will be considered. Such applications need to demonstrate that prior learning is equivalent to or higher than that of the standard minimum entry requirements.

B4.2 The Interview Stage will provide appropriate opportunities to further establish this 'potential to benefit'. Applicants whose qualifications do not conform to the standard entry requirements detailed below will be considered on merit. The applicant must be capable of operating at the appropriate Undergraduate or Postgraduate level. Relevant vocational, professional or other experience will be taken into account.

The applicant must demonstrate knowledge, skills and understanding equivalent to or higher than the standard entry requirements for the programme of study; assessment tasks may be set in order to provide opportunities for applicants to do so. Portfolios of existing work may also be used to demonstrate knowledge, skills and understanding. Applicants must evidence equivalency to standard entry requirements across all areas including written work, problem solving and cognitive reasoning, practical skills etc.

B4.3 The achievement of entry requirements does not guarantee the offer of a place; the offer is subject to satisfactory interview and references, and the availability of places on the programme.

B5 Undergraduate Certificated Minimum Entry Requirements

B5.1 Applicants will need to provide evidence of the following minimum requirements (programme specifications will specify additional requirements for individual programmes):

- The achievement (or likely achievement) of a minimum of 80 UCAS points for standard Honours Degrees and Diplomas of Higher Education or a minimum of 0 48 UCAS points for FdA programmes from A Level, BTEC Extended Diploma or other equivalent advanced level course; or
- Other UK/Overseas Level 3 qualifications, recognised by University Centre Croydon as equivalent to the above.

Mature applicants may be considered on relevant experience without having the required tariff points as outlined in B4.1 and B4.2 above.

B5.2 Applicants may also be required to provide evidence of additional subject specific qualifications, and/or evidence of practical skills through portfolio or audition.

B5.3 Applicants will need to provide evidence of English language skills as demonstrated by:

- A pass in English Language at GCSE at grade C or above; or
- IELTS test at band 6.0 or above with a minimum overall score of 6.0 with a minimum of 6.0 in reading and writing and 6.0 in speaking and listening; or
- Level 2 literacy demonstrated through University Centre Croydon's internal assessment procedures
- Another qualification which University Centre Croydon recognises as equivalent to the above.

NOTE: Students requiring a Tier 4 visa **must** provide evidence of their English language ability through one of the Home Office approved English language qualifications; see <http://www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk>

B6 Postgraduate Diploma or Certificate Minimum Entry Requirements

B6.1 Applicants will need to provide evidence of the following:

- An Honours Degree in a relevant subject; or
- Other equivalent vocational or professional qualifications; or
- Other recognised equivalent UK/Overseas qualifications.

B6.2 Applicants may also be required to provide evidence of additional subject specific qualifications.

B7 Applicants Re-applying Following a Previous Termination of Studies at University Centre Croydon

B7.1 All applicants whose studies at a University Centre Croydon programme were previously terminated will be required to attend an interview as part of the application process. The interview must include a specific discussion of whether the applicant's 'potential to benefit' has improved since their previous unsuccessful study at University Centre Croydon. The interview must also include a specific discussion of how the outcomes from the applicant's previous study at University Centre Croydon would impact on their status with regard to the course applied for, in particular if they are re-applying for the same programme. This includes but is not limited to marks transcript, period of registration for award, and current academic standing.

B7.2 For certain types of withdrawal there may be a prescribed period of minimum length during

which students may not reapply to study at University Centre Croydon. Details are outlined in Section L of this document (Termination of Studies).

C Admission with Advanced Standing and Accreditation of Prior (Experiential) Learning

C1 Background

C1.1 The Accreditation of Prior (Experiential) Learning, or AP(E)L, is a means of recognising or assessing learning acquired outside of University Centre Croydon or partner University.

This may take the form of accreditation of prior learning that is certificated (APL), whereby a student has studied a formal programme at another institution and has evidence of that achievement in the form of a transcript and certificate.

Alternatively this may take the form of accreditation of prior experiential learning (APEL). In this case the learning has taken place other than on formal programmes, for example in the workplace.

In the following regulations these three conventions are used:

- APL= Accreditation of prior learning;
- APEL= Accreditation of prior experiential learning
- AP(E)L= Either 'Accreditation of prior learning' or 'Accreditation of prior experiential learning'.

C1.2 Heads of School and Academic/Programme Leaders have the responsibility of applying these Regulations.

C2 Credits required to be undertaken at University Centre Croydon post registration for an award

C2.1 There should be an absolute minimum, irrespective of programme, of 60 credits (at the appropriate level) which must be undertaken at University Centre Croydon post registration for an award which will guarantee an academic experience approved by the validating University.

Additional Requirements for individual programmes are outlined in the next section.

C2.2 Above this absolute minimum, the proportion of credit which must be undertaken at University Centre Croydon on a programme validated by the University of Sussex varies depending on the award and length of the programme as follows:

- Postgraduate Diploma: 60 credits at Level 7
- Postgraduate Certificate: all credits must be taken at University Centre Croydon
- Graduate Diploma: 60 credits of which 36 must be at Level 6
- Graduate Certificate: all credits must be taken at University Centre Croydon
- Undergraduate degrees: 120 credits minimum (at Level 6 or 5/6)
- Undergraduate Diploma: 120 credits at Level 5
- Undergraduate Certificate: 60 credits at Level 4
- Undergraduate Certificate: all credits must be taken at University Centre Croydon

C2.3 The minimum amount of AP(E)L credit that may be given to an individual student shall be equivalent to one module at any level.

C2.4 University Centre Croydon cannot admit students directly into Level 6 of degree programmes validated by the University of Sussex other than where a validated articulation arrangement exists such as in the case of Foundation Degrees which are also awarded by the University. University Centre Croydon cannot normally admit students directly into Level 5 of Foundation Degree programmes.

C3 Assessment requirements and exemption from programmes / admission with advanced standing

C3.1 The minimum amount of assessment to be undertaken at and conducted by University Centre Croydon providing a validated University of Sussex programme should be 50% (of the weighted assessment) of that specified for any given award in order to verify it as, and guarantee the standard as, a University of Sussex award.

C3.2 The 50% minimum assessment must include:

I. The assessment associated with the highest level credits in the programme as follows:

- Level 7 for postgraduate diplomas and certificates
- Level 6 for undergraduate degrees
- Level 5 for undergraduate diplomas
- Level 4 for undergraduate certificates

C4 Overarching considerations for admission with advanced standing and accreditation of prior learning

C4.1 When considering an application for admission with advanced standing, consideration must be given to whether the applicant's prior learning satisfies:

- I. The general credit required for direct entry at a given level of the programme (i.e. the applicant has accumulated the required number of credits at the appropriate level thereby demonstrating an overall standard of attainment appropriate for progression to the next level)
- II. The specific credit required for the programme concerned (i.e. there must be an appropriate match of prerequisite knowledge, of subject content, and of learning outcomes between the prior learning of the applicant and the prior levels/years of the University of Sussex validated programme).

C4.2 It may be that an applicant satisfies the general credit requirements (e.g. 120 credits at Level 4 required for progression to Level 5), but does not fully meet the specific entry requirements (e.g. a match for a specific module which is a prerequisite).

C4.3 In circumstances detailed in C4.2, an applicant may exceptionally be admitted with advanced standing but be required to take the requisite module(s) (and credits) in addition to the regular level 5 programme of study.

- a) The applicant is required to produce evidence of the prior learning (in the form of authorised transcripts). It is for University Centre Croydon to determine whether or not the general and specific credit of the Sussex validated programme has been satisfied and whether or not the student has the ability to complete the programme.
- b) Where a student is admitted with advanced standing and marks are imported, the assessment weightings approved for the Sussex award will be applied to any imported marks (for the purposes of the award assessment) and not those attributed by the originating institution.
- c) AP(E)L credit for learning acquired in settings other than on programmes of University Centre Croydon may be given to an individual student at the point of admission, or at any stage after enrolment but before the award is conferred (subject to the overall limits set out above).
- d) A student may be awarded a mixture of APL and APEL credit.
- e) AP(E)L credit (general and specific) shall be recorded on the transcript that accompanies the student's award certificate.

- C5 Accreditation (or credit transfer) of Prior Learning which is certificated (APL)**
- C5.1** Accreditation of Prior Learning which is certificated (APL) may take place either on admission to a programme or at any stage after enrolment prior to award.
- C5.2** Students shall submit original certification to University Centre Croydon in respect of any application for credit for prior certificated learning (APL).
- C5.3** The Head of School or Academic/Programme Leader for the programme in question, acting on the authority of the AP(E)L Committee, shall assess APL credit for individual students by completing a standard AP(E)L application form. He or she shall also be responsible for making a judgement about the currency of certificated prior learning subject to approval by the AP(E)L Committee.
- C5.4** Credit may only be given where a student has achieved APL credit at an equivalent or higher level than the level at which the student is studying or applying to study at University Centre Croydon.
- C5.5** If a student has achieved APL credit within University Centre Croydon or on a compatible programme that can be accepted towards an award of the University of Sussex*, marks may be carried forward into the classification of the student's final award. The student shall normally make such a request at the time of applying for credit. The AP(E)L Committee, acting on behalf of the External Assessment Board, shall approve the uses (if required) of agreed conversion tables submitted through the AP(E)L Coordinator for the production of marks. **Where the scheme or programme is not compatible, the classification of the student's final award shall be calculated on the modules studied at University Centre Croydon.** The AP(E)L Committee shall make the final decision on compatibility of other courses and schemes.
- *NOTE: Marks are normally only carried forward from a University of Sussex validated award
- C5.6** APL credit cannot be given retrospectively to replace a failed module grade awarded by a College External Assessment Board.
- C5.7** Upon close scrutiny, the AP(E)L Committee may determine that applicants with a particular qualification are to be admitted regularly with a standard amount of credit; this shall be specified in the programme handbook or programme regulations.

C6 Accreditation of Prior Experiential Learning which is not certificated (APEL)

- C6.1** The Accreditation of Prior Learning which is not certificated may take place either on admission to a programme or at any stage after enrolment. An experience in any setting, such as paid or voluntary work or community activities, can provide appropriate learning opportunities.
- C6.2** The AP(E)L Committee, acting as an External Assessment Board, shall be responsible for overarching arrangements to assess APEL applications.
- C6.3** The applicant or student shall be given an initial diagnostic interview, the outcome of which shall record the credit applied for, the format and deadline of any assessment and any negotiated learning outcomes. The individual applicant's prior learning may be formally assessed either by requiring the applicant to take an appropriate form of assessment, which may include a written assignment, a *viva voce* examination, portfolio, performance, oral presentation or artefact. Attendance at APEL guidance sessions shall not in itself constitute such formal assessment.
- C6.4** Internal examiners shall be responsible for assessing whether or not the applicant has achieved the learning outcomes for APEL credit and they shall be accountable either to the AP(E)L Committee acting as an External Assessment Board or to an External Assessment Board.
- C6.5** Second marking conventions and sampling conventions in these Regulations shall apply, with the rider that the Head of School or Academic/Programme Leader shall act as one of the markers where the other marker has limited experience of the APEL process.
- C6.6** APEL general or specific credit (as appropriate) shall be awarded to a student who has successfully demonstrated the achievement of the requisite learning outcomes by the AP(E)L Committee acting as an External Assessment Board.
- C6.7** A student who fails to achieve the learning outcomes within an APEL assessment shall be permitted one reassessment.
- C6.8** A student shall have the right of appeal against failure in the APEL assessment process. (See the Assessment Appeals Procedure: Academic Regulations L.)

C6.9 The Dean of University Centre Croydon, supported by the HE Registry Assessments Officer, prepares an annual report with an analysis of the number of students receiving APL and APEL.

It must include an analysis of:

- the average Credits (or ECTS) points awarded
- disaggregated by level
- disaggregated by programme area

with additional analysis of the distribution of Credits (or ECTS) points

C6.10 University Centre Croydon reserves the right to change, without notice, the process of assessing whether and to what extent APL or APEL may be awarded.

C7 The AP(E)L Committee

C7.1 The functions of the AP(E)L Committee are:

- To review and approve where appropriate claims made by Head of School or Academic/Programme Leader for Accreditation of Prior Learning or Accreditation of Prior Experiential Learning;
- To provide recognition of standard equivalences of qualifications for the purposes of accreditation of prior learning;
- To establish precedents for what is acceptable and not acceptable as evidence for accreditation of prior experiential learning;
- To monitor the number of awards of prior learning and the volume in terms of average Credits points.

C7.2 The Membership of the AP(E)L Committee comprises:

- Dean of University Centre Croydon or Associate Dean (Chair)
- Academic Leaders and Heads of School with responsibility for higher education programmes
- Programme Leaders
- HE Registry Assessments Officer or nominee (Secretary)

The meeting is quorate when the Dean, the secretary and three others are present.

C7.3 The APL or APEL proposal form must be completed and signed by the Academic Leader

or Programme Leader of the programme on which the student is enrolled and passed to the HE Registry Assessments Officer at least **five working days** before the Committee meets.

- C7.4** Proposals for awards of APL or APEL must be made in person to the Committee by the Head of School or Academic/Programme Leader for the programme on which the student is enrolled.
- C7.5** Proposals for approval of precedents and equivalences of qualifications may be made by any member of the Committee.
- C7.6** The Committee gives approval by majority vote; in the event of a tied vote, the Chair has the casting vote.
- C7.7** In the case of proposals for APL or APEL, a Head of School and Academic/Programme Leader of the area from which the proposal is made, if present, is excluded from the voting process.

D Academic Structure

D1 Background

D1.1 Each academic year of study normally consists of two semesters that are 15 weeks in duration. Some Fast Track programmes have a three trimester year to include a Summer Studies period.

D1.2 The first and last week of each semester are normally used for procedures such as induction, tutorials, assessment, review and administration. The remaining weeks of each semester consist of direct programme delivery and assessment/examination. Students must attend for the full programme of study in each academic year.

D1.3 The Summer Studies period will normally be 10 weeks in duration depending on programme structure. Some or all of this period will usually be used for Dissertation or Project work for part-time Honours Degree students or Bridging Studies for Foundation Degree Students progressing to Honours level study.

D1.4 University Centre Croydon's academic structure supports part-time routes to higher education qualifications. The length of these programmes may vary according to the qualification. For example, part-time Honours study normally operates over a minimum of four academic years and part-time Foundation Degree study normally operates over a minimum of three academic years. Full-time and part-time study routes for the same qualification always cover the same curriculum.

D1.5 Some University Centre Croydon's programmes offer an option with a professional placement year between Level 5 and Level 6 of the programme. For a standard undergraduate full-time programme (excluding any breaks in learning and/or retakes), the sandwich option would increase the standard length of programme from three to four years.

D2 Levels of Study

As a student progresses to each level of study on a higher education programme, the level of the work presents a greater academic challenge than the previous one. For example, at undergraduate level, this is often reflected in the fact that students are progressively given a greater role in the planning, organisation and direction of their studies. They are also expected to demonstrate an increasing sophistication in their contextual awareness, analytical and technical skills. From their first level of study, students are expected to

understand and uphold the principles of academic integrity.

