



Academic Regulations

2025/26

Contents

Section Number	Title
1	Structure, Purpose and Principles
2	Admissions
3	Education and Assessment
4	Progression and Award
5	Examinations
6	Progression and Award Boards and Module Boards
7	Disabled Students
8	Extenuating Circumstances and Mitigation
9	Appeals
10	Academic Honesty
11	Research Awards
12	Engagement and Partnership with Students
13	Approval, Validation and Continuous Curriculum Enhancement
14	External Examiners and Advisers
15	Collaborations and Partnerships
16	Academic Audit
17	Awards of the University and their Standards
18	Definitions of University Awards
19	Glossary
20	Student Charter
21	University Committee Structure



LEEDS
BECKETT
UNIVERSITY

Academic Regulations Structure, Purpose and Principles

Section 1

leedsbeckett.ac.uk

Section 1

Structure, Purpose and Principles

Originating Department:	Academic Quality Enhancement Office
Enquiries to:	quality@leedsbeckett.ac.uk
Approving Body:	Academic Board
Last Approved:	3 July 2024
Next due for approval:	July 2026
Document Type:	Regulation
Target Audience:	Relevant for all University staff and students and of particular relevance to: Deans of School, Heads of Subject, Course Directors, other academic staff, professional services staff, students, Collaborative Partners and the Board of Governors.

Contents

1.1	Structure of University Academic Regulations	1
1.2	Purpose	1
1.3	Principles	2
1.4	Responsibility of Academic Board	3
1.5	Alignment with Sector Expectations	3
1.6	General Educational Aims of the University	4
1.7	Aims and Objectives of Courses	5
1.8	Student Charter	5
1.9	Powers of Academic Board – Academic Standards and Quality	5
1.10	Roles and Responsibilities	6
1.11	Regulatory Sections	7
1.12	Review of our University’s Academic Regulations	9

Section 1: Structure, Purpose and Principles

1.1 Structure of University Academic Regulations

Our University Academic Regulations set out our institutional approach to the setting and maintenance of academic standards and the assurance of the academic quality and continuous and systematic enhancement of our awards and student learning opportunities.

These Academic Regulations apply to all awards and courses of study of the University including undergraduate, postgraduate, professional, short course and continuing professional development provision and research degrees.

Our Academic Regulations reflect national and international higher education expectations and legislation and constitute our policy for quality assurance as required by the European Education Area's Standards and Guidelines.

These regulations and related processes and procedures are reviewed annually and in response to external sector policy or regulatory expectations. Approval of the Academic Regulations is the responsibility of Academic Board (see Section 1.4).

University staff and collaborative partners implement the university's regulations. Students also accept that they are bound by these Academic Regulations when they enrol. The Academic Regulations are made available to students, staff and collaborative partners and it is the responsibility of the Dean of School to put in place arrangements for their development and support.

Exceptionally, variations to our Academic Regulations may need to be approved. The reasons for this may be as a requirement of a professional, statutory or regulatory body, an external awarding body, international and in-country requirements (for example where the delivery is at a location other than Leeds Beckett University campuses), or as a result of the particular type or nature of the provision. All variations to our Academic Regulations are approved by Academic Board or its Committees.

1.2 Purpose

The purpose of the University Academic Regulations is to provide:

- a) the framework within which courses of study leading to awards of the University are designed, validated and approved; and

- b) the means through which the academic standards of University awards are assured and the quality of learning, teaching and assessment is enhanced.

1.3 Principles

The principles of the Academic Regulations are:

- a) Primacy of University Academic Regulations

All credit bearing courses and pathways are subject to the University's Academic Regulations which have been approved by Academic Board. The University Academic Regulations take precedence over any other regulations, including those of external or professional bodies, unless variation is specifically permitted and approved.

Exceptionally, Academic Board has the authority to adapt or suspend regulations.

- b) Parity

All awards of the University are subject to the overarching principles of the University outlined in Section 1 of the Academic Regulations.

- c) Consistency, Fairness, Equity and Inclusivity

The University will apply its regulations fairly, equitably, consistently and inclusively to all.

- d) Rigour and Standards

The University will ensure that the academic standards of assessment are rigorous, of comparable standing with the rest of the sector and meet the requirements of the relevant national qualifications framework. Students have the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level.

- e) Academic Judgements

The academic judgements of examiners cannot, in themselves, be questioned or overturned.

- f) Ratification and Recording of Credit

The University will have sound provisions for the ratification and recording of credit (see Section 6 of the Academic Regulations).

- g) Feedback

The University will ensure students have the opportunity to receive feedback, timed appropriately, that promotes learning and facilitates improvement. The University will

ensure that students will have the opportunity to discuss their academic work with staff.

h) Information to Students

All students will be provided with appropriate information in respect of:

- i) The university requirements for completion of modules, level and award
- ii) Assessment requirements of their modules
- iii) Information about their course of study
- iv) Provisions for submitting extenuating circumstances
- v) Provisions for publication of results
- vi) Provisions for requesting an appeal hearing
- vii) Provisions for making a complaint
- viii) A Course Handbook.

i) Responsibilities of Students

Students are responsible for maintaining awareness of:

- i) The University's Academic Regulations
- ii) Information contained in their Course Handbook
- iii) Complying with the assessment requirements of their modules
- iv) Their standing in respect of progression and award
- v) Their standing in respect of reassessment provisions and arrangements.

j) Confidentiality

The University's Academic Regulations will provide for due and appropriate confidentiality.

k) Language

All awards of the University must be studied and assessed in English.

1.4 Responsibility of Academic Board

In approving the University Regulations, Academic Board has delegated the responsibility for the detailed operation, monitoring and review of these Regulations to its Committees. Final approval of the University Regulations is the responsibility of Academic Board.

1.5 Alignment with Sector Expectations

Our University Regulations and the standards of our awards are informed by and align with national and European higher education expectations including the UK Quality Code

(incorporating the Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies) and the Higher Education Credit Framework for England within that Code, Qualifications Characteristics Statements, the European Credit Transfer System and the European Higher Education Area Standards and Guidelines.

These external higher education expectations are supplemented by internal University requirements and reference documents, relevant sector benchmarks, professional and statutory body requirements and are informed by sector benchmarking and externality.

The UK Quality Code articulates principles that should apply to higher education across the UK including the role providers play in assuring the quality of the student experience offered, supporting student engagement and referencing externality in assuring the integrity of awards and the quality of provision. Our Regulations and approach align with the UK Quality Code for Higher Education and encompass the following characteristics:

- a) Every student is treated fairly and with dignity, courtesy and respect.
- b) Every student has the opportunity to contribute to the shaping of their learning experience.
- c) Every student is properly and actively informed at appropriate times of matters relevant to their course of study.
- d) All policies and processes relating to study and courses are clear and transparent.
- e) Strategic oversight of academic standards and academic quality is at the highest level of academic governance of the provider.
- f) All policies and processes are regularly and effectively monitored, reviewed and improved.
- g) Sufficient and appropriate external involvement exists for the maintenance of academic standards and the quality of learning opportunities.
- h) All staff are supported, enabling them in turn to support students' learning experiences.
- i) Information we produce about the learning opportunities we offer is fit for purpose, accessible and trustworthy.

1.6 General Educational Aims of the University

The aims for our courses will align with the University's distinctive general educational aims and our University's Education Strategy which supports the development of graduates who are critical thinkers and independent learners, and who have been given an opportunity to demonstrate a practical application of knowledge that will give them a head start in the world of work. This reflects the concept of capability by developing students':

- a) intellectual and imaginative powers

- b) confidence and ability to take effective and appropriate action
- c) problem solving and decision-making skills
- d) ability to communicate and explain their actions
- e) ability to work with others and to continue to learn from their experience
- f) ability to see relationships within what they have learned
- g) ability to relate their studies to a wider context.

In support of the University's general educational aims, approved frameworks, courses or pathways of study will stimulate an enquiring, analytical and creative approach, encouraging independent judgement and critical self-awareness. (See Section 3 of the Academic Regulations.)

1.7 Aims and Objectives of Courses

Courses validated by the University shall have aims, objectives and learning outcomes which the curriculum, teaching/ learning methods and forms of assessment are designed to fulfil.

1.8 Student Charter

Leeds Beckett University and the Students' Union are committed to working in partnership with our students to ensure that our University is an inclusive, safe and engaging learning environment which is conducive to study for its students and work life for its staff.

Our Student Charter, alongside the University's Academic Regulations for Engagement and Partnership with Students, Section 12, sets out how we aim to achieve this by working together to understand and fulfil our commitments to one another. Our Student Charter has been produced jointly with the Students' Union and is reviewed regularly.

1.9 Powers of Academic Board – Academic Standards and Quality

The University has a Board of Governors and an Academic Board. Academic Board has responsibilities defined in the University's Articles of Association. Academic Board (and its committees) is responsible for overseeing academic matters relating to research, scholarship, teaching and courses. It advises the Vice Chancellor in the related activities and resources required to support and enhance the quality of educational provision. The University committee structure is provided in Section 21 of the Academic Regulations.

These committees provide institutional oversight of academic standards and quality, contribute to the formulation, review and enhancement of policy and practice, and provide a forum for broader consultation involving staff and student representatives.

The primary responsibility for academic quality and standards rests with the Vice Chancellor, with primary responsibility for institutional oversight via Academic Board with the Vice Chancellor as Chair of this Board and of our University Executive Team.

Academic Board will take any reasonable action it considers necessary to protect the quality of courses of study and the academic standard of the University's awards.

1.10 Roles and Responsibilities

The responsibility for adherence to our Regulations rests with all staff, students and collaborative partners in accordance with the specific regulations, roles and responsibilities defined in our Regulations and supplemented by our University's associated policies and procedures.

Subject to 1.9 above, the Dean of School retains formal management responsibility for the operational standards, quality and delivery of all a School's courses (including collaborative provision) and the execution of all matters contained within the University's Regulations. Where appropriate the enactment of day-to-day activity may be delegated to a nominee.

The Dean of School is supported in this role by academic staff who have responsibility for a defined area of academic provision and staff teams.

The Dean of School is responsible for the effective operation and oversight of quality processes and School deliberative and executive governance structures.

The responsibilities of Heads of Subject and Course Directors are agreed by our University. Heads of Subject and Course Directors provide academic leadership and oversee the course organisation, management and delivery and arrangements for the education and assessment of students. They are responsible with the wider course team for the overall academic standards and quality of the provision and its monitoring, annual review and systematic enhancement.

Roles in relation to collaborative provision partners (i.e. those organisations which contribute to the teaching, assessment or support of students studying on courses which lead to Leeds Beckett University awards) are in Section 15 of the Academic Regulations.

1.11 Regulatory Sections

Our University's Academic Regulations will be delivered in line with our purpose and principles and will be reviewed and enhanced in accordance with the individual sections. These include:

Section 2. Admissions

The Admissions section sets the standard and framework by which decisions will be taken on applications for all taught courses or pathways.

Section 3. Education and Assessment

This section sets the University's framework and structure for taught courses, learning outcomes and the manner in which these will be assessed and credit achieved.

Section 4. Progression and Award

This section defines the regulations for the progression of students from one level of a course to the next and for students' award eligibility and achievement. Additionally, it covers reassessment and repeat study for those students who fail to meet the criteria for progression or award at their first attempt.

Section 5. Examinations

This section details the regulations governing examinations, including the drafting and approval of papers, timetabling, invigilation, security and confidentiality and the conduct and responsibility of students (*referred to as 'candidates' for the purposes of this section*) undertaking the examination.

Section 6. Progression and Award Boards and Module Boards

This section defines the purpose and operation of Progression and Award Boards and Module Boards for taught courses and pathways leading to an award of the University that will reach decisions on students' suitability for progression or award.

Section 7. Disabled Students

The purpose of this section is to outline our duty under the Equality Act (2010) to anticipate the needs of disabled students and the way in which our university manages and implements individual reasonable adjustments.

Section 8. Extenuating Circumstances and Mitigation

This section defines the regulations for the application of extenuating circumstances and mitigation.

Section 9. Academic Appeals

To provide the requirements for students who have valid grounds to appeal against the decision of Progression and Award Boards, Module Boards, Research Degrees Sub-Committee or an Academic Misconduct Board and to set out students' rights and responsibilities in the appeal process, how the University will deal with student requests for an appeal hearing, and possible outcomes of the process.

Section 10. Academic Honesty

This section defines the University's approach to maintaining the academic honesty of students' work and safeguarding against breaches of academic honesty.

Section 11. Research Awards

To set the framework of regulatory requirements for all research awards of the University.

Section 12. Engagement and Partnership with Students

This section defines how the University provides a framework within which student consultation and partnership working contributes to the provision of an excellent education for all our students.

The university actively engages students, individually and collectively in the development, quality assurance and enhancement of their education and experience.

Section 13. Approval, Validation and Continuous Curriculum Enhancement

This section defines the regulations for the validation of courses and subsequent continuous curriculum enhancement review activities which ensure appropriate academic standards are set and maintained and which make available learning opportunities enabling the intended learning outcomes to be achieved.

Section 14. External Examiners and Advisors

This section sets out the University's requirements for external examining of all validated courses leading to an award, to provide assurance that the academic threshold standards of our taught awards are appropriate in light of UK reference points, that the achievement of our students is comparable to that on similar courses elsewhere, and that students are treated equitably in assessment. It sets out the University's processes for appointing external examiners and advisors, the duties expected of them and their annual reporting obligation to us.

Section 15. Collaborations and Partnerships

This section sets out the University's general provisions on the approval, monitoring and review of Collaborations and Partnerships and the duties, roles and responsibilities of the University and Collaborations and Partnerships.

Section 16. Academic Audit

This section provides details of the University's approach to Academic Audit for the assurance of academic standards and quality.

1.12 Review of our University's Academic Regulations

University Academic Regulations are reviewed on an annual basis and in response to external sector policy or regulatory expectations in accordance with our Academic Regulations review process. The review schedule is updated annually to take account of changing external developments and reference points. Approval of the Academic Regulations and the period for their review cycle is the responsibility of Academic Board.



LEEDS
BECKETT
UNIVERSITY

Academic Regulations Admissions

Section 2

leedsbeckett.ac.uk

Section 2

Admissions

Originating Department:	Academic Quality Enhancement Office
Enquiries to:	quality@leedsbeckett.ac.uk
Approving Body:	Academic Board
Last Approved:	2 July 2025
Next due for approval:	July 2026
Document Type:	Regulation
Target Audience:	Relevant for all University staff and students and of particular relevance to: Course Directors, other academic staff, applicants to the University, collaborative partners and professional support staff with particular responsibility for recruitment and admissions.

Contents

2.1	Purpose	1
2.2	General Principles of Admissions.....	1
2.3	Standard Minimum Entry Requirements	2
2.4	Recognition of Prior Learning	3
2.5	Types of Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL)	3
2.6	Assessment of RPL	3

Section 2: Admissions

2.1 Purpose

This section of the Academic Regulations provides a framework for decisions taken on applications to all taught courses. This includes decisions relating to the recognition of equivalent prior learning against course entry requirements or elements of the course itself.

2.2 General Principles of Admissions

All applications for admission to the University will be treated with equity, fairness and consistency and processed by trained and experienced staff in accordance with relevant University procedures.

Prospective applicants for admission to the University will be provided with current, sufficient, relevant and accurate information to enable them to make an informed decision in respect of application to courses of study offered by the University. This will include information about minimum course entry requirements and the mechanisms by which entry will be assessed.

The admission of any student to a course of study is based on an academic judgement that the applicant has satisfied the entry requirements and may, therefore, reasonably be expected to meet the learning outcomes of the course and to achieve the standard of the award.

For apprenticeships, applicants will also be required to provide evidence of eligibility to join the apprenticeship, in line with Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) requirements.

The University may specify entry routes based on Recognised Prior Learning (RPL) as being equivalent to standard entry criteria and consider these through normal admissions processes. The University may also specify RPL routes to facilitate direct entry part way through a course, and consider these alongside entry criteria equivalence through normal admissions processes.

An applicant may be granted RPL if the University is satisfied that they have fulfilled some of the assessment and progression requirements of the course of study by means other than attendance and, by completing the remaining requirements, will be able to meet the learning outcomes of the course of study and attain the standard required for the award.

Admission policies and procedures will be regularly monitored and reviewed to ensure their currency, relevance and appropriateness.

The University will operate formal complaint and appeal procedures which aim to deal with identified concerns in a fair and timely manner, through relevant University procedures.

2.3 Standard Minimum Entry Requirements

Standard minimum course entry requirements:

Entry to Level 4

A pass in two subjects equivalent to Qualifications and Credit Framework (QCF) level 3 and in addition English and Mathematics at GCSE grade C or above or QCF level 2 equivalents

Entry to Level 5

A pass in a relevant subject equivalent to QCF/ Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ) level 4. This is equivalent to 120 credit qualifications such as a Higher National Certificate (HNC); or Certificate of Higher Education (CertHE)

Entry to Level 6

Pass in a relevant subject equivalent to QCF/ FHEQ level 5. This is equivalent to 240 credit qualifications such as a Higher National Diploma (HND) or Foundation Degree.

Entry to Level 7

One of the following:

- an honours degree at 2:2 classification or above
- a postgraduate diploma
- a professional qualification recognised as being appropriate for entry at graduate level.

Other qualifications, including international and professional, which demonstrate that an applicant possesses appropriate knowledge and skills, may be acceptable. Some courses may specify additional entry requirements.

English Language Requirement

Normally, English Language, GCSE grade C or above, or an equivalent QCF level 2 qualification is required for entry to all courses. For those whose first language is not English, IELTS with a score of 6.0 (with no skill below 5.5) will be accepted as an equivalent qualification. Where this level of English Language differs, either higher or lower, this will be stated in the entry requirements criteria.

For apprenticeships, expectations regarding English and maths qualifications at entry will normally align with similar variants of the programme (where applicable) and with relevant requirements set out by Professional Statutory or Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs), those set out in the Apprenticeship Standard and Assessment Plan and with DfE requirements.

The University requires evidence of personal, professional and educational experience which provides an indication of the ability of the student to meet the entry requirements for the course of study.

2.4 Recognition of Prior Learning

Applicants may request exemption from modules or levels of a course, based on their previous qualifications and/or experience. Where this applies the University's Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) process will be followed.

2.5 Types of Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL)

RPL is the overarching term for the process of assessing, recognising and/ or awarding credit for prior certificated and experiential learning. University RPL arrangements relate to applications from individual applicants.

There are three types of RPL: Recognition of Prior Certificated Learning (RPCL), Recognition of Prior Experiential Learning (RPEL) and Credit Transfer.

RPL may be considered against undergraduate and taught postgraduate awards.

Applicants may claim RPL against up to two thirds of the total credit value of the university target award. However, in all cases a minimum of one third of the total credit of the target award, or 60 credits - whichever is the higher - must be studied at the University. No university award may be made solely on the basis of RPL.

RPL may not be awarded against L6 credit of an Honours or Ordinary Degree.

RPL may only be awarded against whole modules, not specific learning outcomes/assessments.

2.6 Assessment of RPL

All applications for RPL will be assessed against specific module or level learning outcomes and criteria specified in the RPL procedure by a suitably qualified member of academic staff.

The credit awarded as part of the RPL process will not include marks, will count as credit only and will, therefore, not count towards any progression, award or classification calculation.

Credit from an achieved qualification at a specific undergraduate level or postgraduate stage, awarded by Leeds Beckett or another educational institution, cannot normally be used against another award at the same level/ stage, for example a DipHE against a DipHE, **in the same cognate area**. This is known as “double counting”.

Course documentation must be explicit in stating where there are Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body (PSRB) requirements that might affect an applicant’s or student’s ability to make an RPL claim for specific credit against certain modules.

The University may enter into an articulation agreement with another institution whereby a course of study at that institution is recognised as meeting the requirements for admission, or direct entry, for defined provision of the University. Articulation agreements must be approved in accordance with university guidance. Applicants admitted through articulation agreements are not required to submit individual requests for RPL.



LEEDS
BECKETT
UNIVERSITY

Academic Regulations Education and Assessment

Section 3

leedsbeckett.ac.uk

Section 3

Education and Assessment

Originating Department:	Academic Quality Enhancement Office
Enquiries to:	quality@leedsbeckett.ac.uk
Approving Body:	Academic Board
Last Approved:	2 July 2025
Next due for approval:	July 2026
Document Type:	Regulation
Target Audience:	Relevant for all University staff and students and of particular relevance to Deans of School, Heads of Subject, Course Directors, Module Leaders; other academic staff, professional services staff, students, collaborative partners and external examiners.

Contents

3.1	Purpose	1
3.2	General Principles of Assessment	1
3.3	Types of Assessment	3
3.4	Module Assessment	3
3.5	Course Assessment	4
3.6	Marking Conventions	6
3.7	Classification	7
3.8	Awards Accredited by Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Bodies	7
3.9	Feedback on Assessed Coursework	8
3.10	Retention of Assessment Records	8
3.11	Submission of Assessment	8
3.12	Penalties for Late Submission	9
3.13	Extenuating Circumstances	9
3.14	Request for an Appeal Hearing	9
3.15	Responsibilities of Students	10
3.16	Disabled Students: Alternative Assessment Arrangements	10
3.17	Leeds Beckett University Students Studying in Other Institutions	11
3.18	Annexe 3A to Section 3 of the Regulations Concerning Assessment	11

Section 3: Education and Assessment

3.1 Purpose

Leeds Beckett University aims to be an excellent, accessible, globally engaged university contributing positively to a thriving Northern economy. The core objective of our Education Strategy is to provide an Excellent Education and Experience for all our students.

Courses leading to awards of the University operate within a modular framework. Modules are located at each level of a specific course and may be core to that course, or optional (providing an opportunity for specialisation, for example). Courses are examined, through the process of validation, to ensure that they present a coherent structure wherein the achievement of specific learning outcomes at module level contributes to the achievement of the learning outcomes at a specific level, and for the overall award.