D3 Undergraduate Levels of Study

D3.1 There are three levels of study for Undergraduate degrees: Levels 4, 5 and 6. Honours degree programmes are comprised of all three levels of study, while Foundation Degree and Higher National Diploma programmes are comprised of levels 4 and 5. Higher National Certificate Programmes are at level 4. The Diploma in Education and Training is comprised of Level 5.

D3.2 *Level 4:* This level includes an introduction to study at higher education level, including the acquisition of fundamental knowledge and skills, the understanding of basic principles and concepts and the resolution or expression of relatively simple problem solving and ideas. It is therefore the most prescribed and tutor-initiated part of the programme.

D3.3 *Level 5:* This level requires the selective application of fundamental knowledge, skills and principles to a range of specified contexts. Students are expected to demonstrate sound analytical skills and research methodologies. This level also deals with the acquisition of more advanced knowledge, higher levels of analysis and the understanding of more complex principles. Students are normally expected to take more responsibility for their own academic development and are given the opportunity to negotiate a personal learning programme.

D3.4 *Level 6:* This level requires students to explore the inter-relationship of knowledge domains and demonstrate a high degree of understanding, independent judgement and critical self-awareness. Students are required to demonstrate significant self-determination in identifying and achieving objectives through a managed learning process. This level is designed to enable students to demonstrate a capacity for sustained independent study and to generate work to a professional standard.

D4 Postgraduate Levels of Study

D4.1 University Centre Croydon delivers higher education programmes up to Post Graduate Diploma level.

D5 Modular Credit Structure

D5.1 The 'module' is the building block upon which programmes of study at University Centre Croydon are based. The modular scheme developed by University Centre Croydon provides students with some flexibility and choice in their studies within a structured framework. The modular scheme also makes study far more transparent to students by ensuring that every module is supported by an appropriate description of its aims and learning outcomes. Monitoring student progression towards an award is facilitated by the scheme through the use of student transcripts that record the attainment of credits.

D6 Credit Accumulation

D6.1 The modular credit framework is based on the successful acquisition and accumulation of credits. Module credits are ascribed to a specific higher education level as set out in the QAA Framework for Higher Education Qualifications. At University Centre Croydon, credits are at Levels 4, 5, 6 and 7.

D7 Module Size

D7.1 Modules vary in their credit rating and the specific module rating for each programme is listed in the relevant Definitive Document or the Awarding Body specification. The most common size of module for undergraduate programmes is 20 credits or sometimes 40 or 60 credits in the final year of an Honours programme. The size of the module expressed in credits indicates the volume of study that is generally required in order to successfully acquire the knowledge and understanding to pass the module.

1 credit equates to approximately 10 learning hours, therefore in order to pass a 10-credit module, a student will generally be expected to have devoted 100 learning hours to that module. The term learning hours is inclusive and covers the time spent on independent study and assessment as well as that in formal teaching sessions.

D7.2 Normally, students on undergraduate programmes are expected to register for 60 credits (full time), or up to 45 credits (part time) per semester. Students on postgraduate programmes are normally expected to register for 60 credits (full time), or up to 40 credits (part time) per semester.

D7.3 The proportion of direct tuition to independent study for a particular module will vary depending on content, but this does not affect the amount of credit that will be awarded upon successful completion of the module.

D8 Module Types: Core, Mandatory, Option Modules

D8.1 All programmes of study offered by University Centre Croydon are made up of different types and combinations of modules. Modules fall into three complementary categories: **Core, Mandatory or Option**. The classification of modules is contained within individual programme specifications. The same module may be classified differently on different programmes of study.

D8.2 Modules are normally delivered within a single semester. In many cases this will be for the duration of the semester, but a module may also be delivered intensively over a fewer number of weeks. A module may be delivered over 2 semesters for sound pedagogical reasons where approved at validation.

D8.3 **Core modules** (often referred to as 'specialist', 'prescribed' or 'compulsory' modules), are to be taken by all students following a particular programme of study. These modules are designed to offer students the underpinning knowledge necessary to progress with their studies.

D8.4 **Mandatory modules** are not only prescribed, like core modules, but a **pass in them is required** as a condition to progress and/or achieve the award.

They are used for the following purposes:

- 1) Where the knowledge and/or skills they contain are necessary to;
 - a) achieve the target award (and are confined to this module), and
 - b) undertake further mandatory modules in the programme structure
- 2) Where an external validating body requires them to meet the requirements for professional recognition.

D8.5 **Option modules** are offered within programmes to enhance student choice and enable students to add breadth to their studies. These modules are normally offered as a required choice from a range of options at a specific stage, semester or level of a programme of study.

D9 Foundation Degrees Modules and Work Related Learning

D9.1 Foundation Degree qualifications include specific knowledge, understanding and skills that

are vocationally relevant and will require the engagement with work related contexts including work related learning, professional practice, work based learning and, where appropriate, work experience.

D9.2 *Work related learning* accurately reflects relevant working practices and contexts through activities such as project work, workshops, role plays and case studies but does not necessarily take place at the work place.

Professional practice includes the introduction to specific knowledge, understanding and skills relevant to a specified industry or professional sector.

Work based learning includes learning that occurs in the workplace. The definition of 'workplace' will vary dependent upon patterns of work, organisation within different industries or professional sectors, ranging from large corporate settings to individual freelance practitioners' premises or locations.

Work Experience or *work placement* provides a specific opportunity to engage with work based and work related learning in the workplace for a specific period.

D9.3 The Foundation Award (FDA) will include a minimum of the equivalent 120 credits that provide the opportunity for work related learning. In addition, this qualification will include a minimum of 20 credits that specifically provides the opportunity for an assessed work experience.

D10 Undergraduate Modes of Study

D10.1 Full-time programmes of study will normally comprise 3 x 20 credit modules in each semester and 6 x 20 credit modules per academic year. It is usual to have a larger 40 or 60 credit project or dissertation module in Level 6 of undergraduate BA (Hons) programmes or in Level 5 of undergraduate FdA programmes.

D10.2 Part-time programmes of study will normally comprise no more than 2 x 20 credit modules in a semester and no more than 4 x 20 credit modules in an academic year.

D11 Postgraduate Modes of Study

D11.1 A standard postgraduate study module is 20 credits denoting 200 learning hours. Modules are generally only delivered within a single semester or Summer Studies period.

D11.2 The standard template for each semester of a full-time programme will comprise 3 x 20

credit modules. These may, however, be divided or aggregated into smaller or larger modules.

D11.3 The requirements of Professional Body accreditation for some programmes may necessitate that some postgraduate level modules are comprised of 10 or 15 credits.

PART TWO: ASSESSMENT REGULATIONS

E Assessment, Marking and Feedback

E1 Background

E1.1 Assessment is the means by which University Centre Croydon and its awarding body assure themselves that students are acquiring specified learning outcomes as outlined in programme specifications. The nature and method of student assessment employed within University Centre Croydon varies from programme to programme and module to module. This is to ensure that the most appropriate assessment approach for each area of study is used.

E1.2 These regulations describe University Centre Croydon's student assessment procedures in relation to undergraduate and postgraduate programmes validated by the University of Sussex. They have been developed to provide both assessors and students with a clear understanding of University Centre Croydon's expectations regarding assessment and its outcomes.

E2 Formative Assessment

E2.1 Formative assessment provides students with information about their developing skills, knowledge or abilities. Formative assessment is an important feature of the assessment profile as it provides students with the opportunity to reflect critically upon their academic performance as compared to the learning outcomes specified for the programme. Formative assessment significantly contributes to the personal development process and facilitates students' self-reflection and evaluation in the context of experiential learning. All higher education programmes of study offer formative assessment opportunities and these are identified in programme handbooks.

E3 Summative Assessment

E3.1 Summative assessment is often undertaken at the end of a module and is formally recorded on the student transcript subsequent to formal confirmation by the relevant External Assessment Board. This type of assessment may be based on continuous coursework (project work, assignments and presentations), final examinations (time-constrained), final project work, or a combination of these. In each case, summative assessment is used to represent a student's overall level of attainment for a specific module of study by assessing performance against stated learning outcomes. Summative

assessment is recorded as a percentage mark (any exceptions are given in the module specification). Details about precise assessment requirements for individual modules can be found in programme handbooks. Marks or grades provided through assessment feedback are subject to ratification by the relevant External Assessment Board.

E4 Disability

E4.1 Schemes and programmes, their objectives and learning outcomes, shall be designed in line with the obligation on University Centre Croydon to set no unnecessary barriers to access to higher education by people with disabilities. In consultation with the Head of Study Plus, University Centre Croydon shall make reasonable adjustments to teaching, learning and assessment arrangements for individual disabled students.

University Centre Croydon will consider whether a reasonable adjustment to learning and assessment is appropriate, or possible, whilst maintaining academic standards in delivery and assessment of module learning outcomes. A reasonable adjustment should always result in a fair and equal opportunity for the student to succeed without conferring an advantage over other students, in order to comply with the principles of assessment.

E4.2 Where students believe they have a disability, a mental health condition or a specific learning difficulty, they should contact Study Plus within 21 calendar days of the start of the academic year, or at the earliest opportunity following a late diagnosis, to discuss support and reasonable adjustment options available.

E4.3 No reasonable adjustments will be made for a student who has not registered with Study Plus.

E4.4 Any reasonable adjustment proposals for extended deadlines for the submission of written or practical work must be referred by Study Plus staff to the relevant Head of School for approval.

E5 Foundation Degree Work Experience Assessment

E5.1 All Foundation Degree programmes include formative and summative assessed Work Experience. Employers or Workplace Mentors may contribute to both formative and summative assessment of student performance in relation to work experience, though they do not directly award marks for student performance. Employers provide Workplace Mentor Reports that focus on vocationally specific attainments and key skills which are used by College academic staff to inform the award of marks.

E6 Summative Module Assessments

E6.1 Assessments for individual module components (examinations, assignments etc.) are conducted during or at the end of each semester. These component marks are aggregated to arrive at an overall module mark.

E6.2 Module marks are themselves subsequently aggregated to arrive at an overall “level percentage” and (upon completion of the programme), where relevant, a “classifying percentage”.

E6.3 Module and level marks are considered initially by Internal Assessment Boards and subsequently by External Assessment Boards; the latter are empowered to award credit, make decisions about progression, and to make awards (see section H).

E7 Marking Process

E7.1 University Centre Croydon is committed to ensuring consistent and reliable standards of assessment and feedback using robust internal processes; these are moderation and double marking. In addition, the External Examiner system provides a final tier of external scrutiny.

E7.2 All work should be moderated. In addition, work in the following categories must be double marked:

- All postgraduate level
- Level 6 on Bachelors and LLB awards
- Level 5 on Foundation Degrees
- Level 5 on HND
- Level 5 on Diploma in Education and Training (a sample)

E7.3 There may be other cases where it would be advisable for work to be double marked, for example in the case of a member of staff new to teaching. The Academic / Programme Leader will make the decision to extend double marking in such cases. Moderation and double marking must involve work from ALL students studying a particular module – this applies equally when there are multiple groups taught separately.

E7.4 Moderation involves a second examiner reviewing a representative sample of work from across the full range of marks awarded. The purpose is to confirm that the first examiner

has applied the assessment criteria consistently and fairly. The role of the moderator is therefore not to give a second mark nor negotiate a final mark. If after reviewing the sample, the moderator believes that the first examiner has applied assessment criteria consistently and fairly, the process is complete and the marks of the first examiner are confirmed; this is recorded on the Module Assessment form. If the moderator believes that the criteria have not been applied consistently and fairly, all work (not just the sample) is second marked according to the process outlined in E7.5.

The moderation sample shall:

- Be **at least** 20% of the total (with a minimum of 10)
- Include work from all grades and grade boundaries
- Include all work awarded <40% undergraduate, and <50% postgraduate by the first examiner
- Include all work awarded >70% by the first examiner

E7.5 Double marking follows on from first marking and requires a second internal examiner to independently mark all students' work using the agreed criteria and any marking scheme that may be applicable. The marks awarded by the two examiners are then reviewed together by both, and agreed marks arrived at for each individual student. All three marks are recorded on the Module Assessment form. Internal examiners shall normally resolve disagreements on marks by discussion and reach a consensus, but not an average. That is they must aim to agree the basis for the mark: they do not simply divide the difference by 2, or indeed any other denominator.

If the 1st and 2nd examiners cannot reach agreement a third examiner may be required to review either all work, or individual cases. External Examiners will not be asked to moderate individual cases; an agreed internal mark must be arrived at.

E7.6 The Academic / Programme Leader shall have management responsibility for all marking matters relating to specific programmes, and will allocate second examiners for moderation and double marking. Module Leaders shall have responsibility for all marking matters relating to individual modules, including the input of final marks on University Centre Croydon's electronic system for any students except Retakers at least 5 working days prior to the Internal Assessment Board, and the submission of a completed Module Assessment form to the HE Registry Assessments Officer at least 5 working days prior to the Internal Assessment Board for any Retaking students.

E7.7 All marks are provisional pending the approval of the External Assessment Board.

E7.8 The Academic / Programme Leader must ensure that marks are entered on the electronic system or, for Retaking students, submitted to the HE Registry Assessments Officer five working days before the Internal Assessment Board or Internal Assessment (Resubmission) Board meeting is scheduled to take place. Repeated failure by academic staff to meet this deadline, or failure by the Head of School or the Academic / Programme Leader to pass the marks to the HE Registry Assessments Officer, may be addressed under University Centre Croydon's Staff Disciplinary Procedure.

E8 Feedback

E8.1 Students will normally be provided with written *Assessment Feedback* within three College weeks of the submission deadline of summative assessments, including examinations. For formative assessment, the feedback will be provided in not more than two weeks. This will aim to provide constructive and timely formative advice and guidance in relation to the extent to which specified learning outcomes have been achieved and ways in which performance could have been improved. All marks and grades for summative assessments are conditional on approval by the relevant External Assessment Board or External Assessment (Resubmission) Board.

E8.2 All written feedback must be given on the standard HE feedback pro formas.

F Assessment Scheme for Foundation, Undergraduate and Postgraduate Awards

F1 Background

F1.1 Students shall be assessed in accordance with the Regulations on assessment and Assessment Boards.

F1.2 Each student shall be offered an opportunity to be assessed in each module for their programme of study under an approved scheme of assessment during the semester in which the module is studied.

F1.3 There may be a number of items of assessed work for each module. The programme and module specifications shall include the assessment scheme for each module and the weighting of each item of assessed work.

F1.4 If a student is unable, through disability, to be assessed by the normal methods, under procedures established on behalf of University Centre Board, Assessment Boards or, exceptionally, Chairs of Assessment Boards may vary the methods as appropriate.

F2 Aggregations and Weightings

F2.1 The pass mark for individual components within modules is 40% at undergraduate and 50% at postgraduate level. However, because of aggregation (see below) it is possible to pass a module whilst not achieving a pass mark in all components. If components are specified as mandatory, they must be passed irrespective of aggregation.

F2.2 The results from each item of assessed work shall be aggregated according to the weightings specified in the validated module specification, to produce an overall mark for the module. Should an item of assessed work not be submitted or be submitted beyond the late submission deadline without valid mitigating circumstances, a mark of zero will be recorded for that item.

F3 Mandatory Modules and Components

F3.1 Programme Specifications may require a particular module to be passed as a condition of progression or award. These are called ***Mandatory Modules***. A compulsory work placement module or period of study or work experience abroad shall always be

mandatory. Module specifications may additionally require particular items of assessed work to be passed in order for the module to be passed. These are designated **Mandatory Components**. All Mandatory Module and Mandatory Component designations are approved at validation.

F4 Student Responsibilities

- F4.1** It shall be the responsibility of students to familiarise themselves with the assessment regulations and with the examination and coursework submission timetables to ascertain details of assessment deadlines.
- F4.2** It shall be the responsibility of students to submit work for assessment by the specified deadlines in the prescribed format and to attend examinations, normally at the earliest opportunity offered in respect of both categories. Students are required to confirm that all work submitted for assessment is their own.
- F4.3** It shall be the responsibility of students who believe they have valid reasons for absence from an examination or for non-submission of an item of assessed work to familiarise themselves with the Mitigation or Intermission procedures for making a claim, and the circumstances in which they are allowed to do so.
- F4.4** It shall be the responsibility of students to familiarise themselves with the guidance for accessing the electronic marking systems and to access these systems to check their results.
- F4.5** It shall be the responsibility of students who believe they have grounds for requesting reviews of decisions of an External Assessment Board - or a relevant body that reports to the External Assessment Board (as outlined in Sections J, K and M) to submit the Academic Appeal form and evidence to the Registry and Partnership Manager to invoke the Academic Appeals Procedure within 21 calendar days of the publication of the results of the External Assessment Board or of the date of the outcome letter from the relevant body that reports to the Board. External Assessment Board results are issued by Registry and are published on the College's electronic data system. Registry notifies students of the results publication date by a posting on UCC Hub, which triggers an email to their student College email address. Outcome letters relating to decisions made by relevant bodies that report to the External Assessment Board are issued by Registry in accordance with timescales specified in the relevant procedures.

F5 Undergraduate Module Outcomes

F5.1 Passing of Undergraduate Modules

In order to pass an undergraduate module a student must achieve a minimum aggregate mark (calculated from the weighted components) of 40%. Professional and statutory bodies may, however, stipulate that all components must be individually passed in order to pass the module; if so this will be detailed in the Programme Specification.

F5.2 Late Submission

There shall be a window of 7 calendar days during which work may be submitted and marked subject to a penalty deduction:

- I. A penalty deduction of 5 percentage points (not 5% of the actual mark) shall be applied to work submitted up to 24 hours late.
- II. A penalty deduction of 10 percentage points (not 10% of the actual mark) shall be applied to work submitted after 24 hours and up to 7 days late.
- III. If the deduction in line with I. or II. would reduce the mark below the pass mark, a penalty of mark capping at 40% will apply instead.

If a case for mitigation is upheld, the penalty deduction or capping will be removed.

Work will not be accepted more than 7 days after the original deadline. A mark of 0 and a non-submission will be recorded.

No window shall be available for resubmission deadlines where marks are already capped at 40%, unless successful mitigation applies, in which case the 7-day late submission deadline may apply if relevant.

The late submission window is for the maximum of 7 calendar days from the original submission deadline (or from the approved extended deadline as per E4.4) and shall not be extended to account for College closures or holidays.

It is the responsibility of Academic / Programme Leaders to plan reasonable submission deadlines that enable late submission opportunities for students who are submitting hard copies of work, such as portfolios, fashion collections and similar – where practicable.

Is it the responsibility of students who are submitting hard copies of work to familiarise themselves with College closure dates and ensure that they are aware of their implications for a potential reduced opportunity for late submission.

F6 Award of Undergraduate Credit

F6.1 Academic Credit

Credit is a quantified means of expressing equivalence of learning. Credit is awarded to a learner in recognition of the verified achievement of designated learning outcomes at a specified level. It is a way of comparing learning achieved in a variety of different contexts. A student shall be awarded Credit for a module where they have achieved a minimum overall module mark (calculated from the weighted component marks) of 40%.

F6.2 Credit is awarded when an aggregate module mark of 40% is achieved (see F5.1). Under certain circumstances compensated/condoned credit may also be awarded (see below).

F6.3 Academic Failure

A student who fails to achieve a minimum of 20 credits (at the end of level progression/award External Assessment Board,), shall be withdrawn from the programme on the grounds of academic failure. Should mitigation apply to any modules, the student will be offered resits/submissions on these modules, and normal regulations will apply.

F6.4 UG Progression from Levels 4-5, and Levels 5-6

A student must achieve 120 credits and a level mark of $\geq 40\%$ to progress from Level 4 to 5 and from 5 to 6.

Retrieving credit: criteria for Trailed credit, Non-discretionary compensated credit and Condoned credit

A maximum of 20 credits may be awarded at each level by an External Assessment Board via either trailed, compensated or condoned credit, subject to the criteria below being met:

F6.5 Discretionary Trailed Credit

An External Assessment Board has discretionary authority to offer an undergraduate student the opportunity to progress to the next level of study while trailing up to a maximum of 20 credits from the previous level, provided that an uncapped level mean of 50% (including the failed module) has been achieved. Permission to trail credit will normally only be granted by an External Assessment (Resubmission) Board following a failed resit. In exercising its discretion, the Board will take into consideration evidence of attendance and engagement across the stage such that the student is likely to succeed at

the next assessment opportunity.

Credit can be trailed at all levels, including into the final level but not beyond the final level.

No trailing of credit is permitted on Fast Track Programmes.

F6.6 Trailed credit will result in the student taking a trailed resit for a module/s already studied with the aim of retrieving the initial fail without attendance.

Students trailing a module will only be entitled to a single trailed resit. A trailed resit is a further final opportunity to take the resit mode which tests all the module learning outcomes.

A trailed resit will result in the capped mark being used for award purposes.

Where the trailed assessment has not been passed after the conclusion of the trailed resit the External Assessment Board may consider other mechanisms available for the retrieval of credit.

A repeat year given by the External Assessment Board must include a trailed module where it has not been passed in the failed year.

F6.7 Non-Discretionary Compensated Credit

Compensation is **automatically** applied at each level of study for marginal fail(s) of up to 20 credits provided the level mean has been achieved on the basis that a strong performance by a student in one part of the curriculum may be used as the basis for the award of credit in respect of a marginal fail elsewhere.

F6.8 Where a student has not achieved the credit requirement for progression or award but has met the following criteria, then up to 20 credits will automatically be granted by compensation provided that the remaining credits in the level meet the pass threshold (40%) and the following conditions are met:

- (i) an uncapped level mean across the full 120 credits of 40% has been achieved
- (ii) the fail on the module/s is marginal (35-39%)

F6.9 Exceptionally, a module may be exempt from the application of non-discretionary compensation based on a Professional and/or Statutory Body (PSB) requirement approved by the University (usually at validation).

F6.10 A maximum of 20 credits per level in undergraduate programmes may be awarded by non-discretionary compensation to enable level progression or award. Compensation will be applied at the External Assessment Board where the criteria are met. The actual mark achieved will stand for progression and award purposes. However, a student awarded compensation in this way may request a resit/resubmit as an alternative. In such cases the student must notify Registry in writing within 10 working days of the publication of the results. Registry must notify the Chair of the External Assessment Board in writing within 10 working days of receipt of the student's request.

The mark achieved at resit will be capped and will stand **even where** it is lower than the original mark achieved which may impact on progression where progression to the next stage had been offered.

F6.11 Modules classified as mandatory in the Programme Specification cannot be compensated.

F6.12 UG Discretionary Condoned Credit

Condonement is applied at the level of the programme. It is defined as the process by which an External Assessment Board, in consideration of the overall performance of a student, decides that without incurring a penalty, a part of the programme that has been failed need not be redeemed.

F6.13 The External Assessment Board has discretionary authority to award up to a maximum of 20 credits via condonement at the time the undergraduate final award is considered, where the programme learning outcomes have been met and the relevant level mean has been achieved. Credit via condonement is not dependent upon an individual module threshold mark being achieved and is awarded only when the final award is considered. However, the assessment must have been attempted by the student; credit via condonement is not available for modules that have been failed due to non-submissions or absence.

F6.14 The original mark achieved will stand for award purposes. Alternatively, the External Assessment Board can give a resit/resubmission. The component mark(s) achieved at resit/resubmission will not be capped and will stand even where they are lower than the original mark achieved. The module mark will be capped at 40%.

A maximum of 20 credits may be granted via a combination of compensated and condoned credit at the time the undergraduate final award is considered.

F6.15 A student given condonement may request a resit/resubmit as an alternative. In such cases the student must notify Registry in writing within 10 working days of the publication of the results. Registry must notify the Chair of the External Assessment Board in writing within 10 working days of receipt of results.

F6.16 The External Assessment Board cannot condone a module failed as a result of misconduct or those classified as mandatory in the Programme Specification.

F7 Retrieval of Failure in order to Progress or Receive Award (UG)

F7.1 End of level Progression/Award External Assessment Board

Students who, at the **end of level progression/award External Assessment Board**, are not able to progress or complete their award after trailed credit, compensation or condonement are applied/considered, shall be offered resit/resubmission for all failed components. Students may decline the opportunity to resit/resubmit in writing prior to the resit or resubmission deadline. **The mark achieved at resit/resubmission will be capped and will stand even where it is lower than the original mark achieved which may impact on progression.**

F7.2 External Assessment (Resubmission) Board

Students who, at the External Assessment (Resubmission) Board, have achieved a minimum of 20 credits but are still not able to progress or receive their award after trailed credit, compensation or condonement are applied/considered, shall:

- At *Level 4* be offered a repeat level providing they have not retaken that level previously, (in which case they will be required to withdraw); or, if at the External Assessment (Resubmission) Board they have achieved at least 60 credits, the opportunity to retake failed modules with attendance.
- At *Levels 5 or 6* at the discretion of the External Assessment (Resubmission) Board be offered a repeat level providing they have not retaken that level previously (in which case they will be required to withdraw); or, if at the External Assessment (Resubmission) Board they have achieved at least 60 credits, the opportunity to retake failed modules with attendance

F7.3 A student studying on a Fast Track programme shall only be entitled to be re-assessed (see below) for up to 40 credits. Should more than 40 credits be outstanding at a level progression point the student will be required to leave Fast Track mode and join the

Standard Track where standard regulations apply.

F7.4 Resit/Resubmission (Reassessment)

A resit/resubmission is an opportunity to retrieve initial failed component(s) without having to repeat the original period of teaching and learning. No fees are normally payable for resit / resubmission, unless the student wishes to repeat the original period of teaching and learning, in which case the retake module fee is payable. Resit/resubmission opportunities will only be offered for modules where the relevant pass mark for the module has not been achieved (40% undergraduate) and/or the credit has not been awarded by the External Assessment Board, for example where there is a Professional and/or Statutory Body (PSB) requirement for passing the module as set out in the Programme Specification.

F7.5 Only failed components are required to be re-assessed. The new marks for resit/resubmitted components will be uncapped, and will be conflated with the marks for previously passed components. The conflated mark will be capped at the level of the module (40%), unless the uncapped mark is below 40%.

F7.6 The module mark achieved at resit / resubmission will be capped and will stand even where it is lower than the original mark achieved, which may impact on progression where progression to the next stage had been offered. In cases where mitigation applies, the External Assessment Board may uncapped the module mark.

F7.7 Retake of Modules

Retaking of modules follows resit / resubmission where a student has still failed to meet the requirements for progression or award (after the application/consideration of trailed credit / compensation / condonement.

Retake of Modules is discretionary to the External Assessment Board at all levels and will only be considered where the student has achieved a minimum of 60 credits at the level. A maximum of 60 credits can be retaken at each level.

Individual modules are retaken with attendance, and no assessments from the first take may carry forward. Previous marks are set aside and the new marks are capped at 40%.

Retaking a module comes with one further opportunity to resit if required. A fee is payable for retake modules.

F7.8 Repeat of Level (see F7.2 above)

Repeat of level can follow resubmission, or may be required/requested at the Summer

External Assessment Board, depending on the level of failure. The repeat of a level is considered where the student has not previously repeated the level, and they have previously achieved a minimum of 20 credits (and normally no more than 40 credits) at the level. The repeat of a level of study means retaking the stage ab initio as published with attendance. That is a repeat of the teaching, learning and assessment. All previous marks and credit will be expunged from the student record and a new full assessment cycle undertaken. Repeat of level comes with one further opportunity to resit/submit if required; however, a student who has had 4 attempts at any module and is still unable to progress or receive award shall be required to withdraw.

F7.9 Non-completion of professional placement year

Some programmes as University Centre Croydon offer a professional placement year between the standard Level 5 and Level 6 of the programme, which the students can choose to progress onto upon successful completion of Level 5, as an alternative to progression to standard Level 6.

If the student subsequently withdraws from their professional placement year before the end of the normal late registration period, i.e. before the end of teaching week three of the academic year, they will be moved onto the standard Level 6 of the programme and will be able to continue with the programme that academic year.

If the student subsequently withdraws from their professional placement year after the normal late registration period, they will be transferred onto the standard version of the programme but will be required to intermit for the rest of the academic year, to join the standard Level 6 the following academic year. The professional placement year will be recorded as a Fail on their diploma supplement.

F7.10 Reassessment shall normally be based on the same principles and requirements as the first opportunity for assessment and shall assess achievement of the same learning outcomes.

F7.11 A student shall not have the right to be reassessed in elements which are no longer current in the programme.

F7.12 The External Assessment Board may, at its discretion, make such special arrangements as it deems appropriate in cases where it is not practicable for students to be reassessed in the same elements and by the same methods as at the first attempt. The programme regulatory schedule in the programme handbooks shall specify the means of reassessment

of any period of work experience or work-based learning.

F7.13 Reassessment may take place in-year or during the summer resit period following the session in which the module was taken. For some assessments (for example those based on action research in teaching, or practical project work) re-assessment will need to take place during formal teaching periods. Students must attempt any type of reassessment (Resit/Resubmission, Retake, Repeat of year) at the next relevant assessment opportunity available, otherwise their studies may be terminated by University Centre Croydon depending on the student's assessment status (see Section L7).

The External Assessment Board shall determine the re-assessment period and deadline in all cases.

F7.14 A student shall not be entitled to resit or retake a module for which a pass mark has been awarded (other than where a complete level is retaken).

F7.15 If a student believes that their failure, absence or non-submission of work was due to illness or other valid reasons, they may submit a claim under the Mitigation Procedure (see section K3 below).

F8 PgDip HRM Module Outcomes

F8.1 Passing of PgDip HRM Modules

In order to pass a PgDip HRM module a student must achieve a minimum of 50% in all components.

F8.2 Late Submission

There shall be a one week window during which work may be submitted and marked subject to a penalty deduction:

- I. A penalty deduction of 5 percentage points (not 5% of the actual mark) shall be applied to work submitted up to 24 hours late.
- II. A penalty deduction of 10 percentage points (not 10% of the actual mark) shall be applied to work submitted after 24 hours and up to 7 days late.
- III. If the deduction in line with I. or II. would reduce the mark below the pass mark, a penalty of mark capping at 50% will apply instead.

If a claim for mitigation is upheld the penalty deduction or capping will be removed.

Work will not be accepted more than 7 days after the original deadline. A mark of 0 and a non-submission will be recorded.

No window shall be available for resubmission deadlines where marks are already capped at 50%.