Achievement of these learning outcomes is measured through assessment (which may relate to a part of a module, an individual module, or a number of modules within a specific level). Assessment may contribute, directly or indirectly, to the final level of achievement for the overall award. The level of achievement within specified modules will lead, where appropriate, to the classification of an award overall.

General Purposes of Assessment

- a) Assessment allows students to demonstrate the extent to which they have met the intended, specified learning outcomes
- b) Assessment promotes and supports students' learning and academic development
- c) Assessment is reliable, consistent, fair and valid
- d) Assessment is inclusive and equitable
- e) Assessment is explicit and transparent
- f) Assessment encourages academic honesty

3.2 General Principles of Assessment

- a) Assessment of a student's work is a matter of academic judgment, not simply of computation.
- b) Academic judgments of examiners cannot, in themselves, be questioned or overturned.
- c) All modules will be assessed.
- d) All learning outcomes of each module must be assessed.

- e) Courses will operate a sufficiently varied diet of assessment to demonstrate students' skills development.
- f) All assessments will operate within a schedule which is made clear to students at the beginning of the module.
- g) Submission of an assessment indicates that the student considers themselves fit to undertake that assessment.
- h) Students who have declared a disability may have alternative assessment arrangements provided to them.
- i) Exceptionally, where approved by the Dean and relevant External Examiners, an alternative assessment arrangement may be provided (e.g. circumstances relating to study abroad, transitional arrangements or exceptional circumstances) and will be reported to the Examination Board.
- j) All assessments will carry a penalty for late submission, unless there is an agreed extension of a deadline in advance of submission.
- k) All assessments must be submitted with due attention to issues of academic honesty, expression, and good academic practice, including clarity in grammar, semantics and syntax.
- l) All assessments will be returned with feedback within an agreed period of time.
- m) Assessment briefs, processes and classification and awards processes will be subject to internal scrutiny, approval, and moderation and external scrutiny by approved External Examiners unless exceptions are approved. Normally level 4 assessments will not be subject to external oversight unless required by a PSRB or for assurance of an academic award. External Examiners have the right to moderate the marks awarded by internal examiners. Moderation of marks contributing to honours degree classifications will reference the expectations set by the classification descriptors, as defined within the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications and aligned with the relevant internal marking conventions.
- n) Assessment practices will be valid, reliable, fair and transparent.
- o) Assessment practices will be fair and consistent, within, and across, courses.
- p) The language of assessment for all modules and awards of the University is English.
- q) Students will be provided with information and resources on the nature of unfair practice. They will be informed of the consequences of breaching the regulations in respect of academic honesty.
- r) Where courses lead to an award at levels 4-8 of the *Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications* they will be prone to external examination.
- s) The processes for the moderation and approval of assessment briefs/ examinations by both internal staff and external examiners will be applied to all forms of summative assessment. It is the Course Director's responsibility to ensure that assessment and reassessment briefs/ examinations are shared with the external examiners for scrutiny and endorsement prior to sharing with students.
- t) Apprenticeship End Point Assessment will be designed and delivered in accordance

with the relevant Apprenticeship Standard's Assessment Plan to meet OfS external quality assurance of apprenticeship end-point assessment for integrated higher and degree apprenticeships guidance. Please refer to the University's [End Point Assessment policy and procedure](#) (available internally only).

3.3 Types of Assessment

Assessment falls into three types.

Any assessments which are invigilated or have time constraints for submission would normally be categorised as examinations and subject to examination regulations.

1. Coursework. Examples of coursework include but are not limited to:

- a) Essay, report or other written assignment.
- b) Dissertation or project.
- c) Portfolio.
- d) Take-away paper.

2. Examination. Examples of examinations include but are not limited to:

- a) Timed examination.
- b) Set exercise, quiz or multiple-choice test (where invigilated or where there is a time constraint).
- c) Practical assessment (where invigilated or where there is a time constraint).

3. Practical. Examples of practicals include but are not limited to:

- a) Practical assessment.
- b) Formal presentation.

3.4 Module Assessment

- a) The overall pass mark for a module is 40% for Levels 4-6 and 50% for Level 7, unless a higher mark is required by a Professional, Statutory, or Regulatory Body. Where modules are used to deliver apprenticeship End Point Assessment (EPA), the module pass mark and grading will be in line with the relevant Apprenticeship Standard's Assessment Plan. Please refer to the University's [End Point Assessment policy and procedure](#) (available internally only).
- b) The assessment diet will relate to the learning outcomes of the module, the level at which it is assessed and to the volume of credit being assessed.
- c) Modules may be assessed on the basis of overall aggregate pass-mark, weighted differentiation between assessments or may focus on one (or more) units of assessment.

- d) All module assessment will be capable of differentiating the achievement of individual students and will adopt marking conventions in line with nationally agreed standards which clearly differentiate performance at the threshold level (a pass) and beyond the threshold level.
- e) After the internal marking and moderation process, student submissions, or an agreed sample, should be sent to the external examiner(s) with reasonable time to consider these prior to the meeting of the relevant Module or Progression and Award Board.
- f) The sample will be derived from the following requirements:
 - Sample sizes should be determined by a square root of cohort size, no smaller than 6, no larger than 15. However not all work is assessed in a way that makes a square root sample possible and allowance should be made in these circumstances. For example, in subjects such as the performing arts where there may be a requirement for an External Examiner to come and view a performance, or to visit the exhibition of artwork.
 - Samples will include all classification categories, and samples at the other grade boundaries including some fails.
 - Samples will consist of internally moderated work, clearly evidencing the moderation process.

3.5 Course Assessment

- a) All courses will have a modular structure which defines those elements which are compulsory and must be passed in order to achieve the final award.
- b) All courses will identify those modules that will be assessed, including any assessed work experience or placement activity.
- c) Progression at each level of a multi-level award will be dependent on successful completion at that level.
- d) All courses will follow a common model of classification (whether for honours for Bachelors awards, or for the award of Merit or Distinction, in other relevant awards) and these outcomes will clearly differentiate performance at the threshold level (a pass), and beyond the threshold level, in line with the expectations of nationally agreed award standards articulated within the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications and other standards or frameworks where applicable. Where applicable to the qualification, classification will reference the expectations set by the classification descriptors defined within the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications and will be aligned with the relevant internal marking conventions.
- e) Module Boards and Progression and Award Boards will make decisions on module marks, progression, reassessment and classification and conferment of awards.

3.6 Marking Conventions

The University adopts the following conventions for: the marking of assessed work for an award of the University and to assist Progression and Award Boards in determining honours degree classification.

A	70%+	First Class
B	60-69%	Upper Second Class
C	50-59%	Lower Second Class
D	40-49%	Third Class
F1	30-39%	Fail
F2	15-29%	Fail
F3	below 15%	Fail

Marking conventions will be supported by guidance issued by the Academic Quality Enhancement Office.

In addition, descriptors for the classification of honours degrees have been defined and are located within annexe 3B to this section of the regulations and form part of these regulations.

The following conventions are adopted for postgraduate taught awards, including the first 180 taught credits of a Professional Doctorate:

70%+	Distinction
60-69%	Merit
50-59%	Pass
40-49%	Fail
30-39%	Fail
15-29%	Fail
below 15%	Fail

In addition, marking conventions for Level 7 awards have been defined and are located within annexe 3C.

Assessments on Integrated Masters courses will be marked in according with the marking conventions for each level of study.

3.7 Classification

Honours Degree Classification

In determining the class of Bachelor Degree with Honours to be recommended, a Progression and Award Board should take account of the weighted average of the best 100 credits at levels 5 (25%) and 6 (75%) in relation to the marking conventions above.

Integrated Masters Classification (excluding Integrated Master of Architecture)

In determining the class of Integrated Masters to be recommended, a Progression and Award Board should take account of the weighted average of the best 100 credits at levels 5 (10%), 6 (20%) and 7 (70%) in relation to the marking conventions above.

The approach to classification for Integrated Masters students referenced within the regulations is applicable for students who commence Level 4 of this type of award from August 2022.

Upgrade of Borderline Performance

If the final weighted average for an honours degree, Integrated Masters award or the final level average for any other non-honours award is within 2% of the boundary for classification (#8/#9) then a class of award will be upgraded provided that 50% or more of the credit achieved at the final level is in the higher classification (unless this is prohibited by the regulations of a Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body).

Distinction and Merit

Awards of Distinction and Merit may be made in respect of all awards except an honours degree and an Integrated Masters (see Progression and Award regulations).

3.8 Awards Accredited by Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Bodies

For awards accredited by professional, statutory or regulatory bodies, students must:

- a) fulfil the requirements of an award of the University;
- b) fulfil any further requirements for accreditation specified by the professional, statutory or regulatory body. Both staff and students must be made aware of the specific requirements to be fulfilled in order to obtain the accredited award.

Students failing to achieve the specific assessment requirements for awards accredited by professional, statutory or regulatory bodies will be advised of alternative courses of study available within the University.

3.9 Feedback on Assessed Coursework

Students will be informed of:

- a) the feedback they can expect;
- b) the date by which this will be provided;
- c) the format in which the feedback will be communicated.

Feedback will vary with the assessment task in question. Forms of feedback on assessed work may include the following:

- a) oral feedback.
- b) written comment.
- c) provisional marks indicated on scripts/submission.
- d) the final ratified mark.

3.10 Retention of Assessment Records

Period of Retention

A sample of major coursework assessment will be retained until one academic year after the student or students have finished their course in the University.

For apprenticeships, to support Ofsted inspections and audits, samples of work should be accessible for up to 6 years from the end of the financial year in which the last payment of Funding was received.

Samples Retained

Normally this will be two samples from each of the classification divisions and two samples of failures. A photographic record of artefacts may be kept where appropriate.

Secure Storage

Arrangements for the secure storage of these samples must be in accordance with the University document retention policy.

3.11 Submission of Assessment

The arrangements for the submission of assessed work will be clearly notified to students. Arrangements may vary across the University. The University requirement is that they should be secure and prevent, in so far as possible, a student being able to claim that a piece of work was handed in without such a claim being verifiable.

3.12 Penalties for Late Submission

The penalties for late submission of assessed coursework will be clearly notified to students.

Students are expected to submit work on time, but where a student has failed to submit assessment(s) by the prescribed date without good cause they will be penalised as detailed below. The same penalties will be applied to both full-time and part-time students.

“Days” include weekdays and include vacations, but exclude weekends, bank holidays and other days when the University or designated collaborative institution is closed. A day is 24 hours (e.g. a submission deadline is 4.00pm on a Tuesday and any work submitted from 4.01pm on the Tuesday until 4.00pm on the Wednesday would be considered as 1 day late). Where assessment submission ‘windows’ are in place, late penalties will be applied after the closure of this ‘window’.

1 to 10 days late: the work will normally be capped at the threshold pass mark (40% for Levels 4-6 and 50% for Level 7). Any assessment with a final mark below the pass mark would not have any late penalties applied.

Beyond 10 days late: a mark of zero would normally be recorded.

Cases of persistent late submission will be brought to the attention of the Progression and Award Board or Module Board by the Module Leader.