F9 Award of PgDip HRM Credit

F9.1 Academic Credit

Credit is a quantified means of expressing equivalence of learning. Credit is awarded to a student in recognition of the verified achievement of designated learning outcomes at a specified level. It is a way of comparing learning achieved in a variety of different contexts. A student shall be awarded Credit for a module where they have achieved a minimum component mark of 50% in all components.

F10 Pg Dip HRM Retrieval of Failure

F10.1 Re-assessment

A student who does not pass a module at the first attempt shall be entitled to be re-assessed in any components not passed. The subsequent overall module mark will be capped at 50% (unless subject to a successful mitigation claim in which case marks shall be uncapped).

F10.2 If a student achieves a lower mark following reassessment, the re-assessed mark will stand.

F10.3 Reassessment shall normally be based on the same principles and requirements as the first opportunity for assessment and shall assess achievement of the same learning outcomes.

F10.4 A student shall not have the right to be reassessed in elements which are no longer current in the programme.

F10.5 The External Assessment Board may, at its discretion, make such special arrangements as it deems appropriate in cases where it is not practicable for students to be reassessed in the same elements and by the same methods as at the first attempt. The programme regulatory schedule in the programme handbooks shall specify the means of reassessment of any period of work experience or work-based learning.

F10.6 Reassessment shall usually take place during the summer resit period following the session in which the module was taken. For some assessments (for example those based on action research in teaching, or practical project work) re-assessment will need to take place during formal teaching periods. The External Assessment Board shall determine the

re-assessment period and deadline in all cases.

F10.7 Re-taking

A student who fails to pass a module following re-assessment will be given one opportunity to re-take the whole module including undertaking any assessments previously passed at the next available delivery. The module mark will be capped at 50%, whilst component marks are uncapped. This would normally be in the following academic year and the student would be required to enrol and follow the module tuition and would be liable for tuition fees. Retaking a module comes with one further opportunity for re-assessment.

F10.8 A student shall not be entitled to resit or retake a module for which a pass mark has been awarded.

F10.9 If a student believes that their failure, absence or non-submission of work was due to illness or other valid reasons, the student may submit a claim under the Mitigation Procedure (see Section K.3).

F11 PgDip HRM Progression

F11.1 In order to meet the requirements of the Chartered Institute of Personnel Development students must pass all modules (totalling 60 credits) attached to stage One of the programme before progressing to stage Two, which is comprised of a further 60 credits.

In order to pass a module a student must achieve a minimum of 50% in all components.

G Awards

G1 Background

G1.1 External Assessment Boards shall confer all awards, provided the student has achieved the learning outcomes of that level of the programme. Students who have not completed the programme for which they have been registered and have not re-enrolled on the same programme by the end of week 3 of teaching shall be issued with a certificate as a record of the highest level of award conferred on them.

G2 Exit Awards and Named Awards

G2.1 In the case of all awards, the Programme Specification will indicate mandatory modules/components, rules of combination, and any other programme specific requirements for that award.

G2.2 A Certificate of Higher Education shall be awarded to a student who has achieved 120 credits or more at Level 4 or above and achieved an overall weighted mean mark of $\geq 40\%$. A minimum of 100 credits must come from the modules listed in the programme specification of the named award.

G2.3 A Diploma of Higher Education shall be awarded to a student who has achieved 240 credits at Levels 4 & 5, and achieved an overall weighted mean mark of $\geq 40\%$ across 120 credits at Level 5. At least 120 credits must be at Level 5. A minimum of 200 credits must come from the modules listed in the programme specification of that named award.

G2.4 A Higher National Certificate (named award) shall be awarded to a student who has achieved 120 credits or more at Level 4 or above and achieved an overall weighted mean mark of $\geq 40\%$. A minimum of 100 credits must come from the modules listed in the programme specification of the named award. All mandatory modules listed in the programme specification must be passed.

G2.5 A Higher National Diploma (named award) shall be awarded to a student who has achieved 240 credits or more at Level 4 or above and achieved an overall weighted mean mark of $\geq 40\%$, with a minimum of 120 credits being at Level 5. A minimum of 200 credits must be academic credit coming from the modules listed in the programme specification of the named award. All mandatory modules listed in the programme specification must be passed.

- G2.6** A Foundation Degree (named award) shall be awarded to a student who has achieved 240 credits or more at Level 4 or above and achieved an overall weighted mean mark of $\geq 40\%$, with a minimum of 120 credits being at Level 5. A minimum of 200 credits must come from the modules listed in the programme specification of the named award. All mandatory modules listed in the programme specification must be passed.
- G2.7** An ordinary bachelors degree (named award) shall be awarded to a student who has met the requirements for a Diploma of Higher Education, and, achieved a further 60 credits (coming from the modules listed in the programme specification of the named award) at Level 6 and achieved an overall weighted mean mark of $\geq 40\%$.
- G2.8** A bachelors degree with Honours (named award) shall be awarded to a student who has met the requirements for progression to Level 6 and achieved a further 120 credits at Level 6, coming from the modules listed in the programme specification of the named award. All mandatory modules listed in the programme specification must be passed and an overall weighted mean mark of $\geq 40\%$ across levels 5 and 6 must be achieved.
- G2.9** An aegrotat award is reserved for those circumstances where it is unlikely that a student will be able to return to academic study in the foreseeable future and other possible solutions such as claim for Mitigating Circumstances or Intermission are inappropriate. An aegrotat degree (ordinary or unclassified honours variants) applies where a student has undertaken the assessments for programmes contributing a combined total of 60 credits or fewer in the final stage. There are two types of aegrotat award: aegrotat ordinary and aegrotat unclassified honours.
- The aegrotat unclassified honours award will be reserved for those exceptional circumstances in which the External Assessment Board recognises higher level academic achievement.
- In determining whether to recommend an aegrotat award the External Assessment Board will take account of the general level of performance that is available for evaluation, the expected trajectory had not circumstances intervened and any other such matters as the Board considers relevant to the case. This includes substantiation through the Mitigation Claims Review Panel of absence through ill health or other serious cause which has deemed the impairment so severe as to make return to study unlikely in a reasonable timeframe.
- G2.10** A postgraduate certificate (named award) shall be awarded to a student who has achieved 60 Level 7 credits coming from modules listed in the programme specification. All

mandatory modules listed in the programme specification at postgraduate certificate level must be passed and an overall mean mark of $\geq 50\%$ must be achieved.

- G2.11** A postgraduate diploma (named award) shall be awarded to a student who has met the requirements for the postgraduate certificate and achieved a further 60 Level 7 credits coming from modules listed in the programme specification. All mandatory modules listed in the programme specification must be passed and an overall mean mark of $\geq 50\%$ must be achieved.
- G3** **Calculation of Award Classification**
- G3.1** A Higher National Certificate with merit shall be awarded to a student who has achieved the requirements of a pass award, and who has a minimum weighted mean mark across 120 credits at Level 4 of 60%.
- G3.2** A Higher National Certificate with distinction shall be awarded to a student who has achieved the requirements of a pass award, and who has a minimum weighted mean mark across 120 credits at Level 4 of 70%.
- G3.3** A Higher National Diploma with merit shall be awarded to a student who has achieved the requirements of a pass award, and who has a minimum weighted mean mark across 120 credits at Level 5 of 60%.
- G3.4** A Higher National Diploma with distinction shall be awarded to a student who has achieved the requirements of a pass award, and who has a minimum weighted mean mark across 120 credits at Level 5 of 70%.
- G3.5** A Foundation Degree with merit shall be awarded to a student who has achieved the requirements of a pass award, and who has a minimum weighted mean mark across 120 credits at Level 5 of 60%.
- G3.6** A Foundation Degree with distinction shall be awarded to a student who has achieved the requirements of a pass award, and who has a minimum weighted mean mark across 120 credits at Level 5 of 70%.
- G3.7** Bachelors degrees shall be classified according to the following scheme. A weighted mean from the 120 credits at Level 5 shall constitute 40% of the classifying percentage A weighted mean from the 120 credits at Level 6 shall constitute 60% of the classifying percentage. The overall classifying percentage across Levels 5 and 6 will be calculated

and awards made according to the following boundaries:

40% - 49.99% = Third class

50% - 59.99% = Second class lower division

60% - 69.99% = Second class upper division

70% and above = First Class

- G3.8** The External Assessment Board shall have no discretion in determining awards; however, the following shall apply:
- if the classifying percentage as calculated above is within 2% of the next higher boundary, and
 - at least 50% (by credit volume) of modules across Level 6 have marks in the higher classification

The award shall be made at the higher classification.

- G3.9** A Postgraduate Certificate with merit shall be awarded to a student who has achieved the requirements of a pass award, and who has achieved a minimum weighted mean mark across the 60 Level 7 credits of 60%. A Postgraduate Certificate with distinction shall be awarded to a student who has achieved the requirements of a pass award, and who has a minimum weighted mean mark across 60 Level 7 credits of 70%

- G3.10** A Postgraduate Diploma with merit shall be awarded to a student who has achieved the requirements of a pass award, and who has achieved a minimum weighted mean mark across the 120 Level 7 credits of 60%. A Postgraduate Diploma with distinction shall be awarded to a student who has achieved the requirements of a pass award, and who has a minimum weighted mean mark across 120 Level 7 credits of 70%

G4 Termination of Studies on the grounds of academic failure

G4.1

The External Assessment Board may terminate study at University Centre Croydon only on the grounds of academic failure, i.e. when the student has exhausted all opportunities given in these regulations to achieve the award.

A full list of types of Termination of Studies is outlined in the relevant section of the present Academic Regulations.

H Assessment Boards and External Examiners

H1 Background

H1.1 An Internal and External Assessment Board shall be established for every Higher Education (HE) programme of study delivered at University Centre Croydon in order to oversee the assessment of students and recommend awards to the validating university.

H2 External Assessment Boards

H2.1 It is the role of the External Assessment Board to:

- Properly discharge their responsibilities to the awarding body with regard to making awards
- Implement all of University Centre Croydon's examination and assessment regulations that contribute to the offer of named awards
- Ensure that proper standards are maintained for the approval of awards
- Ensure that each student is fairly assessed, within the programme regulations, as an individual and in relation to his or her peers

H2.2 External Assessment Board Terms of Reference:

- To ensure appropriate student progression across all levels
- To approve student pass lists for all modules
- To approve final pass lists for awards
- To recommend conferment of the appropriate awards and their classifications to awarding bodies
- To consider all students who fail a module and determine the terms for the retrieval of failure
- To receive outcomes of mitigation panels and intermission
- To formally notify any students who fail a module and of their options
- To terminate studies on the basis of academic failure
- To consider and award academic credit as set out in University Centre Croydon's regulations
- To award non-discretionary compensated credit
- To consider the award of discretionary condoned credit and trailed credit
- To receive and respond to Examiners(s) reports and correspondence

H2.3 The membership of the External Assessment Board is as follows:

- Chair (from the University of Sussex)
- Vice-Chair (the Head of School or an Academic Leader of a group of programmes other than that in which the programme is located)
- Secretary, normally the HE Registry Assessments Officer
- Head of School and Academic / Programme Leader(s) for the programme(s) whose students are the subject of the meeting
- External Examiners(s)
- All Module Leaders for the programme(s) whose students are the subject of the meeting

(Attendance as appropriate):

- Other key staff
- Representatives of Validating Institution
- Representative of other External Body (where applicable)

The quorum is one third of the appointed members of the Board. At least one External Examiner should be present at each External Assessment Board where an award is made.

H2.4 External examiners act as full members of the Board. Their guidance and recommendations should be considered carefully.

H2.5 The role of the external examiner is to confirm that assessment for individual modules has been carried out fairly and consistently (in line with supplied assessment criteria, grade descriptors, and national norms), and to monitor and advise on the conduct of the External Assessment Board.

H2.6 All marks remain provisional until ratified by the External Assessment Board

H2.7 The final agreed marks array from the External Assessment Board must be signed by the external examiner(s) and the Chair of the External Assessment Board. A pass list is generated from the marks array and is transmitted to the awarding body for approval.

H2.8 Sub-Committees of the External Assessment Board

The External Assessment Board has a number of sub-committees that report to it. These are:

1. Mitigation Claims Review Panel
2. Academic Misconduct Panels

3. Appeals Panels
4. AP(E)L Committee

These groups undertake detailed work on behalf of the External Assessment Board, which allows the Board to carry out its business more effectively. Whilst the full External Assessment Board ultimately confirms final decisions, the Board does not re-visit decisions taken by these groups other than in the case of appeal.

H3 External Examiners

H3.1 University Centre Croydon, through its University Centre Board, nominates at least one external examiner for every higher education programme. External examiners play an important role in assuring University Centre Croydon and the validating institutions that:

- the assessment processes at University Centre Croydon are consistent and operate in a fair manner through the implementation of University Centre Croydon's Academic Regulations for Undergraduate and postgraduate Programmes;
- the academic standards of the higher education provision are appropriate and consistent with similar provision elsewhere; and
- good practice is identified and shared.

H3.2 External examiners are normally senior academics and professionals drawn from the higher education sector and industry. They are appointed by the validating partner for a four year period. External examiners are expected to attend meetings of the External Assessment Boards, sample and review examination scripts and other assessed work. They must also submit an annual report to University Centre Croydon and validating partner university on the operation of the programme and conduct of the External Assessment Board that highlights good practice and makes recommendations for the improvement of provision.

H3.3 External Examiners are required to attend External Assessment Boards where awards are to be made to ensure the meeting is quorate. At least one External Examiner, who has also attended the main External Assessment Board, is required to attend the External Assessment Board following a resit opportunity, where an award is made. If a programme has two External Examiners and one of them is unable to attend due to exceptional circumstances, the other External Examiner can agree to stand as a proxy. In such a case the non-attending External Examiner must:

1. Confirm in writing that they have undertaken moderation and agree the final

internal marks being presented at the External Assessment Board

2. Provide contact details (phone/email/fax as appropriate) to the Deputy Chair of the External Assessment Board or to the Registry Assessments Officer and be available to discuss any issues raised by telephone during the External Assessment Board

H3.4 All examination questions should be prior approved by the relevant external examiner(s). A sample of coursework assignments across all levels should also be reviewed by relevant external examiner(s).

H3.5 External examiners by means of sampling the marked work, establish whether

1. The rank order of students is consistent;
2. Assessment Criteria and marking schemes have been applied consistently;
3. The marking of students' work is consistent with national standards.

H3.6 The sample of students' work must be selected using the following criteria:

(1) The Volume of the Sample:

Total Number of Assignments/Scripts	Number to be Moderated
1-20	At least 50% and not fewer than 10
21-60	At least 33% and not fewer than 15
61-100	At least 25% and not fewer than 20
More than 100	At least 20% and not fewer than 25

H3.7 2) The sample must be chosen across the classification range, or, where there are only pass and fail classifications, from across the mark range.

- Assignments, scripts or practical work should be chosen near to each grade boundary,
- Some at least must be from near the middle of a grade range.

All scripts within 10% below the fail boundary must be moderated, and it is usual to include all work >70% within the sample.

H3.8 External examiners are not empowered to change marks themselves. However, if they identify issues they will recommend that the internal examiners revisit the assessment of particular components or modules in order to resolve the issues. For example the following recommendations may be made:

Issue	External Examiners Suggest an Alteration to Marks
The rank order is largely inaccurate	Team invited to remark all assignments/scripts for the component or module.