3.13 Extenuating Circumstances

Students will be clearly advised that it is their responsibility alone to draw to the attention of the Progression and Award Board any extenuating circumstances which they think may have affected their performance and to adhere to the procedures for doing this.

3.14 Request for an Appeal Hearing

Information about how and when to submit a request for an appeal may be found on the Academic Regulations website. See Section 9 of the Academic Regulations for more information on appeals.

3.15 Responsibilities of Students

It is the responsibility of students to comply with the University's regulations. In relation to assessment, students should note these responsibilities in particular:

- a) to ensure that they are aware of examination dates and coursework submission dates.
- b) to attend examinations and submit work for assessments as required.
- c) to request an extension to an assessment submission deadline if necessary.
- d) to provide to examiners in advance of their meetings any relevant information on personal circumstances which may have affected their performance and which they wish to be taken into account.
- e) to request an appeal hearing if necessary.
- f) to avoid plagiarism and other forms of academic misconduct.

Students should be aware of the following potential consequences of failure to meet their responsibilities in assessment:

- a) in the event of failure to attend examinations or submit work for assessment without good cause, examiners have the authority to deem the student to have failed the assessment(s) concerned.
- b) in the event of failure to provide information in advance on extenuating circumstances that they wish examiners to take into account, where there is no valid reason for this not being provided, any request for an appeal hearing on the grounds of these circumstances will normally be rejected.

Definition of a Non-Compliant Assessment Submission

Non-compliant submissions of either coursework or examination scripts are submissions of materials consisting only of information that identifies the student. In the event of non-compliant submission, the student will receive a non-submission outcome for the assessment (NS).

3.16 Disabled Students: Alternative Assessment Arrangements

Disabled students may be assessed under alternative assessment arrangements. These will be provided only where the alternative arrangements have been agreed under the provisions of the Code of Practice: Disabled Students. The University provides guidance on inclusive assessment.

3.17 Leeds Beckett University Students Studying in Other Institutions

Leeds Beckett University students may study in other institutions, including institutions in other countries, either as a requirement of their course or as an optional module or component of their course.

In such cases the assessment will be specified in the course documentation. Where the assessment relates to the University's 'Study Abroad' programme, the assessment will be defined in the host institution's course documentation. The assessment will be conducted either according to the co-operation agreement between the universities or according to the regulations and procedures of the host institution.

If assessment or reassessment opportunities required by Leeds Beckett University regulations cannot be delivered by the host institution, (for example, where it is impractical to travel overseas for a scheduled reassessment attempt or where no reassessment is offered), an alternate assessment task that supports the learning outcomes of the module or component concerned may be agreed by Leeds Beckett University and offered to the student.

Students of the University will normally only be awarded appropriate credit for study undertaken in other institutions. In such cases their final award classifications will be based solely on the marks/ grades earned for study at Leeds Beckett University itself. By exception only, marks/ grades achieved for specific study in other institutions may contribute to the classification of University awards.

Information about any such arrangement will be detailed in the relevant course document, specified at validation for assessment and communicated to students before they commence any study in another institution.

3.18 Annexe 3A to Section 3 of the Regulations Concerning Assessment

An annexe 3A has been added to this section of the regulations which draws together expectations for assessment practice and its operational implementation. The annexe 3A provides a clear and comprehensive summary of the requirements associated with the maintenance of standards of assessment in a rigorous, robust and equitable manner.

These expectations in Annexe 3A are not regulations but are extrapolations of the regulatory principles and they form a framework that governs our assessment protocols. They should be deemed to have the same status as regulations, rather than guidance, in that they must be followed unless specific exemption is sought.

Academic Regulations Annexe 3A Relating to Assessment Practice and Associated Staff Guidance

The Purpose of Assessment

Assessment allows students to demonstrate their achievement of validated, specified learning outcomes for courses, academic levels, and modules, in line with expectations set by the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications and other relevant national sector standards (for example, those set within apprenticeship standards or recommended in subject benchmark statements). Qualifications and credit must only be awarded to students who demonstrate the achievement of these learning outcomes.

Each module of study, level of study and award has constructively aligned, interlinked learning outcomes which are the sum of the defined knowledge, skills and behaviours that students can be expected to demonstrate upon completion.

Through the scrupulous, consistent and robust application of national standards and external oversight, assessment, and the processes invoked to confirm its form and standard, supports the comparability of student achievement across the sector and maintains the value of the qualifications both at the point they are awarded and over time. The University's Education Strategy provides an additional framework to contextualise and deliver appropriate assessment standards and strategies.

Assessment Strategy

The assessment strategy for the course will be defined and reviewed at validation. The aim of our course design principles is to ensure that courses are well designed, inclusive and provide a high-quality experience for students of the required academic standard. Validation will ensure the appropriateness of the course and the assessment strategy as planned, to enable the achievement of students to be reliably assessed and the achievement of learning outcomes to be demonstrated.

Assessment strategies are designed to be inclusive, appropriate for the qualification, level and module learning outcomes being assessed, be constructively aligned and support students' progression and achievement. Assessment should promote academic honesty and be undertaken securely.

Assessment strategies must enable consistent, equitable, reliable, valid and fair assessment to ensure the appropriate measurement of students' achievement of the intended learning outcomes, at and beyond the threshold level.

The standard, form and process of assessment must also be reasonably comparable with that of other UK providers and aligned with the required national standards including the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications.

For integrated apprenticeships the assessment should be designed in accordance with the relevant Apprenticeship Standard's Assessment Plan and align to the OfS external quality assurance requirements.

Assessment requirements and processes must be explicit and transparent with clear, accurate and timely information provided for students.

Assessment may constitute:

Assessment of learning: identifies the level and standards of achievement, facilitates the awarding of credit and qualifications, and supports the assurance of academic standards.

Assessment for learning: supports students by providing timely and comprehensible feedback concerning students' achievement of the required outcomes at and beyond the threshold and how their work might be improved.

Assessment as learning: where a balanced and varied assessment strategy develops students' understanding of their strengths and of areas for further development of academic skills when engaging with assessment tasks. This supports the increased independence and maturity of the learner.

Assessment may be formative: it is used both as a tool for tutors to measure student progress and as a benchmark for students to understand the progression of their own learning through receiving and building on feedback from tutors. Students use formative assessment and associated feedback to refine and strengthen their academic performance with regard for threshold standards (defined by the pass mark) and higher levels of achievement. The outcomes of formative assessment are not expressed as final module marks.

Assessment may be summative: it fulfils all the aims of formative assessment and additionally, is designed to indicate the extent of student success in meeting specific learning outcomes and associated volumes of credit at defined levels of the FHEQ. The outcomes of summative assessment are expressed as module/ module component marks. Cumulatively, these may be expressed as outcomes for student progression and/ or student award eligibility and classification.

Summative assessment may be set for components of modules, whole modules or groups of modules.

Assessment and the Achievement of Learning Outcomes

The achievement of module learning outcomes is demonstrated by students' submissions of assessment and completion of examinations (where applicable) and the extent to which they have evidenced the intended learning outcomes. The assessment process and the awarding of marks will measure and grade students' achievement of the intended learning outcomes and academic standards of performance. This will consider the extent to which students' achievement has met or is beyond the required threshold pass standard, in the academic judgement of both internal and external examiners.

The achievement of level learning outcomes is demonstrated by accumulated achievement in modules at that level, to the standards prescribed in **Section 4 of the Academic Regulations: Progression and Award**. Where courses have multiple levels of learning, this allows students to progress through their course of study.

Ultimately, when students have met all the intended level and course learning outcomes, they are able to demonstrate their eligibility for an award of the University. The course learning outcomes are an aggregation and consolidation of the constructively aligned module and level learning outcomes which assessment has tested.

Assessment and Academic Standards

Assessment supports the maintenance of standards and the volume of credit achieved for the award of a qualification and at a level.

Assessment should be proportionate, inclusive, equitable, secure, relevant, and progressive, to support students' learning.

Assessment tasks and a sample of students' assessed performance are reviewed and confirmed as appropriate by examiners external to the University. This provides assurance that standards are set at the appropriate level, are comparable across the sector and support the demonstration of learning outcomes having been met. In addition, this confirmation assures that the mark awarded is appropriate to performance either above, at, or below the threshold level

Regulatory Expectations for Assessment Practice

The following are required elements of our assessment practice:

- A1 We ensure that the academic standards of assessment are rigorous, of comparable standing with the rest of the sector and meet the requirements of the relevant national qualifications framework.
(ref: Section 1.3 (d): Principles/ Section 3.2: General Principles of Assessment/ Section 14.3.6: Duties of External Examiners)
- A2 We ensure that all summative assessments are subject to internal scrutiny, approval, and moderation, and where appropriate (i.e. above Level 4 and/ or leading to a recognised H.E. award of the University at Level 4 and above/ and or required by a professional body) are scrutinised by external examiners.
(ref: Section 3.2: General Principles of Assessment / Section 5.2.2: Examination Responsibilities/ Section 5.2.3: Principles on Moderation and Approval of Examination Papers/ Section 14.3.6: Duties of External Examiners)
- A3 We ensure that an agreed sample of submissions (course work) or scripts (examination papers) are sent to the external examiner associated with the assurance of standards of the module concerned, within the parameters described in expectation A2 above.
(ref: Section 5.2.3: General Principles on Moderation and Approval of Examination Papers)
- A4 We ensure assessment is valid, reliable, fair, inclusive, transparent and consistent within and across our courses.
(ref: Section 3.2: General Principles of Assessment)
- A5 We ensure that assessment tasks are marked with regard for the University's agreed marking conventions.
(ref: Section 3.5: Course Assessment)
- A6 We ensure that external examiners see the work of a representative sample of students proposed for each category of award and have appropriate access to all assessed work where practicable. We recognise that external examiners have the right to moderate internal marking.
(ref: Section 3.4: Module Assessment/ Section 14.3.6: Duties of External Examiners)
- A7 We ensure that the form and conduct of reassessment tasks is of a comparable standard to the original assessment task and recognise that the principles of assessment are equally applicable to reassessment.
(ref: Section 3.2: General Principles of Assessment)

General Expectations for Assessment Practice

In addition to the regulatory position summarised in the expectations above, which set the overarching framework for the maintenance of assessment standards, the following operational expectations for the management of assessment practice were considered and endorsed by the Regulatory Review group established in 2019/20 to review and advise on assessment practice. These expectations are important to the maintenance of excellent assessment practice and exemption from these should be sought from the Academic Quality Enhancement Office, only by exception, and accompanied by a clear rationale for the exemption:

- B1 Each summative assessment task should be accompanied by an assessment brief accessible to students, tutors and external examiners and which includes the following information:
 - i) a description of the task (which may include a word count or length);
 - ii) the intended learning outcomes;
 - iii) referencing style/requirements;
 - iv) marking criteria and grade descriptors;
 - v) the mode of feedback.
- B2 An internal verification process is required for all summative assessment/ reassessment tasks and is undertaken by at least one member of academic staff of appropriate experience, preferably from outside the module team. The purpose of the verification process is to confirm the appropriateness of both the task and the associated marking scheme with due regard for expectations A1, A2, A4 and A5.
- B3 External examiners will scrutinise the standard and form of summative assessment/ reassessment tasks which lead to the award of credit and/ or qualifications described in A2 above. If a sampling approach to approval is being followed, external examiners must approve at least one summative assessment task for each module concerned. Confirmation of this will be required through the submission of the external examiners report. Both of these activities are undertaken prior to the release of the assessment tasks to students.
- B4 The marks for each component of assessment/ reassessment are internally moderated in alignment with the parameters described in A2 above. Where assessment does not require a written submission, the record of the assessment outcome concerned (in whatever form that is captured) should form the basis of the moderation process and should support a moderation process.

- B5 Where a team of tutors is marking the same assessment, or assessments are being second marked, the tutors should meet early in the assessment process to ensure consistency of approach. Additionally, one or more members of that team should have appropriate experience of subject standards across the sector (e.g. through external examining appointments or participation in sector recognised subject calibration processes) to support appropriate calibration of performance standards.
- B6 The internal moderation of assessment submissions may be undertaken based on the same sample size articulated for external moderation purposes. Both internal and, where applicable, external moderators may request additional/ all submissions to review.
- B7 Any concerns relating to the standard of student performance highlighted through the moderation process should be brought to the attention of the module leader for further action (e.g. the potential amendment of cohort marks up or down).

Supporting Resources

University guidance and resources are available to support the delivery of these expectations: Institutional guidance on inclusive practice, inclusive assessment and sample sizes etc.:

www.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/staffsite/-/media/files/staff-site/quality-assurance/key-information/validation/inclusive-assessment-guide-final.pdf

General development resources for excellent assessment practice and access to the Inclusive Course Design Tool:

www.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/teachlearn
www.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/teachlearn/learning-and-teaching-guidance/inclusive-practice
www.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/-/media/files/clt/inclusive-assessment-guide-feb-2022-pdf
www.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/teachlearn/excellent-academic-practice/how-to-build-learning-pathways-through-your-course/feedback

Undergraduate and Postgraduate marking descriptors (including the first 180 taught credits of a Professional Doctorate) can be located:

www.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/-/media/files/clt/rubrics/undergraduate-marking-descriptors---july-2023-pdf.pdf
www.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/-/media/files/clt/rubrics/postgraduate-marking-descriptors---feb-2022-pdf.pdf

Further information on can be located:

www.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/teachlearn/excellent-academic-practice/how-to-build-learning-pathways-through-your-course/assessment/

The External Examiners' Handbook (which also includes a list of key Course Director responsibilities):

www.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/our-university/public-information/external-examiners

The University is also implementing the Advance HE examiners training programme for the professional development of staff members who have assessment and examining roles/responsibilities. The purpose of the programme is to provide strengthened assurance of degree standards across the UK Higher Education sector. More information concerning the programme is available at the following link: www.advance-he.ac.uk/degree-standards-project.

Additional external guidance and resources relating to assessment protocols for the maintenance of academic standards are available at the following links:

www.qaa.ac.uk/en/quality-code/advice-and-guidance/assessment

www.qaa.ac.uk/quality-code/advice-and-guidance/external-expertise

www.qaa.ac.uk/en/quality-code/qualifications-and-credit-frameworks

www.qaa.ac.uk/quality-code/subject-benchmark-statements

www.advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/external-examining

Section 3: Annexe 3B Undergraduate Marking Conventions

Marking Conventions Bachelors with Honours and Level 6 awards										
Grade	Percentage Mark	Level of Performance	Level of outcomes achieved, demonstrated at, beyond or below the threshold for Bachelors with Honours Degree Classification	Threshold outcomes for the Level 6 outcomes and Bachelors with Honours awards	Knowledge and Understanding: A systematic extensive and comparative understanding of key aspects of the field of study, including coherent and detailed knowledge of the subject and critical understanding of theories and concepts, at least some of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of defined aspects of a discipline.	Cognitive Skills: A conceptual understanding of a level that is necessary to devise and sustain arguments, and/or to solve problems and comment on research and scholarship in the discipline, with an appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge.	Practical Skills: An ability to manage one's individual learning and to deploy accurately established techniques of analysis and enquiry within a discipline or as necessary for the discipline.	Transferable Skills: Personal and enabling skills appropriate to the discipline, including the ability to communicate information, ideas, problems and solutions to both specialist and non-specialist audiences, the exercise of initiative and personal responsibility, and decision-making in complex and unpredictable contexts.	Professional Competencies: Typically, where a degree award requires an assessment of professional competencies, no award will be made if the student does not meet them. Providers remain free to set course learning outcomes above the threshold and classify students accordingly.	Bachelors with Honours Degree ***
A	70 and above	Excellent	Achieved all required course learning outcomes and consistently demonstrated	Achieved Level 6 threshold outcomes and those for Bachelors with Honours	The student has shown exceptional knowledge and understanding, significantly beyond the threshold expectation of a graduate at this level and beyond what has been taught.	The student has demonstrated an exceptional ability to select, consider, evaluate, comment on and synthesise a broad range of research, primary sources, views and information and integrate references.	The student has demonstrated an accomplished and innovative application of discipline-specific specialist skills.	The student can communicate information, ideas, problems and solutions to an accomplished level verbally, electronically and in writing. They have shown an accurate, fluent, sophisticated style. They possess exceptional numeracy and digital literacy skills.	The student has demonstrated achievement of professional competence when assessed against the requirements of a PSRB.	First Class
			* advanced knowledge and understanding, cognitive, practical and transferable skills.		The student has demonstrated an exceptional understanding of subject-specific theories, paradigms, concepts and principles, and in-depth knowledge, if not mastery of a range of specialised areas.	The student has made consistent, logical, coherently developed, and substantiated arguments, and demonstrated the ability to systematically consider, critically evaluate and synthesise a wide range of views and information. They have demonstrated sophisticated perception, critical insight and interpretation of complex matters and ideas.	The student has autonomously completed practical tasks and/or processes with a high degree of accuracy, coordination and proficiency.	The student has demonstrated the capability to make clear, authoritative and valuable contributions to group discussions and/or project work, with exceptional teamwork and leadership skills.	The student has adhered to the appropriate rules and/or conventions set by regulators or the industry.	
			* exceptional initiative and personal responsibility		The student has conducted independent, extensive and appropriate investigation, analysis, research, enquiry and/or study well beyond the usual range, together with critical evaluation, to advance work and/or direct arguments.	The student has demonstrated a wide range of extremely well-developed problem-solving skills, as well as a strong aptitude for decision-making with a high degree of autonomy, in the most complex and unpredictable circumstances.	The student has a full range of exceptional technical, creative and/or artistic skills.	The student has shown an exceptional ability to manage their learning on their own initiative, and work without supervision.		
			* ability to reflect critically and independently on their work			The student has demonstrated exceptional creative flair and originality.	The student has presented research findings perceptively, convincingly and appropriately in a wide range of formats, and has gathered, processed and interpreted a wide range of complex data efficiently and effectively.	The student has demonstrated exceptional initiative and/or personal responsibility.		
			* exceptional problem-solving skills					The student has demonstrated an exceptional ability to reflect critically and independently on their work.		
B	60-69	Good	Achieved all their required course learning outcomes and demonstrated	Achieved Level 6 threshold outcomes and those for Bachelors with Honours	The student has demonstrated sophisticated breadth and depth of knowledge and understanding, showing a clear, critical insight.	The student has thoroughly selected, critically evaluated and commented on reading, research and primary sources, usually beyond the set range.	The student has demonstrated a capable and effective application of discipline-specific specialist skills.	The student can communicate information, ideas, problems and solutions with a high-degree of proficiency verbally, electronically and in writing. They have a clear, fluent and expressive style with appropriate vocabulary. They have a high standard of numeracy and digital literacy skills.	The student has demonstrated achievement of professional competence when assessed against the requirements of a PSRB.	Upper Second
			* thorough knowledge and understanding, cognitive, practical and transferable skills.		The student has demonstrated a thorough understanding of subject-specific theories, paradigms, concepts and principles, and a sound understanding of more specialised areas.	The student has demonstrated the ability to make coherent, substantiated arguments, as well as the ability to consider, critically evaluate and synthesise a range of views and information. They have demonstrated a thorough, perceptive and thoughtful interpretation of complex matters and ideas.	The student has performed practical tasks and/or processes autonomously, with accuracy and coordination.	The student has demonstrated the capability to make strong, valuable contributions to group discussions and/or project work, with an understanding of team and leadership roles.	The student has adhered to the appropriate rules and/or conventions set by regulators or the industry.	
			* good initiative and personal responsibility		The student has conducted thorough background investigation, analysis, research, enquiry and/or study using established techniques accurately, and possesses a well-developed ability to critically appraise a wide range of sources.	The student has demonstrated thorough problem-solving skills, selecting and justifying their use of a wide-range of methods, and can make decisions in complex and unpredictable circumstances with a degree of autonomy.	The student has a thorough command of highly-developed relevant technical, creative and/or artistic skills.	The student has shown a strong ability to systematically manage their learning and work without supervision.		
			* an ability to reflect critically on their work			The student has shown a high level of creativity and originality throughout their work.	The student has presented thorough research findings perceptively and appropriately in a wide range of formats, and has gathered, processed and interpreted a wide range of complex data efficiently and effectively.	The student has consistently demonstrated well-developed initiative and/or personal responsibility.		
			* thorough problem-solving skills					The student has demonstrated the ability to reflect critically on their work		
C	50-59	Strong	Achieved all their required course learning outcomes and demonstrated	Achieved Level 6 threshold outcomes and those for Bachelors with Honours	The student has demonstrated a sound breadth and depth of subject knowledge and understanding, if sometimes balanced towards the descriptive rather than the critical or analytical.	The student has selected, evaluated and commented on reading, research and primary sources, sometimes beyond the set range.	The student has consistently demonstrated the development and informed application of discipline-specific specialist skills.	The student can consistently and confidently communicate information, ideas, problems and solutions verbally, electronically and in writing. They show a clear, coherent, expressive style, with a range of vocabulary. They have consistently demonstrated strong numeracy and digital literacy skills.	The student has demonstrated achievement of professional competence when assessed against the requirements of a PSRB.	Lower Second
			* strong knowledge and understanding, cognitive, practical and transferable skills.		The student has consistently demonstrated an understanding of subject-specific theories, paradigms, concepts and principles as well as more specialised areas.	The student has argued logically, with supporting evidence, and has demonstrated the ability to consider and evaluate a range of views and information. They have clearly and consistently explained complex matters and ideas.	The student has consistently completed practical tasks/processes mainly independently in an accurate, well-coordinated and proficient way.	The student has consistently demonstrated the capability to make coherent and constructive contributions to group discussions and/or project work.	The student has adhered to the appropriate rules and/or conventions set by regulators or the industry.	
			* initiative and personal responsibility		The student has conducted background investigation, analysis, research, enquiry and/or study using established techniques accurately, and can critically appraise academic sources	The student has consistently solved complex problems, selecting and applying a range of appropriate methods, and can make decisions in complex and unpredictable circumstances.	The student has consistently demonstrated well-developed technical, creative and/or artistic skills.	The student has consistently shown an ability to systematically manage their learning and work without supervision.		