H3.9

Issue	Authority of External Examiners to Require an Alteration to Marks
Students awarded fails within 10% of the lower pass boundary are adjudged as passing by the external examiners, but at other levels the rank order is accurate and the marking is consistent with national standards.	Team invited to reassess all assignments/scripts.

H4 Internal Assessment Boards

H4.1 The remit of the Internal Assessment Board is to assemble all assessment information relevant to the deliberations of the External Assessment Board.

H4.2 Internal Assessment Boards are responsible for:

- Considering and discussing any academic matter or management issues affecting the development, operation or delivery of the provision.
- Checking that the double marking and moderation processes have been carried out according to the regulations
- Checking the marks and amending where necessary the electronic marking system or submitting amended marks for Retakers to the HE Registry Assessments Officer at least five working days before the External Assessment Board;
- Completing the summary form of all allegations of academic misconduct arising out of the assessment process
- Ensuring that the two summary forms and amended marks for Retakers are passed to the HE Registry Assessments Officer and amended marks for any students except

Retakers are amended on the electronic marking system at least five working days before the meeting of the External Assessment Board or the External Assessment (Resubmission) Board.

- H4.3** The membership of each Internal Assessment Board consists of :
- The Head of School and/or the Academic/Programme Leader (Chair)
 - Core academic staff: those who have been responsible for assessing students' work that is to be considered by the Internal Assessment Board and those who have led the modules for which that work has been produced.
- H4.4** • The grade sheets amended and/or approved at the Internal Assessment Board must be presented to the External Assessment Board.
- H4.5** Internal Assessment Boards normally meet 3 times a year
- H4.6** Meeting one is to prepare for the summer end-of-year External Assessment Boards in June or July.
- H4.7** Meeting two is in September in preparation for the External Assessment (Resubmission) Boards.
- H4.8** The third meeting is in February (between the first and second semesters of the academic session) in order to:
- Finalise marks achieved during the first semester;
 - Deal with issues of mitigation, intermission and allegations of academic misconduct;
 - Review the academic situation of their students.

If the programme requires an External Assessment Board at that time, then the internal board must also prepare all marks and the documentation for claims for intermission and mitigation and any allegations of academic misconduct.

H5 Recording of Assessment Outcomes

H5.1 All students whose work is to be considered by an Internal or External Assessment Board must have signed off the receipt of the Academic Regulations Sign Off sheets before their work is submitted or before they have sat the paper. The Academic Regulations Sign Off sheets provide a summary of key academic regulations and processes applicable to students' work and outcomes.

- It is the student's responsibility to do this; no student may be permitted to submit

work or to sit an examination without confirmation from the Academic / Programme Leader that they have completed these forms

- It is the Personal Tutor's responsibility to notify the Academic / Programme Leader of any of her/his tutees who has not done so.

- H5.2** No assignment or script may be considered for assessment that was not submitted by the due date and time, or within the specified late submission window.
- H5.3** The due date includes not only the published deadline for the submission of work, but any such dates for submission as may have been exceptionally agreed under the mitigation process.
- H5.4** The marking process must have been completed and marks entered on the electronic marking system or, for Retakers, submitted on MA1 forms to the HE Registry Assessments Officer, 5 working days before the Internal Assessment Board to enable the HE Registry Assessments Officer to prepare an accurate transcript of the marks for consideration by the Internal Assessment Board. It is the Academic / Programme Leader's responsibility to ensure that this is achieved. If examiners are absent and unable to mark the work, the Academic / Programme Leader must take all reasonable steps to manage the problem, so that the deadline is met. If the Academic / Programme Leader is absent through illness, then her/his responsibilities for managing the marking process devolve upon the Head of School. If the Head of School is absent, then her/his responsibilities for managing the marking process devolve upon the Dean of University Centre Croydon.
- H5.5** The component marks and their weightings must be entered on the standard Module Assessment (MA) spreadsheet. Marks for all components must be out of a denominator of 100. This is adjusted by the weightings. This must be used as a source document for entering marks on the electronic system, or, for Retakers, passed to the HE Registry Assessments Officer at least five working days before the Internal Assessment Board. This sheet, duly completed, is an essential link in the audit trail, and a copy must be retained on file by the HE Registry Assessments Officer and by the Head of School or the Academic/Programme Leader. All moderation and double marking is also recorded on this sheet, as are the names of those undertaking these roles.
- H5.6** At the Internal Assessment Board Meeting, the checks must be carried out as detailed above. Any doubts about the marking of any assignment or script should be raised by the markers at the meeting and the advice agreed incorporated into the re-marking of all

scripts for the component or module.

- H5.7** It is the responsibility of the HE Registry Assessments Officer to ensure that the Individual Student's Academic Record (ISAR) for each student whose work is being considered by the Internal and External Assessment Board is available at the meeting in the agreed format.
- H5.8** It is the responsibility of the Academic/Programme Leader to keep auditable records of the assessments (Module Assessment Sheets), the marks for which have been entered by academic staff on the electronic marking system or (for Retakers) have been passed to the HE Registry Assessments Officer. The Head of School or the Academic/Programme Leader and the HE Registry Assessments Officer must keep this auditable material securely, in compliance with the Data Protection Act 1998 for a period of six years. It is the responsibility of the HE Registry Assessments Officer to keep electronic records of all student transcripts indefinitely.
- H5.9** The External Assessment Board must provide the following information to be sent to students who have been adjudged to fail and who, under the regulations, are permitted a chance to retrieve their failure:
- What tasks need to be completed;
 - Arrangements in place for the student to liaise with academic staff during the retrieval period;
 - The deadline(s) for resubmission or resitting the module.
- H5.10** The minutes of the External Assessment Board must be completed and sent to each member of the Board within 15 working days of the meeting of the Board:
- H5.11** All examination scripts are retained by the Academic/Programme Leader until the deadline for appeals following the Re-submission Board has passed in any academic year. The Academic/Programme Leader must ensure that all other assignment media are made available to the students within 4 weeks of the External Assessment Board (or External Assessment (Resubmission) Board) Meeting.
- H6** **Awards for Withdrawn Students**
- H6.1** If a student who is registered for an award withdraws or is withdrawn from the programme as outlined in the Termination of Studies section, a lower award may, if appropriate, be recommended provided that the assessment and credit requirements associated with the

award have been met. The award will be recommended and, where justified by the student's academic record, be confirmed by an External Assessment Board.

H6.2 The lower qualification must have had one third of its assessments, calculated in terms of credits taught *and* passed at University Centre Croydon

H7 Publication of Results

H7.1 Students are formally notified of assessment outcomes following a meeting of the External Assessment Board via the electronic marking system. The date or date range of the result notification is announced to students via the University Centre Croydon Student Notice Boards and University Centre Croydon Hub on moodle.

At the end of the final level, or where students are awarded exit awards or transferring to another institution, the HE Registry Assessments Officer or nominee will provide them with a hard copy of the results in a prescribed format. Hard copies of students' results will normally be sent to students with their certificates, but will be issued by Registry at an earlier date on an individual basis if requested by students, for example when needed for the student's progression to another educational institution.

H7.2 The HE Registry Assessments Officer notifies students of their results via the electronic marking system within 15 working days of the date of the External Assessment Board.

H7.3 At the end of each level, the HE Registry Assessments Officer ensures that each student is notified of their academic status, the requirements of progression or pending award, as appropriate.

J Procedure Governing Allegations of Academic Misconduct

J1 Background

J1.1 University Centre Croydon is committed to promoting the values of academic integrity and preventing academic misconduct by educating students in appropriate academic conduct. All students are expected to understand and uphold the principles of academic integrity.

J1.2 The Purpose of this Procedure is:

1. To ensure that University Centre Croydon meets its obligations to the awarding bodies and its academic partners;
2. To maintain the academic standards of the qualifications for which University Centre Croydon has responsibilities;
3. To maintain equity of treatment of all University Centre Croydon's learners.

J2 Underlying Considerations

1. University Centre Croydon is a centre for a large number of different awarding bodies. In each case, University Centre Croydon has contractual obligations under civil law to uphold the procedures which those bodies have laid down to maintain the robustness and fairness of their awards. If members of staff act or collude to subvert these, then they place University Centre Croydon in a situation where it is in breach of its obligations and where University Centre Croydon may have its status as a centre for the awarding body's qualification withdrawn.
2. Certain serious breaches of awarding body regulations may constitute a serious criminal offence. For example, personating a student and sitting a public examination for her or him has in the past been punished by a prison sentence of two years.
3. Misconduct by staff in relation to awarding body regulations may constitute professional misconduct or even gross professional misconduct.
4. Misconduct by students, either cheating directly for their own benefit, or colluding with others, is not only a breach of the awarding body's regulations, but is also a breach of University Centre Croydon's disciplinary policy.
5. It is the obligation of any member of University Centre Croydon, staff or student, to inform the Head of School or Academic/Programme Leader responsible for the programme in respect of which the offence occurs, if s/he has evidence that misconduct has occurred in regard to any qualification.

J3 General principles

1. All work submitted for assessment must be the student's own work.
2. It is an offence for any student to be guilty of, or party to, collusion, plagiarism, the fabrication of research results, or any other act which may mislead the examiners about the development and authorship of work presented in assessments, including misleading examiners about the source of information included in an assessment
3. All work must fully acknowledge, in an approved format, all sources of information used in preparing the work being submitted. This includes acknowledging all written and electronic sources. Where work is produced under examination room conditions it will be sufficient to acknowledge the source without providing a full reference.
4. Students must not take notes or other means of accessing information into an examination room unless the rules explicitly state that this is allowed.
5. The development of academic skills is an important part of student learning. It is recognised that students new to UK higher education may be inexperienced, and may need time to develop good academic referencing skills. For this reason, first year undergraduate students and those new to UK higher education are strongly recommended to refer to the "Guide to Referencing" produced by University Centre Croydon Library Service.

J4 Definitions

J4.1 *Academic Integrity*

Academic integrity represents a set of values which operate as the foundation of academic practice. These values include honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility.

J4.2 *Assessment*

Assessment includes any submission made by a student for which marks contributing to a programme are awarded, including those programmes which are marked pass/fail. This includes oral, electronic, physical and written material, including examinations.

J4.3 *Collusion*

Collusion is the preparation or production of work for assessment jointly with another person or persons unless explicitly permitted by the Markers. An act of collusion is understood to encompass those who actively assist others or allow others to access their work prior to submission for assessment. In addition any student is guilty of collusion if they access and copy any part of the work of another to derive benefit irrespective of

whether permission was given. Where joint preparation is permitted by the Markers but joint production is not, the submitted work must be produced solely by the student making the submission. Where joint production or joint preparation and production of work for assessment is specifically permitted, this must be published in the appropriate module documentation.

J4.4 ***Plagiarism***

Plagiarism is the use, without acknowledgement, of the intellectual work of other people, and the act of representing the ideas or discoveries of another as one's own in written work submitted for assessment. To copy sentences, phrases or even striking expressions without acknowledgement of the source (either by inadequate citation or failure to indicate verbatim quotations), is plagiarism; to paraphrase without acknowledgement is likewise plagiarism. Where such copying or paraphrasing has occurred, the mere mention of the source in the bibliography shall not be deemed sufficient acknowledgement; each such instance must be referred specifically to its source. Verbatim quotations must be either in inverted commas, or indented, and directly acknowledged.

J4.5 ***Personation***

Personation is where someone other than the student prepares the work submitted for assessment. This includes purchasing essays from essay banks, commissioning someone else to write an assessment or asking someone else to sit an examination.

J4.6 ***Misconduct in unseen examinations***

Misconduct in unseen examinations includes having access, or attempting to gain access, during an examination to any books, memoranda, notes, unauthorised calculators, or any other material, except such as may have been supplied by the invigilator or authorised by official college or university bodies. It also includes aiding or attempting to aid another student, or obtaining or attempting to obtain aid from another student, or any other communication within the Examination Room. All instances of plagiarism, collusion, fabrication of results, or misconduct in an unseen exam are serious failures to respect the integrity and fairness of the examination process.

J4.7 ***Fabrication of results***

Fabrication of results or observations in practical or project work is where the student makes up their results or observations without basing them on facts acquired through the

practical or project work concerned.

J5 Identifying and classifying Academic Misconduct

University Centre Croydon assessment procedures are designed to enable the identification of plagiarism, personation and collusion, and University Centre Croydon may make use of electronic means in reviewing students' work. All allegations of misconduct are referred by means of a written report on the prescribed form to the Registry and Partnership Manager who shall refer the allegation to an Investigating Officer who will investigate the case in detail.

J6 Investigating Officer

The role of the Investigating Officer is to determine whether a case is major or minor based on the evidence file provided by the person who made the allegation (usually the Module Leader).

At the beginning of each academic year, each Head of School will identify academic staff members in their School who are authorised to act as Investigating Officers. In case of staff changes, it is the Head of School's responsibility to update the Registry and Partnership Manager of any amendments to the pool of Investigating Officers.

The Investigating Officers can investigate cases on modules owned by their School, unless they have taught or tutored the student who has been accused of academic misconduct. In that case, the case will be given to another Investigating Officer, either within the same School or from another School.

Investigating Officers may also act as Misconduct Panel members in cases where they have not determined the prima facie case and have not taught nor tutored the student in question.

J7 Procedures for reporting allegations of Academic Misconduct

J7.1 Examinations

If, during an examination, an invigilator believes that a student has committed an offence under these Regulations, he or she shall inform the student, and endorse the student's answer book with his or her initials, the time, and a brief note of the circumstances. Any prohibited material will be removed and retained until the incident has been investigated.

The student shall then be permitted to continue in a new answer book. A written report of the incident shall be made to the Head of School, the Dean and Associate Dean of University Centre Croydon and the Registry and Partnership Manager by the invigilator or examiner concerned, as soon as possible and normally within five working days of the incident. The Senior Invigilator shall, in addition, note the circumstances on the Senior Invigilator Report.

J7.2 All Assessments

1. Where an internal examiner establishes to their satisfaction that there is sufficient evidence of academic misconduct, they shall provide a written report to the Registry and Partnership Manager as soon as possible after the alleged offence has been identified.
2. Where an alleged offence is identified by an external examiner, the external examiner shall notify the internal examiner. The internal examiner shall report the incident as specified in Regulation J7.2.1 to the Registry and Partnership Manager as soon as possible after the alleged offence has been identified.
3. Where a student makes an allegation of academic misconduct against another student, the student shall report the incident to the Academic or Programme Leader for the programme. If the Academic or Programme Leader establishes to their satisfaction that there is sufficient evidence of academic misconduct, they shall provide a written report to the Registry and Partnership Manager as soon as possible after the alleged offence has been identified.
4. **Where the allegation is plagiarism**, the Marker should mark the work taking the plagiarism into account. If a piece of work is plagiarised, in whole or in part, the mark should be reduced in proportion to the extent of the plagiarism identified. Non plagiarised sections should be marked as standard. Therefore, the final mark should reflect a combination of the extent of the plagiarised passages, and the quality of the non plagiarised work; it may or may not be a fail mark
5. **Where the allegation is another form of misconduct**, the assessment should be given a mark which reflects the Marker's opinion of the work, as far as possible with the suspicion of misconduct discounted so that the mark awarded reflects the quality of the work as it stands.