Section 3: Annexe 3B Undergraduate Marking Conventions

Marking Conventions Bachelors with Honours and Level 6 awards										
Grade	Percentage Mark	Level of Performance	Level of outcomes achieved, demonstrated at, beyond or below the threshold for Bachelors with Honours Degree Classification	Threshold outcomes for the Level 6 outcomes and Bachelors with Honours awards	Knowledge and Understanding: A systematic extensive and comparative understanding of key aspects of the field of study, including coherent and detailed knowledge of the subject and critical understanding of theories and concepts, at least some of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of defined aspects of a discipline.	Cognitive Skills: A conceptual understanding of a level that is necessary to devise and sustain arguments, and/or to solve problems and comment on research and scholarship in the discipline, with an appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge.	Practical Skills: An ability to manage one's individual learning and to deploy accurately established techniques of analysis and enquiry within a discipline or as necessary for the discipline.	Transferable Skills: Personal and enabling skills appropriate to the discipline, including the ability to communicate information, ideas, problems and solutions to both specialist and non-specialist audiences, the exercise of initiative and personal responsibility, and decision-making in complex and unpredictable contexts.	Professional Competencies: Typically, where a degree award requires an assessment of professional competencies, no award will be made if the student does not meet them. Providers remain free to set course learning outcomes above the threshold and classify students accordingly.	Bachelors with Honours Degree ***
			* an ability to reflect on their work			The student has consistently demonstrated creativity.	The student has consistently presented their research findings effectively and appropriately in many formats, and has gathered, processed and interpreted data efficiently and effectively.	The student has consistently demonstrated initiative and/or personal responsibility.		
			- * skills					The student has consistently demonstrated a well-developed ability to reflect on their work.		
D	40-49	Satisfactory (Pass or threshold)	Achieved all their required course learning outcomes and demonstrated	Achieved Level 6 threshold outcomes and those for Bachelors with Honours	The student has demonstrated a depth of knowledge and understanding in key aspects of their field of study, sufficient to deal with terminology, facts and concepts.	The student has demonstrated the ability to select, evaluate and comment on reading, research and primary sources.	The student has demonstrated evidence of developing and applying discipline-specific specialist skills.	The student can communicate information, ideas, problems and solutions verbally, electronically and in writing, with clear expression and style. They have also demonstrated numeracy and digital literacy skills.	The student has demonstrated achievement of professional competence when assessed against the requirements of a PSRB.	Third (pass or threshold)
			* knowledge and understanding, cognitive, practical and transferable skills.		The student has demonstrated an understanding of subject-specific theories, paradigms, concepts and principles.	The student has shown the ability to devise and sustain an argument, with some consideration of alternative views, and can explain often complex matters and ideas.	The student has completed practical tasks and/or processes accurately and with a degree of independence.	The student has demonstrated a capability of making useful contributions to group discussions and/or project work.	The student has adhered to the appropriate rules and/or conventions set by regulators or the industry.	
			* initiative and exercised personal responsibility		The student has conducted general background investigation, analysis, research, enquiry and/or study using established techniques, with the ability to extract relevant points.	The student has demonstrated an ability to solve problems, applying a range of methods to do so, and the ability to make decisions in complex and unpredictable circumstances.	The student has demonstrated technical, creative and/or artistic skills.	The student has shown an ability to manage their learning and work with minimal or no supervision.		
			* some ability to reflect on their work			The student has produced some creative work.	The student has presented their research findings, in several formats, and has gathered, processed and interpreted data effectively.	The student has demonstrated initiative and/or personal responsibility.		
			* problem-solving skills					The student has demonstrated the ability to reflect on their work.		
F1	0-39	Not Successful	Did not achieve the required course learning outcomes and did not consistently demonstrate	Did not achieve Level 6 threshold outcomes or those for Bachelors with Honours	The student's knowledge and understanding of the subject is inadequate, without the required breadth or depth, with deficiencies in key areas.	The student has displayed an over-reliance on set sources. They have not demonstrated an adequate ability to select and evaluate reading and research.	The student has not demonstrated sufficient evidence of discipline-specific skills development or application.	The student is not able to sufficiently express ideas and convey clear meaning verbally, electronically and/or in writing, uses inaccurate terminology, with many errors in spelling, vocabulary and syntax. They have been unable to demonstrate consistently basic numeracy and digital literacy skills.	The student has not demonstrated achievement of professional competence when assessed against the requirements of a professional, statutory or regulatory body (PSRB).	Fail
			* sufficient knowledge and understanding, cognitive, practical and transferable skills.		The student has demonstrated inadequate understanding of subject-specific theories, paradigms, concepts and principles, including their limitations and ambiguities.	The student's arguments and explanations are weak and/or poorly constructed, and they are not able to critically evaluate the arguments of others or consider alternative views.	The student has attempted practical tasks/processes but followed a limited, procedural or mechanistic formula, and they contain errors, with little or no independence.	The student has made infrequent contributions to group discussions and/or project work.	The student has failed to adhere to the appropriate rules and/or conventions set by regulators or the industry.	
			* adequate initiative and personal responsibility		The student has not produced sufficient evidence of background investigation, analysis, research, enquiry and/or study.	The student has shown a limited ability to solve problems and/or make decisions.	The student has demonstrated a lack of technical, creative and/or artistic skills in most, or key, areas.	The student has demonstrated little or no ability to manage their learning and/or work without supervision.		
			* ability to reflect on their work			The student has shown little or no real creativity.	The student has not presented their research findings clearly or effectively, and their gathering, processing and interpretation of data is unsatisfactory.	The student has not demonstrated adequate initiative or personal responsibility.		
			* problem-solving skills					The student has shown little or no ability to reflect on their work.		

Section 3: Annexe 3B Undergraduate Marking Conventions

Threshold outcomes for Level 6 and Bachelors with Honours awards					
Threshold outcomes for the Level 6 outcomes and Bachelors with Honours awards ie for awards at threshold, pass or above the threshold	Knowledge and Understanding: A systematic extensive and comparative understanding of key aspects of the field of study, including coherent and detailed knowledge of the subject and critical understanding of theories and concepts, at least some of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of defined aspects of a discipline.	Cognitive Skills: A conceptual understanding of a level that is necessary to devise and sustain arguments, and/or to solve problems and comment on research and scholarship in the discipline, with an appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge.	Practical Skills: An ability to manage one's individual learning and to deploy accurately established techniques of analysis and enquiry within a discipline or as necessary for the discipline.	Transferable Skills: Personal and enabling skills appropriate to the discipline, including the ability to communicate information, ideas, problems and solutions to both specialist and non-specialist audiences, the exercise of initiative and personal responsibility, and decision-making in complex and unpredictable contexts.	Professional Competencies: Typically, where a degree award requires an assessment of professional competencies, no award will be made if the student does not meet them. Providers remain free to set course learning outcomes above the threshold and classify students accordingly.
Level 6 (All awards including Bachelors with Honours)	A systematic understanding of key aspects of their field of study, including acquisition of coherent and detailed knowledge, at least some of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of defined aspects of a discipline.	Conceptual understanding that enables the student:	An ability to deploy accurately established techniques of analysis and enquiry within a discipline.	Holders will have: the qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring:	The student has demonstrated achievement of professional competence when assessed against the requirements of a PSRB.
		* to devise and sustain arguments, and/or to solve problems, using ideas and techniques, some of which are at the forefront of a discipline	The ability to manage their own learning, and to make use of scholarly reviews and primary sources (for example, refereed research articles and/or original materials appropriate to the discipline).	* the exercise of initiative and personal responsibility	The student has adhered to the appropriate rules and/or conventions set by regulators or the industry.
		* to describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research, or equivalent advanced scholarship, in the discipline.	Typically, holders of the qualification will be able to:	* decision-making in complex and unpredictable contexts	
		* An appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge.	* apply the methods and techniques that they have learned to review, consolidate, extend and apply their knowledge and understanding, and to initiate and carry out projects	* the learning ability needed to undertake appropriate further training of a professional or equivalent nature.	
			* critically evaluate arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and data (that may be incomplete), to make judgements, and to frame appropriate questions to achieve a solution or identify a range of solutions to a problem		
			* communicate information, ideas, problems and solutions to both specialist and non-specialist audiences.		
Bachelors with Honours (as Level 6 above and the following additional requirements)	Holders of a bachelor's degree with honours will have developed an understanding of a complex body of knowledge, some of it at the current boundaries of an academic discipline.	Through this, the holder will have developed analytical techniques and problem-solving skills that can be applied in many types of employment.	The holder of such a qualification will be able to evaluate evidence, arguments and assumptions, to reach sound judgements and to communicate them effectively.	Holders of a bachelor's degree with honours should have the qualities needed for employment in situations requiring the exercise of personal responsibility, and decision-making in complex and unpredictable circumstances.	The student has demonstrated achievement of professional competence when assessed against the requirements of a PSRB.
					The student has adhered to the appropriate rules and/or conventions set by regulators or the industry.

Section 3: Annexe 3B Undergraduate Marking Conventions

Awarding degrees where threshold FHEQ Level 6 standards may not have been met	
Ordinary Degrees	
In England, full-time honours degrees usually take place over three years.	
Our University may permit students to study slightly fewer credits and achieve an ordinary degree - an award which is still set at Level 6 FHEQ in England.	
Students completing an ordinary degree are awarded a pass/merit/distinction or a fail - they are not classified in the same way as honours degrees.	
Ordinary degrees are structured in a number of ways with typical models including a general degree where the emphasis is on breadth rather than depth of study, or a designated degree where the main subject of study will be identified in the award title and/or student transcript.	
Ordinary degrees are also sometimes awarded to students who take the full honours degree but do not succeed in all assessments.	
Pass Degrees	
In England students who study the full honours degree but do not achieve all the required credits, may be awarded a pass degree. Pass degrees are not classified.	

Section 3: Annex 3C Level 7 Marking Conventions (including the first 180 taught credits of a Professional Doctorate)

Grade	Percentage Mark	Level of Performance	Level of outcomes achieved and demonstrated at, beyond or below the threshold	Postgraduate Degree Standard ¹
A	70 and above	Excellent	Achieved all their course learning outcomes and consistently demonstrated: • a systematic and exceptional understanding of knowledge, and a critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, much of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of their academic discipline, field of study or area of professional practice. • a comprehensive and exceptional understanding of techniques applicable to their own research or advanced scholarship. • exceptional originality in the application of knowledge, together with a practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline • exceptional conceptual understanding that enables the student: - to evaluate critically current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline - to evaluate methodologies and develop critiques of them and, where appropriate, to propose new hypotheses. • advanced ability to deal with complex issues both systematically and creatively, make sound judgements in the absence of complete data, and communicate their conclusions clearly to specialist and non- specialist audiences. • self-direction and originality in tackling and solving problems, and act autonomously in planning and implementing tasks at a professional or equivalent level. • exceptional ability to continue to advance their knowledge and understanding, and to develop new skills to a high level. • the exceptional qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring: - the exercise of initiative and personal responsibility - decision-making in complex and unpredictable situations - the independent learning ability required for continuing professional development.	Distinction
B	60-69	Good	Achieved all their course learning outcomes and consistently demonstrated: • a systematic and sophisticated understanding of knowledge, and a critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, much of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of their academic discipline, field of study or area of professional practice • a thorough and comprehensive understanding of techniques applicable to their own research or advanced scholarship • high level of originality in the application of knowledge, together with a practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline	Merit

¹ Where regulatory requirements for the award, all course outcomes at threshold and beyond the threshold are achieved and meet the applicable national standards in the FHEQ.

Section 3: Annex 3C Level 7 Marking Conventions (including the first 180 taught credits of a Professional Doctorate)

Grade	Percentage Mark	Level of Performance	Level of outcomes achieved and demonstrated at, beyond or below the threshold	Postgraduate Degree Standard ¹
			- thorough conceptual understanding that enables the student: - to evaluate critically current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline - to evaluate methodologies and develop critiques of them and, where appropriate, to propose new hypotheses. - the ability to deal with complex issues both systematically and creatively, make sound judgements in the absence of complete data, and communicate their conclusions clearly to specialist and non- specialist audiences - self-direction and originality in tackling and solving problems, and act autonomously in planning and implementing tasks at a professional or equivalent level - the ability to continue to advance their knowledge and understanding, and to develop new skills to a high level. - the qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring: - the exercise of initiative and personal responsibility - decision-making in complex and unpredictable situations - the independent learning ability required for continuing professional development.	
C	50-59	Satisfactory	Achieved all their course learning outcomes and demonstrated: - a systematic understanding of knowledge, and a critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, much of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of their academic discipline, field of study or area of professional practice - a comprehensive understanding of techniques applicable to their own research or advanced scholarship - originality in the application of knowledge, together with a practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline - conceptual understanding that enables the student: - to evaluate critically current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline - to evaluate methodologies and develop critiques of them and, where appropriate, to propose new hypotheses. - the ability to deal with complex issues both systematically and creatively, make sound judgements in the absence of complete data, and communicate their conclusions clearly to specialist and non- specialist audiences - self-direction and originality in tackling and solving problems, and act autonomously in planning and implementing tasks at a professional or equivalent level - the ability to continue to advance their knowledge and understanding, and to develop new skills to a high level. - the qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring: -the exercise of initiative and	Pass

Section 3: Annex 3C Level 7 Marking Conventions (including the first 180 taught credits of a Professional Doctorate)

Grade	Percentage Mark	Level of Performance	Level of outcomes achieved and demonstrated at, beyond or below the threshold	Postgraduate Degree Standard ¹
			personal responsibility - decision-making in complex and unpredictable situations - the independent learning ability required for continuing professional development.	
F	0-49	Not successful	Did not achieve the required course learning outcomes and did not demonstrate the required award threshold standards. Did not demonstrate: • sufficient or a systematic understanding of knowledge, and a critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, much of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of their academic discipline, field of study or area of professional practice. • a comprehensive understanding of techniques applicable to their own research or advanced scholarship. • originality in the application of knowledge, together with a practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline. • conceptual understanding that enables the student: - to evaluate critically current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline - to evaluate methodologies and develop critiques of them and, where appropriate, to propose new hypotheses. • ability to deal with complex issues both systematically and creatively, make sound judgements in the absence of complete data, and communicate their conclusions clearly to specialist and non- specialist audiences. • self-direction and originality in tackling and solving problems and act autonomously in planning and implementing tasks at a professional or equivalent level. • ability to continue to advance their knowledge and understanding, and to develop new skills to a high level. • the qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring: - the exercise of initiative and personal responsibility - decision-making in complex and unpredictable situations - the independent learning ability required for continuing professional development.	Fail

Academic Regulations Progression and Award

Section 4

Section 4

Progression and Award

Originating Department:	Academic Quality Enhancement Office
Enquiries to:	quality@leedsbeckett.ac.uk
Approving Body:	Academic Board
Last Approved:	2 July 2025
Next due for approval:	July 2026
Document Type:	Regulation
Target Audience:	Relevant for all University staff and students and of particular relevance to: Deans of School, Heads of Subject, external examiners and academic and professional support staff involved in Progression and Award Boards or Module Board activities.

Contents

4.1	Purpose	1
4.2	General Principles of Student Progression and Award	1
4.3	Student Progression and Award	4
4.3.1	Requirements for Student Progression	4
4.3.2	Requirements for Award Eligibility	5
4.3.3	Undergraduate Profiles of Achievement	6
4.3.4	Bachelor Degree with Honours: Determination of Classification	9
4.3.5	Postgraduate Profiles of Achievement	9
4.3.6	Student Reassessment for Progression or Award Eligibility	13
4.3.7	Students Unable to Progress or Ineligible for Award Following Reassessment ..	14
4.3.8	Unable to Progress: Opportunities for Repeat Study	14
4.3.9	Ineligible for Award: Opportunities for Repeat Study	14
4.3.10	Carrying Forward of Modules	15
4.3.11	Pre-Requisite Modules.....	15
4.3.12	Modules Which Must Be Passed	15
4.3.13	Students' Responsibilities	16
4.3.14	Aegrotat Awards	16
4.3.15	Posthumous Awards	16

Section 4: Progression and Award

4.1 Purpose

This section of the Academic Regulations defines how students progress from one level of a course to the next and how students' become eligible for, and achieve, awards of the University. Additionally, it covers reassessment and repeat study for those students who fail to meet the criteria for progression or award at their first attempt.

To assure academic standards are maintained, and in the interests of student equity and fairness, this section applies to all the University's credit bearing taught courses unless variation is formally approved through the appropriate University process and clearly publicised for applicants and students in the Course Specification and Course Handbook.

The processes through which progression and award decisions are taken are covered in ***Section 6 Progression and Award Boards and Module Boards***.

Module Boards confirm student module marks and confirm that student performance has been graded with due regard for the meeting of module learning outcomes and the University's marking conventions, in line with the expectations of nationally agreed standards articulated within the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications and where applicable, professional, statutory and regulatory body or apprenticeship requirements

Progression and Award Boards consider the module marks students achieve across the whole level and make decisions on progression to the next level of the course or achievement of University awards at the final level of the course.

Progression and Award Boards will ensure that their decisions are consistent with students having met the relevant level and/ or course learning outcomes, for the award of credit and qualifications, and that award outcomes are consistent with the performance thresholds defined through institutional marking conventions in line with the expectations of nationally agreed award standards articulated within the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications and where applicable, professional, statutory and regulatory body or apprenticeship requirements.

4.2 General Principles of Student Progression and Award

Each level of a course is comprised of modules of study. Levels may be made up of core modules, which students are required to study, and elective modules, where there is an element of student choice in module selection.

Student learning is assessed at modular level and each module may have a number of components (separate pieces of assessment) which, when combined, form the overall module mark a student can achieve.

Modules have learning outcomes (statements of what students will have learned upon successful completion) which when brought together, demonstrate the achievement of level learning outcomes and ultimately, course learning outcomes.

Decisions regarding progression, award eligibility and award outcome are made with due regard for:

- a) the achievement of level and course learning outcomes;
- b) the requirements for progression from one level to the next, as defined later in this section;
- c) a profile of achievement for each award, as defined later in this section.

Where students have met or exceeded a defined profile of achievement, and by doing so demonstrated achievement of the level learning outcomes, they will have met the standard required to progress to the next academic level. See 4.3.3 and 4.3.5 below for defined profiles of achievement in respect of progression.

Where students have met or exceeded a defined profile of achievement, and by doing so demonstrated achievement of the course learning outcomes, they will have met the standard required for award eligibility. See 4.3.3 and 4.3.5 below for defined profiles of achievement in respect of individual qualification aims.

Students who have not met the defined profiles of achievement for progression or award eligibility at the first attempt are eligible for reassessment. Students are offered reassessment opportunities once only in those modules with an overall mark of less than 40% for Levels 4-6 and 50% for Level 7.

Reassessment is undertaken at component level so any module component marks of 40% or more for Levels 4-6 or 50% or more for Level 7 will not be subject to reassessment.

All reassessed work is capped at 40% for Levels 4-6 or 50% for Level 7.

For apprenticeship EPA modules, reassessment opportunities will be agreed in line with Apprenticeship Standard Assessment Plans.

Following reassessment, students who do not meet the requirements for level progression or award will be eligible for one or more of the following outcomes:

- a) Contained Award: a lower award is made based on the student's profile of achievement
- b) Failed/ Complete: failed modules are repeated
- c) Failed/ Repeat: the whole level is repeated
- d) Failed/ Withdraw: the student is not allowed to continue on the course

These decisions are a matter for the Progression and Award Board. Students' overall academic performance and/ or engagement with the course will inform the decision-making process of the Board.

A Board may decide that a student's performance merits an opportunity to repeat modules. A decision of Failed/ Complete means that students retain the marks of passed modules. A decision of Failed/ Repeat means that no marks are retained.

Students at the final level of their course are not eligible for Failed/ repeat decisions and may complete failed modules once only.

Repeat module marks are not capped and students¹ will be required to attend the university and pay tuition fees for repeat study.

Students completing or repeating a level may, subject to the agreement of the Course Director, (or nominee) choose to take different elective modules from those electives previously taken to demonstrate the achievement of level learning outcomes.

Students undertaking sandwich placements are required to perform satisfactorily and complete the prescribed work experience before progressing to the next level of study. Students who have not completed the prescribed work experience satisfactorily may repeat it (where provisions for this can be made) or transfer to a non-sandwich mode of study.

Students who fail to achieve the profile of achievement for their target award shall be recommended for the conferment of a contained award for which they have achieved the specified requirements.

Students may be entitled to one of the following contained awards:

- a) Certificate in Lifelong Learning at levels 4-6

¹ Responsibility for payment of costs associated with an apprenticeship is outlined in contractual documentation.

- b) Certificate of Higher Education at level 4
- c) Diploma of Higher Education at level 5
- d) Bachelor Degree at level 6
- e) Advanced Certificate in Lifelong Learning at level 7
- f) Postgraduate Certificate or Postgraduate Diploma at level 7
- g) Master's Degree at level 7

The profiles of achievement for these awards are defined in 4.3.3 and 4.3.5, below.

4.3 Student Progression and Award

4.3.1 Requirements for Student Progression

Where a Level 0, 4 or 5 student (or Level 6 of an Integrated Masters) has met or exceeded the following profile, and by doing so demonstrated achievement of the level learning outcomes, they will have achieved the standard required to progress to the next academic level:

- studied 120 credit points on an approved path of study at the level concerned (including any Recognition of Prior Learning);
- submitted in all specified components (pieces) of assessment;
- achieved an average of 40% or more in modules equivalent to 100 credit points at the level concerned;
- achieved an overall average of 40% or more across all modules studied at this level.

Additionally, apprentices will normally be required to evidence:

- that their completion of off-the-job learning hours is evidenced and within agreed parameters.