J8 Written Report into Suspected Academic Misconduct

All allegations of misconduct are referred by means of a written report to the Registry and

Partnership Manager who shall appoint an Investigating Officer. The written report into the suspected Academic Misconduct should be made on the appropriate form and shall:

1. In the case of an allegation relating to an examination, state the time, date and location that the academic misconduct is alleged to have occurred. In the case of an allegation relating to coursework, the date when the internal examiner or another person making the allegation identified reasonable grounds for the allegation of academic misconduct;
2. Specify the full name and the student ID number of the student to whom the allegation relates;
3. Be in writing and signed by the person making it;
4. State the evidence on which the allegation is based and be accompanied by any relevant evidence where available;
5. Provide details of the assessment including the coursework or examination questions, the weighting of the item of assessed work and any information provided to students concerning academic conventions and practices.
6. In the case of plagiarism provide a copy of the Turnitin report

All of the above documentation must be completed and passed by hand to the Registry and Partnership Manager within 5 working days of identifying the alleged offence.

J9 Determination of Minor and Major Cases of Misconduct

The Investigating Officer should bear in mind the following when defining misconduct as either major or minor:

- a) the *extent* of the misconduct is a key factor: a piece of work which has been downloaded verbatim from the internet will inevitably be regarded as a prima facie case of major misconduct, whereas the lack of proper citation in one or two articles or where it is incorrectly formatted might be seen as a minor case of misconduct;
- b) *pre-meditated intention* is also a key factor. For example, where the evidence suggests that the student has deliberately made minor amendments of the plagiarised text to give the impression that it is their own work, such as by using the “find and replace” function, the misconduct might be deemed major even though the Turnitin score indicates a quantitatively minor breach. Conversely, a single instance of a large but un-edited section of non-attributed text within an essay which is otherwise properly referenced might justify deeming an apparently major case as minor

- c) the assessment *impact* is not a relevant issue. For example, academic misconduct is an equally serious matter regardless of component weighting or the level of study.

J10 Minor Misconduct

1. Minor misconduct is where a small proportion of a piece of assessed work is found to be plagiarised or has been subject to minor collusion (for example, where two students work together on producing a small section of an assessment or where the misconduct occurs in one of several small components of assessment), or where minor examination room infringements occur.
2. Misconduct is more likely to be considered 'minor' when a student is inexperienced and the misconduct relates mainly to the poor use of referencing protocols.
3. Multiple instances of minor misconduct are likely to lead to a charge of 'major' misconduct.
4. In the case of non-assessed work which contains material that would be subject to misconduct procedures were the work to be assessed, and such potential misconduct is identified, students will be referred to the published guidance on avoiding plagiarism and may receive advice as to future conduct. A 'notice of advice', which should include an indication of the guidance provided, may be held on the student's file. The student will be notified at their registered address if such a notice is retained. The notice of advice may be used only to establish that appropriate guidance has been provided, and may not be used to establish the extent of guilt should subsequent cases arise.

J11 Major Misconduct

1. Major misconduct is where a significant proportion of a piece of work is found to be plagiarised, where there is substantial collusion or fabrication of results or abuse of examination room protocols, where there is evidence of serial minor misconduct, or where personation has occurred.
2. Misconduct is more likely to be considered 'major' where the work contributes to the classification of an award, or where the student has experience of UK higher education.
3. Students found guilty of submitting work which they describe as their own but which has been produced on their behalf by another person, or found guilty of soliciting another person to undertake an assessment on their behalf (for example by commissioning someone to write an essay for them), or of undertaking to solicit or prepare an assessment on behalf of someone else shall be guilty of personation. Students guilty of personation are likely to receive the most severe penalty available.

J12 No Case

If the Investigating Officer believes that the evidence presented does not constitute a *prima facie* case, they will ask the Registry and Partnership Manager to request more information from the staff member who made the allegation. If the evidence is not provided within 5 working days of the Investigating Officer's request, the case will be dismissed and the file returned to the Academic or Programme leader for a relevant follow-up within the Programme Area. For example, even when a case is not confirmed as proven academic misconduct, the student might benefit from a referral to the Library for the Academic Referencing workshop.

J13 Investigation of Minor Misconduct

If the Investigating Officer determines that the breach is minor, the case will be referred to the Head of School (or nominee) for consideration. The Head of School (or nominee) will review the case material and interview the student within 10 working days of the case being referred by the Investigating Officer. The Head of School (or nominee) may dismiss the case or may apply a penalty as set out below.

Should the student fail to attend a pre-arranged meeting, the Head of School (or nominee) will review the case on the basis of the evidence available and apply the most appropriate penalty.

The meeting between the student and the Head of School should be attended by a Registry staff member who will take minutes and issue the outcome letter after the meeting.

J14 Penalties to be applied: Minor Misconduct

The following penalties are available to the Head of School (or nominee) or the Misconduct Panel:

1) A caution (usually reserved for a first offence where improvements to referencing would be sufficient to avoid a charge)

2) Reduce the mark for the assessment by 10 percentage points (not 10% of the mark), short of causing module failure

a) In all cases of plagiarism the student will also be required to attend an academic

- b) The Head of School (or nominee) will normally inform the student either of the penalty to be imposed, or of the dismissal of the case, at the end of the hearing (and / or in writing as soon as possible thereafter, and no later than 5 working days).

Note: If the work is not of pass standard *and* the overall module does not achieve a pass mark, the student must resit/resubmit/retake (according to their current standing) as per normal External Assessment Board Regulations. Loss of credit under the above rules cannot be readdressed by granting trailed, compensated or condoned credit.

J15 Investigation of Major Misconduct

If the Investigating Officer determines that the breach is Major, the case will be put before a Misconduct Panel. The composition of Misconduct Panels is given below. The following is a summary of the procedure:

1. The student will be sent a letter, notifying the time and place of the hearing, and containing the initial report along with any evidence collated, at least five working days in advance of the hearing. A copy of this Procedure will also be provided;
2. The student can be accompanied at the hearing by a member of University Centre Croydon, by a Student Advisor or another student from the programme;
3. The student is entitled (but not required) to attend a Panel hearing but may ask a representative to attend on their behalf in their absence, or they may submit a written statement. Misconduct hearings can proceed in the student's absence unless the Panel decides their presence is key to reaching a conclusion;
4. The Misconduct Panel will not consider the student's intentions when determining whether academic misconduct has actually occurred. It may consider intent when determining a penalty;
5. Panel members are required to familiarise themselves with the evidence before the Panel meeting. The panel discussion must be based on evidence provided and not rely on the presentation of the case on the day of the Panel meeting.
6. The staff member who made the allegation or the Module Leader will normally act as Presenter at the hearing. In cases where neither of them is available to be the Presenter they will be asked to liaise with the Registry and Partnership Manager to identify an appropriate substitute Presenter, which may be the original Marker or the

Investigating Officer, or another appropriately briefed member of University Centre Croydon.

7. If the student is unable to attend the hearing, they may provide a written statement instead. The statement must be submitted to the Registry and Partnership Manager at least 2 working days before the panel hearing. No reschedule options are available.
8. Misconduct hearings sometimes have to be held during the summer vacation. University Centre Croydon will reimburse reasonable travel costs if the student is found not guilty;
9. If the student is found guilty, the Misconduct Panel will normally inform the student of the penalty to be imposed at the end of the hearing (and / or in writing as soon as possible thereafter). The subject External Assessment Board is required to apply the penalty passed to it by the Misconduct Panel;
10. If found guilty by the Panel the student can appeal against the decision within 21 calendar days of learning of the Panel's decision (see below for further information).
11. If found guilty of misconduct the student will be penalised more severely than those who simply did not submit a piece of work.

J16 Major Misconduct Panel Composition

At the beginning of each academic year, each Head of School will identify academic staff members in their School who are authorised to act as Major Misconduct Panel members. In case of staff changes, it is the Head of School's responsibility to update the Registry and Partnership Manager of any amendments to staff availability.

The Registry and Partnership Manager shall appoint two academic staff members and assign one of them as Chair, to hear all allegations. The Registry and Partnership Manager (or nominee) will act as Secretary to the Panel and as a third Panel member (but must not be Chair).

No person shall be eligible to be a member of the Panel who has:

- any responsibility for the teaching or assessment of the module in question; or,
- been involved in a previous hearing of the same allegation or a previous hearing involving the same student. (This does not apply to procedures to consider new evidence relating to the same case.)

If the member of staff who has made the allegation is not already attending in the capacity

of Presenter, they should be available to the Panel if possible, in order to clarify any issues which may be raised by the Panel or student.

The Registry and Partnership Manager shall supply all relevant documentation and evidence to the Panel and the student prior to the hearing.

Conduct of the hearing

The hearing will be conducted as follows:

- (i) The Chair will explain to the student the procedure of the hearing. It will be made clear that the panel will seek, initially and as far as possible, to exclude the issue of 'intent' from the stage of determining whether misconduct has occurred or not, and will reach a decision on that point on the basis of the facts presented. The panel may consider 'intent' as a legitimate factor in considering mitigation or aggravation;
- (ii) The Chair will read out the allegation, including the relevant definitions of misconduct, and will then ask the student whether they admit or deny the accusation;
- (iii) **Admission of accusation**
If the student admits the accusation, the hearing will be concerned with assessing the gravity of the offence and considering any evidence in mitigation. The presenter will be invited to assess the extent of the misconduct. The student will be invited to respond with the help of their representative.
- (iv) **Denial of accusation**
If the student denies the accusation, the hearing will first be concerned to establish whether misconduct has taken place. The presenter will make the case against the student. The student will defend their case with the help of their representative. Members of the panel may intervene from time to time to raise a question;
- (v) Where the Chair of a misconduct panel considers it to be beneficial in resolving a case (either in advance of or during a hearing), s/he may invite an academic from the relevant department (but not the person responsible for marking the work) to attend. The purpose of the questioning will be to establish the student's knowledge of the work in question, knowledge of the methods used to produce the work, and knowledge of the sources (cited or otherwise) informing the work. In the case of this requirement

emerging during a hearing, the meeting will be adjourned and a new date established.

- (vi) Once the Chair deems that all the relevant evidence has been heard, they will invite the student, the student's representative and the presenter to withdraw, while the panel members reach a conclusion with regard to whether the student has been found not guilty or guilty, and if the latter, the penalty. The Chair will then ask the student, the student's representative and the presenter to return and hear the panel's conclusion on whether the student has been found guilty or not guilty. The Chair may give permission for the Presenter to leave after presenting the case, provided they are not required.

Not guilty

- (vii) If the student is found not guilty, the work will be remarked and be used for progression and classification purposes. The student will be told, at the end of the hearing, the outcome and the Secretary to the hearing will also inform the student, in writing, within ten working days from the date of the hearing.

Guilty

- (viii) If the student is found guilty the Panel will agree an appropriate penalty as set out below, if the Panel confirms the Investigating Officer's finding of Major Misconduct. Alternatively, the Panel may, upon consideration of representations, decide to amend the final finding to Minor Misconduct, and apply an appropriate penalty as set out in J14.
- (ix) The student will be told, at the end of the hearing, the penalty to be applied. The panel reserves the right to defer its decision for a short period but the student will be informed informally as soon as possible once a decision has been reached. The Secretary to the hearing will formally inform the student, in writing, within ten working days from the date of the hearing of the penalty (if any) and will inform the student that the outcome will be presented to the External Assessment Board for implementation and will not be open for revision, and that the outcome letter and the academic misconduct evidence pack may be presented to the External Assessment Board if requested.

- (x) The decision of the panel will then be sent to the External Assessment Board for implementation and will not be open for revision.

Second offence

- (xi) If a student is found guilty of a second offence of academic misconduct, the Panel will, in determining the penalty for the subsequent offence, take into account any previous offence(s) and reserve the right to disqualify the student from the award of a degree.

Simultaneous offences in multiple modules or components

- (xii) Allegations of academic misconduct in several modules and/or module components that are considered simultaneously at the same Panel hearing are deemed a single case for the purposes of the “second offence” rule. This means that if the first allegation of academic misconduct against a student involves multiple module components, the Panel might decide on different penalties for each module component if relevant but must not disqualify the student from the award of a degree because none of the simultaneous allegations would be deemed to meet the definition of a second offence.

J17 Penalties to be applied: Major Misconduct

The following penalties, which may be applied singly or in combination, are available only to a formal Misconduct Panel:

1. Reduce the mark for the module to the threshold pass mark
2. Require the student to resit/resubmit/retake (according to their current standing) the assessment component (or equivalent) to pass level. Module mark capped at threshold level.
3. Require the student to resit/resubmit/retake (according to their current standing) the assessment component (or equivalent) to pass level in order to obtain credit (and demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes). The assessment component mark is recorded as a 0; the module mark is capped at threshold level; the consequent module mark is used in classifying calculations.
4. Require the student to resit/resubmit/retake (according to their current standing) the assessment component (or equivalent) to pass level in order to obtain credit (and demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes). The mark for the module as a whole is recorded as 0; this mark is used in classifying calculations.
5. Reduce classification by one or more class (Note: this penalty is not available for first year undergraduates),

6. Disqualify from honours [Note: this penalty is reserved for undergraduate final year students]
7. Disqualify from award (main award / exit award)

Notes:

In the case of students who are given penalties requiring a repeat of the assessment there may not be an opportunity to repeat until the next main cycle of assessment. Misconduct panels must therefore exercise caution in using these options particularly for those students who would otherwise be at the point of graduation (undergraduate and postgraduate)

In the case of penalties 2-4 the resit/resubmission/retake will be recorded as an attempt on the student's academic record. Should the student fail to resit/resubmit/retake a mark of 0% will be recorded. Normal External Assessment Board regulations concerning number of attempts and possible resit/resubmission/retake opportunities will apply.

Loss of credit under the above rules cannot be readdressed by granting trailed, compensated or condoned credit.

In all plagiarism cases the student is also required to attend an academic practice workshop.

J18 External Assessment Board Role in Allegations of Misconduct

External Assessment Boards will not proceed to confirm progress or determine classification whilst an allegation of academic misconduct is outstanding.

J19 Appeal procedure

Appeals against the decision of the Head of School (or nominee) for Minor Misconduct and the Academic Misconduct Panel for Major Misconduct are governed by the Academic Appeals Procedure.

K Intermission of Studies & Mitigating Circumstances

K1 Background

K1.1 University Centre Croydon recognises that students may be subject to circumstances beyond their control which may affect their studies. Such circumstances may be in the case of specific assignments or examinations, or may be so severe as to affect or potentially affect the whole programme of study. University Centre Croydon has in place two procedures to ensure that students are not unduly disadvantaged should they find themselves in such situations.

K2 Intermission of Studies

K2.1 University Centre Croydon recognises that due to exceptional personal or health reasons a student may need to take a break from their studies. University Centre Croydon may in such circumstances permit a student to intermit. It is the student's responsibility to demonstrate that there are sufficient grounds to grant permission to intermit, and to provide any relevant evidence. Approval is not automatic. Evidence submitted in a foreign language is accepted only if an English translation is also provided and accompanied by the student's signed declaration that it is a true translation.

K2.2 Permission will be granted on two occasions only, which must not be consecutive. The duration of a period of intermission shall not exceed one academic year at a time, with no less than one semester and no more than two semesters requested.

K2.3 Requests for intermission must be made in writing using the Request for Intermission form to the Academic/Programme Leader concerned. The request must include a reason for the intermission and the intended date of return to the programme of study together with any relevant documentation. The Academic/Programme Leader will forward the request onto the Associate Dean of University Centre Croydon (or nominee) for final approval, which will then be communicated to the student.

K3 Mitigating Circumstances

K3.1 University Centre Croydon recognises and accepts that in rare instances, student achievement will be affected by sudden, unforeseen and temporary circumstances beyond

their control that have prevented or impeded the assessment of student work through absence or the non-submission of work.

K3.2 The purpose of the mitigating circumstances procedure is to offer eligible students the opportunity to be assessed or reassessed on equal terms with other students.

A successful claim for mitigating circumstances should never give a student an unfair advantage over other students.

Students who believe that their assessed module or module component mark will be affected by such circumstances should apply for mitigating circumstances using the procedures set out below and following the Guidelines accompanying the Claim form.

K3.3 Claims for mitigation in respect of poor performance shall not be valid.

K3.4 A student may submit a claim seeking mitigation for a particular item of assessed **work on two occasions only**. A mark of zero will then be awarded for that item of assessed work if it is not attempted at the next opportunity. There will be no further opportunity for reassessment if it is not attempted at the next opportunity.

A mitigation claim that is rejected does count towards the limit of two mitigation claims per an item of assessed work.

K3.5 Making a Claim for Mitigation

Students who wish to claim mitigation, must submit a Mitigating Circumstances Claim form to the University Centre Croydon Registry office in person, or by email to ucc.registry@croydon.ac.uk. Blank forms are available from the Registry Office and UCC Hub on moodle. It is the student's responsibility to complete and submit the form and evidence (unless valid circumstances prevent) within 14 days of the exam/assessment/submission date. In exceptional circumstances, the student may nominate another person to submit the form on her/his behalf or may post the form by Recorded Delivery to the Registry Office.

Members of University Centre Croydon's academic staff may not initiate or receive mitigation claims.

K3.6 The designated member of staff

Mitigation claims and evidence are considered by the designated staff member, with delegated authority from the Dean of University Centre Croydon.

The designated staff member can be Registry and Partnership Manager or another Registry staff member subject to the Dean's consideration.

The mitigation claim may be accepted, rejected or deemed inadmissible in accordance with the principles outlined in K3.8 b, or referred to the Chair of the Mitigation Claims Review Panel.

K3.7 The Mitigation Claims Review Panel

- a) Where the designated staff member is unable to make a decision, claims for mitigation will be passed to a *Mitigation Claims Review Panel* for consideration
- b) The Mitigation Claims Review Panel is a sub-committee of the programme's External Assessment Board, and is empowered to make judgements on the validity of mitigation claims on its behalf.
- c) The membership of the panel is as follows:
 - i. Head of School or Academic Leader (or nominee) who is independent of the programme(s) being reviewed (Chair)
 - ii. Two members of University Centre curriculum staff who are independent of the programme(s) being reviewed.
 - iii. The panel is also attended by Registry and Partnership Manager (or nominee) who will act as Secretary but is not a Panel member

K3.8 Procedure for Meetings of the Mitigation Claims Review Panel

- a) The Mitigation Claims Review Panel for a programme or group of programmes must meet before the meeting of the relevant External Assessment Board, to which its judgements will be submitted.
- b) In reaching its decision, the Panel will take into account the following:
 - Is there documentary evidence attached?
 - Does the evidence presented support the case?
 - Does the date affected by the circumstances, correspond with the date of the assessment?
 - How severe were the circumstances?
 - How many times has mitigation been requested for the module?

K3.9 Outcomes of the mitigation claim consideration by the designated staff member or by the Mitigation Claims Review Panel

- a) The External Assessment Board will accept the judgement on validity made by the designated staff member or by the Mitigation Claims Review Panel, but retains the right to determine what actions to take in response to valid claims.
- b) If the Panel rejects the claim, it will not be taken into account by the External Assessment Board (the External Assessment Board records will show that a claim was made)
- c) If after reviewing the evidence the Panel judges that the claim is valid and that there was a potential impact on the assessment, then the External Assessment Board will allow an examination to be taken or coursework to be resubmitted to a new timetable. The marks gained from this will be recorded as if taken for the first time. Where the assessment concerned was itself a reassessment or retake, the module mark shall be capped at 40% for undergraduate and 50% for postgraduate.
- d) Under exceptional circumstances (such as in the case of a degenerative illness) the External Assessment Board may seek to assess and mark the student's learning through whatever means they believe is appropriate. This may include additional assessment tasks or the review of previous work.

K3.10 Criteria for a Mitigating Circumstances claim

Students must provide evidence that confirms sudden, unforeseen and temporary conditions/events which may have significantly impacted on performance in assessments. Minor illness and everyday problems, normally experienced in the course of daily life, will not be accepted nor will long term conditions or health issues for which anticipatory forms of support exist.

Students with pre-existing or recently declared disabilities may only submit a claim if they experience a sudden exacerbation, or issues that are unrelated to the disability, and meet the criteria for making a claim. See section E.4 for Study Plus support arrangements for students with disabilities, mental health conditions or specific learning difficulties. Students whose claim refers to incapacity of an ongoing nature (over 3 weeks duration) will be referred to, and expected to take up, appropriate support rather than make repeated claims, even if the initial claim is accepted.

K3.11 A mitigating circumstances claim may be submitted as a result of the following assessment situations:

- a) Missing an assessment deadline with subsequent late submission or non-submission.
- (b) Absence from in-person examination or practical assessment.
- (c) Forthcoming in-person assessment where an absence is anticipated, and exceptionally

an anticipated non-submission or late submission, where the evidence covers this.

Mitigation claims for impaired performance at an exam or assessment are not accepted.

K3.12 Types of evidence

The evidence to support a claim must be robust and dates must correspond to the assessment deadlines/scheduled examination.

The evidence must prove impact on the student's ability to submit work or sit an examination, rather than just proving that the event has occurred.

Acceptable evidence is a document written and signed by an appropriate third party giving details of the circumstance, its duration and, wherever possible, its impact. An appropriate third party would be one who knows the student in a professional capacity or one who can verify the circumstance from a position of authority (e.g. GP, hospital consultant, solicitor, police officer, external counsellor) and who is in a position to provide objective and impartial evidence. Letters from family members or fellow students are not normally acceptable.

Evidence submitted in a foreign language is accepted only if an English translation is also provided and accompanied by the student's signed declaration that it is a true translation.

(a) Examples of acceptable evidence include but are not limited to:

1. Medical certificate with dates of consultation and diagnosis.
2. Death certificate of close relative or someone the student is close to; in cases where the student's surname is different from the deceased, also official evidence confirming relationship to the deceased. Except in cases where the deceased is the student's first-degree relative (spouse/partner, parent, sibling, child), the student is also expected to provide evidence of impact.
3. Hospital admissions report/appointment letter or crime statement verifying the circumstances and timing.
4. A letter from a Study Plus staff member confirming that 'reasonable adjustments' were not yet in place or were in need of revision due to an acute flare up of a long term stable condition, such as asthma. Study Plus staff members For the latter, a GP certificate would constitute evidence if the condition was usually stable. A claim may be rejected if a student fails to register with Study Plus for support as multiple claims cannot be made for a period

of instability of a long term condition that should be managed by a 'reasonable adjustment'.

5. A report from the exam invigilator confirming the circumstances of an individual student during an invigilated examination, for example, illness.

(b) Examples of rejected claims and insufficient evidence (an opportunity to submit additional evidence will be given):

1. Student indicates an acute medical condition but no medical evidence is submitted or medical certificate lacks detail to support claim.
2. 'Retrospective' medical note – consultation dates do not support the claim.
3. Long term events and conditions which have already been claimed for and Study Plus has offered to review and/or consider reasonable adjustments
4. Ongoing or longer term conditions or circumstances, unless when they are first confirmed/diagnosed or become suddenly, unexpectedly and markedly worse at a particular assessment point.

(c) Examples of inadmissible cases and evidence (no further opportunity to submit evidence will be given):

1. Circumstances that the student could have reasonably foreseen or prevented (such as suspension, intoxication or conviction for illegal activity).
2. Minor illness or ailment (cold, minor allergy).
3. Holiday arrangements.
4. Wedding arrangements.
5. Financial issues.
6. Religious observance.
7. Personal computer/data loss and/ or printer problems.
8. Jury service.
9. School administrative error (student to seek appropriate solution with the School or to refer to the appeals process).

10. Loss/theft of computer (student to ensure work backed up separately).

11. Lack of fitness to study.

K3.13 Mitigating circumstances claim deadlines

The claim and evidence must normally be submitted within 14 calendar days of the first assessment deadline cited.

When a mitigation claim and evidence is submitted later than 14 calendar days of the first assessment deadline cited, the reason for lateness must be stated. If the reason for lateness is not explained, the claim will be rejected and the student will be given the opportunity to provide the explanation within 14 calendar days (or less if the deadline would be less than 5 working days before the Internal Assessment Board). If the explanation is not provided, the rejection will stand. Late claims may only be made for the current academic year.

Any late claims will only be considered up to 5 working days before the Internal Assessment Board that will be considering results for the modules that the mitigation claim is being submitted for. Any late claims submitted after that deadline will not be considered and students will be asked to follow the appeals procedure instead. In the case of mitigation claims for resubmission, this may result in a shortening of claim submission timescales, due to the Internal and External Assessment (Resubmission) Board timescales. Should this be the case, the Registry and Partnership Manager will publish mitigation claim deadlines on University Centre Hub before the final resubmission date.

Where a claim is rejected due to insufficient evidence or to unexplained late submission of the claim, the designated staff member will give the student one opportunity to provide additional evidence within 14 calendar days (or within a shorter period of time for mitigation claims for resubmissions, as per the paragraph above). If additional evidence or explanation of lateness is provided within the timescale required, the claim will be re-considered. If additional evidence or explanation of lateness is not provided within the timescale required, the rejection decision will stand.

K3.14 Notification of Outcomes of Mitigation Claims

Students will be informally notified in writing (by the designated staff member, Secretary of the Mitigation Panel or nominee to their University Centre email account) of the outcome of any mitigation claim within 10 working days of the mitigation being assessed by the designated staff member, or of a decision being reached by the Mitigation Claims Review

Panel. All mitigation outcome decisions are ratified by the External Assessment Board.

K3.15 Appeals against the Outcomes of Mitigation Claims

A student who wishes to appeal the outcome of their Mitigation Claim must submit an appeal form and any relevant evidence within 21 calendar days of the receipt of the email from the designated staff member, Secretary of the Mitigation Panel or nominee. The appeal is subsequently handled as an Assessment Appeal.

L Termination of Studies

L1 There are several ways in which studies may be terminated, either by University Centre Croydon, by the student:

L2 Withdrawal at the Student's Request

A student may decide to leave their programme at University Centre Croydon and not return at a future date. The student should notify such a decision to the Academic Leader of their programme in writing.

L3 Withdrawal on Grounds of Academic Failure

When the student has exhausted all opportunities given in these regulations to achieve the award and has failed to achieve it, the External Assessment Board shall withdraw them on grounds of academic failure. This is the only type of termination of studies that may be decided by the External Assessment Board.

L4 Withdrawal on Grounds of Poor Attendance

Withdrawals on grounds of poor attendance are governed by University Centre Croydon's Attendance and Punctuality Policy. When the student's attendance is below the required minimum standard without a valid reason as outlined in the Policy and the student has failed to improve it following standard warnings, they may be withdrawn for poor attendance. The decision to withdraw a student on grounds of poor attendance must be made by at least an Academic Leader or the Head of School.

L5 Disqualification from Award on grounds of Academic Misconduct

This type of termination of studies is decided by the Academic Misconduct Panel and is governed by the Academic Misconduct procedure (see Section J of the present Academic and Assessment Regulations).

L6 Withdrawal due to Time Lapse

Students who do not return from intermission at the agreed time or do not attempt reassessment in the re-assessment period and by the reassessment deadline as outlined in Section F7.12 may have their studies terminated by University Centre Croydon due to time lapse depending on their assessment status. The decision to withdraw a student on grounds of time lapse must be confirmed by both UCC Registry and the Academic Leader and approved by the Head of School.

L7 Exclusion / Suspension

Decisions on exclusions and/or suspensions from the programme are governed by the Student Disciplinary Procedure and may be applied, for example, in cases of inadequate application to study or breaching the Code of Conduct.

L8 Notification Timescales

Students will be notified by University Centre Croydon within five working days following a decision to terminate their studies as per L3, L4, L5, L6 above. The reason for the termination will be included.

L9 Appeals against Termination of Studies

Appeals against terminations of studies based upon academic performance as per L3, L4, L5, L6 must be made using University Centre Croydon's *Assessment Appeals Procedure* (Section M of the present Academic and Assessment Regulations).

Appeals against exclusion on disciplinary grounds as per L7 are governed by the *Student Disciplinary Procedure*.

L10 Financial Obligations and Termination of Studies

It is the student's responsibility to settle any financial obligations to University Centre Croydon that are due on the date when the studies are terminated, in line with the usual rules outlined in University Centre Croydon's Fee Policy.

L11 Return following Termination of Studies

Students wishing to re-enrol on a University Centre Croydon programme following a termination of studies must follow the usual admission procedure.

Students who have been withdrawn from a programme on the grounds of academic failure or on grounds of poor attendance will not normally be able to re-register for the same programme. Exceptionally, students who are able to provide appropriate additional evidence of their potential to benefit from the programme from which they have been withdrawn may apply to re-register.

Students whose studies have been terminated as a result of academic misconduct or a disciplinary matter as outlined in G4.5 and G4.6 above can be disqualified from University Centre Croydon / Croydon College for a period of at least 3 years.

M Assessment Appeals Procedure

M1 Background

- M1.1** The procedure applies to decisions on assessments made by Assessments Boards. This includes decisions made by bodies that report to the External Assessment Board: the AP(E)L Committee, the Mitigation Claim Review Panel, the Mitigation Claim designated staff member and the Academic Misconduct Panel, the Heads of School (or nominee) for Minor Academic Misconduct and relevant types of withdrawals, and designated staff member for Mitigation Claims (unless referred to the Mitigation Panel).
- M1.2** A student may not lodge an appeal on the grounds of dissatisfaction with the design, curriculum or delivery (teaching, departmental support, etc.) of a programme; University Centre Croydon's Procedure for Complaints, Suggestions and Commendations exists in part to deal with such issues.
- M1.3** The investigation of a complaint from a student may reveal issues that would have formed grounds for an appeal under the Assessment Appeals Procedure. When this is the case, a student must not be prevented from exercising the right to appeal subsequent to the findings of the complaints investigation on the grounds of its being 'out of time'. In such instances, the deadlines set out in this procedure must be calculated from the date at which the student received the information as an outcome of the complaints investigation that might form the basis of her/his appeal.
- M1.4** The Dean of University Centre Croydon, Chief Operating Officer or Vice Principal: Curriculum & Quality is empowered to refer the matter as an appeal to whichever is the appropriate forum for its consideration. Equally, if a student submits as a complaint, which is wholly or partly an appeal on one of the four grounds then it is an obligation of University Centre Croydon to ensure that the issue is considered under the Assessment Appeals Procedure.
- M1.5** It is important to ensure that the deliberations and decisions of assessors, examiners and External Assessment Boards and any consequences of such decisions are dealt with strictly in relation to assessment.

M2 Grounds for Appeal

M2.1 The potential grounds for appeal in relation to a decision by an Assessment Board are as follows:

1) that there existed circumstances affecting the student's performance of which the examiners were not aware when their decision was taken, and which could not reasonably have been presented to the examiners;

2) that there was a procedural irregularity (including administrative error) or other inadequacy in the conduct of the examinations, or processing of marks or grades, or the categorisation of an award of such a nature as to cause doubt as to whether the result might have been different had there not been such an irregularity;

3) that there exists evidence of prejudice or of bias on the part of an examiner.

M2.2 These are the only grounds for appeal. There is no right of appeal against assessment decisions which are matters of academic judgement.

M3 The Procedure for Appeal

M3.1 Students may wish to take advice as to whether to appeal or not. Their personal tutors, the Academic/Programme Leader or the Head of School are all suitable members of staff from whom to obtain advice about how to use the Appeals procedure. However, University Centre Croydon recognises that the student may feel that these are not unbiased sources as they are involved to varying degrees with the assessment decision against which the student may wish to appeal. In such instances, the student may wish to consider asking the Registry and Partnership Manager to refer her or him to another member of University Centre Croydon, who would not be involved in the assessment decision, and is qualified to explain the appeals procedure.

M3.2 Whatever source of information the student chooses, it is their responsibility to choose whether to appeal, the grounds upon which they do so and the evidence they decide to present. Evidence submitted in a foreign language is accepted only if an English translation is also provided and accompanied by the student's signed declaration that it is a true translation.

M3.3 For assessments dealt with by External Assessment Boards, a student who wishes to appeal against a decision of the External Assessment Board must submit the appeal form and evidence to the Registry and Partnership Manager to invoke the Academic Appeals Procedure **within 21 calendar days of the date of the publication of the External Assessment Board results.**

M3.4 For recommendations made by the designated staff member assessing mitigation claims, Mitigation Claims Review Panel, the Head of School (or nominee) with regard to Academic Misconduct, or the Academic Misconduct Panel, a student who wishes to appeal must submit the appeal form and evidence to the Registry and Partnership Manager to invoke the Academic Appeals Procedure within **21 calendar days** of receipt of the letter or email from the Registry and Partnership Manager or a nominee.

M3.5 It is not possible to appeal twice regarding the same matter. Where a student has already appealed against a Mitigation Claim decision or Academic Misconduct decision within the 21-day time frame from learning the decision, and has received a decision on the outcome of their Appeal, they may not appeal against the outcome again once the outcomes of these procedures have been ratified by the External Assessment Board and notified to the student formally as part of results publication.

Where the student did not appeal within the 21 calendar days of receiving the Mitigation Claim decision or Academic Misconduct decision, they still may appeal against these decisions using the timeframe of 21 calendar days of the publication of the External Assessment Board results as per L3.3. However, when appealing under these circumstances the student will be expected to provide a compelling reason for not having submitted the appeal within the 21 calendar days of receiving the Mitigation Claim decision or Academic Misconduct decision.

M3.6 A request for an appeal must state the decision concerned, the grounds (i.e. one or more of the acceptable grounds given above) and be accompanied by documents that are evidence for the case.

M3.7 The Dean of University Centre Croydon, Chief Operating Officer or Vice Principal: Curriculum & Quality shall make an assessment of the validity of the case and decide whether or not it should be put before the Assessment Appeals Panel. The decision to proceed with such a request will only be taken if it has been established that:

- the case is based, prima facie, on additional information about a student's personal circumstances

or

- on evidence of procedural irregularity;

and

- is not one which challenges the academic judgement of the External Assessment Board or the AP(E)L Committee.

M3.8 This decision should normally be made within 10 working days of receipt of the appeal from the student, and be advised to them in writing.

It is the student's obligation to provide the evidence for the Dean of University Centre Croydon, Chief Operating Officer or Vice Principal: Curriculum & Quality to consider. It is not the duty of the Dean of University Centre Croydon, Chief Operating Officer or Vice Principal: Curriculum & Quality to obtain evidence on behalf of the student for the appeal; their decision shall normally be based only on the evidence provided and the case made by the appellant.

In exceptional cases, the Dean of University Centre Croydon, Chief Operating Officer or Vice Principal: Curriculum & Quality may request clearly specified additional items of evidence from the appellant or from a University Centre Croydon's staff member, if they feel that such specific items of evidence are relevant for the completion of the initial consideration of the appeal. However, such cases are by exception only and this provision is not intended to provide the appellant with extended opportunity to submit evidence that they could have reasonably submitted with their original appeal by the standard deadline.

M3.9 In the case of the student providing unequivocal evidence supporting the appeal, the Dean of University Centre Croydon, Chief Operating Officer or Vice Principal: Curriculum & Quality is authorised to take Chair's Action to uphold the appeal without a hearing being convened.

M4 The Function of the Assessment Appeals Panel

M4.1 The Assessment Appeals Panel will consider appeals against assessment decisions of External Assessment Boards. The decisions of their sub-boards, the Academic Misconduct

Panel and the Mitigation Claims Review Panel, as well as Head of School (or nominee) for Minor Academic Misconduct and designated person for Mitigation Claims unless referred to Mitigation Claims Review Panel, which are reported by the External Assessment Board, are considered for the purpose of the appeal process to be decisions of the External Assessment Boards. It will establish whether there is, prima facie, a justified case of appeal and if so to consider whether

1. To uphold the decision of the External Assessment Board
2. To overturn the decision of the External Assessment Board or
3. To require the External Assessment Board to reconsider their decision.

M5 The Constitution of the Assessment Appeals Panel

M5.1 The membership of the Assessment Appeals Panel shall be:

- Chair: the Dean of University Centre Croydon or her/his nominee who has not previously been involved in the assessment decision being appealed against and is a member of Senior Management;
- a manager of at least Programme Leader level who has not previously been involved in the assessment decision;
- a member of a higher education programme's teaching staff, not directly concerned with the programme, in which the programme and the student are based;
- the secretary to the Panel, normally the Registry and Partnership Manager or his/her nominee.

Note

Any potential member who has been involved in teaching, assessing, counselling or advising a student will be ineligible to serve on the Panel hearing the case of that student.

- A quorum of the Assessment Appeals Panel requires all three members, plus the Secretary.

M5.2 The Secretary of the Panel:

- Is responsible for ensuring that the procedures are appropriately adhered to;
- Shall convene meetings of the Assessment Appeals Panel;
- Shall ensure that decisions are notified to all parties concerned and that appropriate action is taken.

M6 Convening of Assessment Appeals Panel

M6.1 The Secretary shall convene a meeting of the Academic Appeals Panel on the first convenient date, which shall not normally be more than twenty working days after the request has been lodged.

Ten working days' notice of any meeting of the Academic Appeals Panel shall be given to the members, the student and any other persons required to attend, for example witnessed to the assessment decision.

The student should normally be present and may be accompanied by one person of his/her choosing. If the student is unable to appear, the appeal will be held in the student's absence. If there is reasonable doubt about the student having received the papers or notification of the date, then the meeting will be postponed, until the student has had due notice of its sitting.

The Assessment Appeals Panel and/or the student may summon to appear any other person(s) whom they may reasonably consider to be a material witness.

M7 Conduct of Assessment Appeals Panel Hearing

M7.1 Prior to the hearing, all parties to the appeal will have been circulated with written statements setting out the student's grounds for appeal and any written statements of those responsible for the assessment decision which is being appealed against, together with any evidence provided by the student.

M7.2 If the student is present, the Panel will start by hearing an opening statement from the student, or the student's representative, on the grounds for the appeal. At this point, the Panel may question the student and/or her/his representative (if there is one).

Note: Students with learning difficulties and/or disabilities will be allowed appropriate support.

If the student is not present, the Panel will receive any further documentary evidence in support of the appeal at this point. The Panel will then consider the appeal in the student's absence.

M7.3 The Panel will next hear from any witnesses the student wished to offer followed by witnesses to the assessment decision which is the subject of the appeal.

- M7.4** Witnesses will be heard individually and separately. No witnesses shall be allowed to remain in the room in which the hearing is taking place either before or after they have given their evidence.
- M7.5** Witnesses may be questioned by the student or the student's representative and then by the Panel.
- M7.6** The Chair of the Panel must ensure that witnesses are only questioned about matters germane to the case of the student on the grounds permitted by the Procedure. Questions may not be used to discuss complaints or other matters of dissatisfaction of the student.
- M7.7** The Chair must also ensure that witnesses do not question any party to the appeal and do not make statements that are not relevant to the questions they are asked.
- M7.8** After all witnesses have been heard, the student or her/his representative may make a concluding statement summarising what has been presented to the Panel.
- M7.9** The Assessment Appeals Panel is not empowered to consider any appeal on grounds other than those lodged by the student at the time of giving notice of the appeal. Any grounds other than those made within the 21 calendar day period for the notice of appeal, will not be considered and will be deemed 'out of time'.
- M7.10** The student's classification will not be lowered as a consequence of them submitting an appeal, and nor will an individual mark be reduced.
- M7.11** The Panel will then deliberate in private and announce its decision publicly to the student and the student's representative.
- M7.12** The Panel's decision will also be communicated in writing within 7 working days to:
- The student;

- The student's representative, if there is one;
- The Dean of University Centre Croydon;
- The Associate Dean of University Centre Croydon
- The HE Registry Assessments Officer;
- The Chair of the External Assessment Board which made or recorded the decision against which the appeal has been made;
- The Chair of the AP(E)L: Panel, where the appeal was against the decision of the AP(E)I Panel;
- The Academic/Programme Leader of the programme to which the appeal refers;
- The student's Academic/Programme Leader.

M8 Decisions of the Assessment Appeals Panel

M8.1 The Assessment Appeals Panel shall consider the appeal and if it finds that the student has established a valid case, will either

1. overturn the decision of the External Assessment Board or
2. require the External Assessment Board whose decision has been challenged, to reconsider that decision.

M8.2 Where the Assessment Appeals Panel finds that the student has not established a valid case for a review of the decision, it will uphold the External Assessment Board's decision. This outcome shall be communicated to the student by the Secretary of the Panel. There is no further right of appeal within University Centre Croydon. See L10 below regarding the right to appeal to the awarding body.

M8.3 When a decision has been referred back to an External Assessment Board Chair they shall reconsider, within three calendar months, the student's case, giving due consideration to the comments and recommendations of the Assessment Appeals Panel. They will either confirm their decisions or make appropriate adjustments.

M8.4 The Chair of the External Assessment Board will report the decision to the Secretary of the Appeals Panel who will inform the student and take any further necessary action.

M8.5 If, after consideration in the circumstances detailed above, the External Assessment Board does not modify its decisions, or the modified decision is still considered to be in error by

the Academic Appeals Panel, then the Academic Appeals Panel may annul that decision.

M8.6 In cases of procedural or other irregularity, or where it is not possible to reconvene an External Assessment Board, the Appeals Panel has the power to annul a decision of an External Assessment Board. If an error or irregularity is found to have affected more than one student, the Appeals Panel may annul the whole assessment or any part of it. The decision of the Appeals Panel shall be final.

M8.7 The person with responsibility for conducting the appeal at each stage of the procedure, has the responsibility to communicate the outcome to:

- The HE Registry Assessments Officer
- The Head of School and the Academic/Programme Leader who has responsibility for the programme;
- The Dean of University Centre Croydon.

M9 Confidentiality

M9.1 It is a requirement for all those involved in the appeals process that information on personal circumstances presented by students is treated as strictly confidential and only made known to other colleagues if essential for due consideration to be given to the student's case.

M9.2 Once an appeal has been accepted there must be no communication of any sort between interested parties and members of the Assessment Appeals Panel.

M10 Right of Appeal to the Awarding Bodies

M10.1 If an appeal is **rejected or not upheld**, the student must be informed at the time s/he is given the decision that s/he has the right to request the awarding body to review the College's implementation of its assessment appeals process. In such circumstances, in the appeal outcome letter the student must be provided with the address to which to send her/his request.

The student has the right to request a review by the awarding body even if an appeal has, in the view of University Centre Croydon, been **upheld** but the student remains dissatisfied with the outcome. The student must be informed of this option in the appeal outcome letter.

To invoke this process for programmes awarded by the University of Sussex, the student

should submit a completed 'appeals form for decisions of a partner institution' to the Appeals Officer within 21 calendar days of the issue of the appeal outcome letter. The decision of the University indicates the completion of the appeals procedure.

For programmes awarded by professional bodies that are members of the OIA scheme, the same process will apply.

For programmes awarded by professional bodies that are not yet members of the OIA scheme and/or do not have a process for reviewing University Centre Croydon's appeals process, it may be appropriate for University Centre Croydon to signpost the student to University Centre Croydon's Complaints Procedure to ensure that the student has exhausted all internal options first, or to issue the Completion of Proceedings letter after University Centre Croydon's appeals stage.

Where the student is not satisfied with the outcome of the procedure s/he may request a review by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA). The OIA provides an independent scheme to enable the review of unresolved student complaints including appeals. The student must submit a complaint to the OIA within 12 months of the date of the Completion of Procedures letter from the University of Sussex. An appeal to the OIA is made by completing a Scheme complaint form. Copies of this form should be made available within University Centre Croydon and are also available at **www.oiahe.org.uk**.

N STUDENT COMPLAINTS

N1 University Centre Croydon recognises that despite its best efforts, some things will inevitably go wrong. It welcomes complaints as a means of improving its services. In the first event, the matter should be discussed informally with the individuals involved or their manager(s) or the student should discuss the issues with her/his tutor. Where this does not resolve the matter, formal complaints may be submitted under University Centre Croydon's *Complaints Procedure*. If an appeal made under the Assessment Appeals Procedure includes issues more properly considered under the *Complaints Procedure*, then there is an obligation upon University Centre Croydon to examine them under the latter procedure. This does not prejudice or prevent the consideration of those issues properly governed by the *Assessment Appeals Procedure*. Advice on the processes and a copy of the procedures may be obtained from: Registry and Partnership Manager (or nominee), University Centre Croydon Tel: 020 686 5700 (Ext 7012).

N2 If a complaint relates to academic provision, the University will normally consider the complaint only if a student has first exhausted the partner institution's complaints procedure and remains dissatisfied. In such cases, students should enter the University's procedure at Level 3 (<http://www.sussex.ac.uk/ogs/complaintsappeals>). A student must write to the Academic Secretary within 21 calendar days of the notification of the outcome of the process by the partner institution. If after considering the case against the criteria the Academic Secretary decides to undertake further investigation, s/he will consult senior officers at the partner institution as well as the University's Partnership Office.

The Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA) provides an independent scheme to enable the review of unresolved student complaints and will review complaints made by students or former students of the partner institution that have been through the institution's internal procedure and have not been satisfactorily resolved.

Students may complain to the OIA providing:

- The student has exhausted all the partner institution's procedures;
- The complaint is not concerned with a matter of academic judgement (e.g. an assessment of degree award)
- The matter is not the subject of court or tribunal proceedings
- The matter has been closed in the last 12 months.