Courses may exceptionally establish stages within academic levels of courses. These stages constitute groups of modules upon completion of which, student progress is considered and both reassessment and subsequently repeat opportunities may be offered.

In-level stages are normally proposed and confirmed through the course validation process. Stages are proposed with due regard for curriculum coherence, student workload, the availability of tutorial support and other support arrangements.

4.3.2 Requirements for Award Eligibility

In addition to satisfying the submission and attainment requirements for each module of study, students are required to achieve defined profiles of achievement in respect of University awards.

All taught courses (with the exception of Honours Degrees and Integrated Masters (excluding Integrated Master of Architecture)) whose students have demonstrated excellent performance will be awarded a distinction or merit where they have attained a defined profile of achievement confirmed through the course validation process or, where there is no defined profile, have attained a specific average mark in assessments contributing to the final award as follows:

- 60% or more for a merit
- 70% or more for a distinction.

If the final level average for an award is within 2% of the merit or distinction classification boundary then the award will be upgraded to that classification, provided that 50% or more of the credit achieved at the final level of study is in the higher classification band.

Only Level 7 modules will contribute towards the final average calculation for taught postgraduate courses.

In addition, an award of the University will only be conferred when the following conditions are satisfied:

Registration, Fees and Financial Liabilities

The candidate is a registered student² with the University at the time of their assessment for an award, and payment of all the appropriate tuition fees has been made.

Completion of Programme of Study

The candidate has completed a programme of study approved by the University leading to the award being recommended.

Prior to a target academic award being made apprentices must normally pass the End Point Assessment*.

² Responsibility for payment of costs associated with an apprenticeship is outlined in contractual documentation.

** there are various types of EPA (non-integrated/integrated/fully integrated) and further information on the EPA requirements for each apprenticeship will be outlined in the relevant Apprentice Handbook.*

Recommendation for an Award

The award has been recommended by a Progression and Award Board, convened, constituted and acting under the regulations approved by the Academic Board of the University; or a duly established Appeal Panel of the University.

4.3.3 Undergraduate Profiles of Achievement

a) Certificate in Lifelong Learning

The Certificate in Lifelong Learning is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 30 credit points at either Levels 4, 5 or 6. The University awards these credit points where a student has:

- pursued a course of study of 30 credit points at Levels 4, 5 or 6;
- submitted in all specified components of assessment;
- achieved an average of 40% or more in modules equivalent to 30 credit points at Levels 4, 5 or 6;
- not met the eligibility criteria for a target or contained award

b) Certificate

The Certificate is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 60 credit points at Level 4. The University awards these credit points where a student has:

- pursued a course of study of 60 credit points at Level 4 or above;
- submitted in all specified components of assessment;
- achieved the overall learning outcomes for the award;
- achieved an average of 40% or more in modules equivalent to 40 credit points at Level 4 or above;

c) Certificate of Higher Education

The Certificate of Higher Education is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 120 credit points at Level 4. The University awards these credit points where a student has:

- pursued a course of study of 120 credit points at Level 4 or above (including any recognition of prior learning);

- submitted in all specified components of assessment;
- achieved the overall learning outcomes for the award;
- achieved an average of 40% or more in modules equivalent to 100 credit points at Level 4 or above
- achieved an overall average of 40% or more across all modules studied.

d) Diploma

The Diploma is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 120 credit points at Level 4 and 60 credit points at Level 5 or above. The University awards these credit points where a student has:

- achieved the requirements for progression from Level 4 to Level 5 or has been admitted directly to Level 5;
- pursued a course of study of 60 credit points at Level 5 or above;
- submitted in all specified components of assessment;
- achieved the overall learning outcomes for the award;
- achieved an average of 40% or more in modules equivalent to 40 credit points at Level 5 or above;

e) Diploma of Higher Education

The Diploma of Higher Education is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 120 credit points at Level 4 and 120 credit points at Level 5. The University awards these credit points where a student has:

- achieved the requirements for level progression from Level 4 to Level 5, or has been admitted directly to Level 5;
- pursued a course of study of 120 credit points at Level 5 or above (including any recognition of prior learning);
- submitted in all specified components of assessment;
- achieved the overall learning outcomes for the award;
- achieved an average of 40% or more in modules equivalent to 100 credit points at Level 5 or above;
- achieved an overall average of 40% or more across all modules studied at this level.

f) Foundation Degree

The Foundation Degree is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 120 credit points at Level 4 and 120 credit points at Level 5. The University awards these credit points where a student has:

- achieved the requirements for level progression from Level 4 to Level 5, or has been admitted directly to Level 5;
- pursued a course of study of 120 credit points at Level 5 or above (including any recognition of prior learning);
- submitted in all specified components of assessment;
- achieved the overall learning outcomes for the award;
- achieved an average of 40% or more in modules equivalent to 100 credit points at Level 5 or above;
- achieved an overall average of 40% or more across all modules studied at this level.

g) Bachelor Degree

The Bachelor Degree is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 120 credit points at Level 4, 120 credit points at Level 5 and 60 credit points at Level 6. The University awards these credit points where a student has:

- achieved the requirements for level progression from Level 4 to Level 5, and from Level 5 to Level 6, or has been admitted directly beyond Level 4;
- pursued a course of study of 60 credit points at Level 6 or above;
- submitted in all specified components of assessment;
- achieved the overall learning outcomes for the award;
- achieved an average of 40% or more in modules equivalent to 40 credit points at Level 6 or above;

h) Bachelor Degree with Honours

The Bachelor Degree with Honours is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 120 credit points at Level 4, 120 credit points at Level 5, and 120 credit points at Level 6. The University awards these credit points where a student has:

- achieved the requirements for level progression from Level 4 to Level 5, and from Level 5 to Level 6, or has been admitted directly to Level 6;
- pursued a course of study of 120 credit points at Level 6 or above (including any recognition of prior learning);
- submitted in all specified components of assessment;
- achieved the overall learning outcomes for the award;
- achieved an average of 40% or more in modules equivalent to 100 credit points at Level 6 or above;
- achieved an overall average of 40% or more across all modules studied at this level.

4.3.4 Bachelor Degree with Honours: Determination of Classification

Bachelor Degrees with Honours are available with the following classifications:

- First Class: overall outcome of 70%+
 - Upper Second Class: overall outcome of 60% to 69%
 - Lower Second Class: overall outcome of 50% to 59%
 - Third Class: overall outcome of 40% to 49%
- a) In determining the class of Bachelor Degree with Honours to be recommended, a Progression and Award Board will consider performance at both Level 5 and Level 6.
- b) The following formula will be used:

The best 100 credits of Level 5 work at 25% weighting added to the best 100 credits of Level 6 work at 75% weighting.

- c) If the final weighted average for an award is within 2% of the next classification boundary then the award will be upgraded to that classification, provided that 50% or more of the credit achieved at level 6 is in the higher classification band.
- d) Only modules studied within the University, or within the terms of an agreed University arrangement or collaboration, can be considered when establishing the classification of an honours degree.
- e) Work undertaken on the placement year for a sandwich degree cannot be considered when establishing a degree classification unless it is validated as a credit bearing module or modular component at Level 5 or Level 6.

4.3.5 Postgraduate Profiles of Achievement

a) Advanced Certificate in Lifelong Learning

The Advanced Certificate in Lifelong Learning is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 30 credit points at Level 7. The University awards these credit points where a student has:

- pursued a course of study of 30 credit points at Level 7;
- submitted in all specified components of assessment;
- achieved an average of 50% or more in modules equivalent to 30 credit points at Level 7;

- not met the eligibility criteria for a target or contained award.

b) Postgraduate Certificate

The Postgraduate Certificate is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 60 credit points at Level 7. The University awards these credit points where a student has:

- pursued a course of study of 60 credit points at Level 7 or above;
- submitted in all specified components of assessment;
- achieved the overall learning outcomes for the award;
- achieved an average of 50% or more in modules equivalent to 60 credit points at Level 7 or above;
- achieved an overall average of 50% or more across all modules studied at this level that contribute to the award being considered.

c) Postgraduate Diploma

The Postgraduate Diploma is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 120 credit points at Level 7. The University awards these credit points where a student has:

- pursued a course of study of 120 credit points at Level 7 or above;
- submitted in all specified components of assessment;
- achieved the overall learning outcomes for the award;
- achieved an average of 50% or more in modules equivalent to 100 credit points at Level 7 or above;
- achieved an overall average of 50% or more across all modules studied at this level that contribute to the award being considered.

d) Masters Awards (including the first 180 taught credits of a Professional Doctorate)

Masters degrees are awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 180 credit points, of which a minimum of 160 credits points are at Level 7, with the remaining 20 credits at Level 6 or above. The University awards these credit points where a student has:

- pursued a course of study of 180 credit points, of which a minimum of 160 credit points are at Level 7 or above;
- achieved the overall learning outcomes for the award;
- submitted in all specified components of assessment;
- achieved an average of 50% or more in modules equivalent to 160 credit points at Level 7 or above;
- achieved an overall average of 50% or more across all modules studied at this level

that contribute to the award being considered.

e) Executive Master

Executive Masters degrees are awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 180 credit points, of which a minimum of 150 credits points are at Level 7, with the remaining 30 credits at Level 6 or above. The University awards these credit points where a student has:

- pursued a course of study of 180 credit points, of which a minimum of 150 credit points are at Level 7 or above;
- achieved the overall learning outcomes for the award;
- submitted in all specified components of assessment;
- achieved an average of 50% or more in modules equivalent to 150 credit points at Level 7 or above;
- achieved an overall average of 50% or more across all modules studied at this level.

f) Master of Landscape Architecture (MLA)

Master of Landscape Architecture degrees are awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 300 credit points at Level 7. The University awards these credit points where a student has:

- pursued a course of study of 300 credit points;
- achieved the overall learning outcomes for the award;
- submitted in all specified components of assessment;
- achieved an average of 50% or more in modules equivalent to 280 credit points at Level 7 or above;
- achieved an overall average of 50% or more across all modules studied at this level.

g) Integrated Masters Awards

Integrated Masters degrees are awarded for the attainment of 480 credit points: 120 credit points at level 4, 120 credit points at level 5, 120 credit points at level 6 and 120 credit points at level 7. The University awards these credit points where a student has:

- achieved the requirements for level progression from Level 4 to Level 5, from Level 5 to Level 6, from Level 6 to Level 7 or has been admitted directly beyond the first level of the course;
- pursued a course of study of 120 credit points at Level 7 or above;
- submitted in all specified components of assessment;
- achieved the overall learning outcomes for the award;

- achieved an average of 50% or more in modules equivalent to 100 credit points at Level 7 or above;
- achieved an overall average of 50% or more across all modules studied at this level that contribute to the award being considered.

h) Integrated Master of Architecture

Integrated Masters degrees are awarded for the attainment of 540 credit points: 120 credit points at level 4, 120 credit points at level 5, 120 credit points at level 6 and 180 credit points at level 7. The University awards these credit points where a student has:

- achieved the requirements for level progression from Level 4 to Level 5, from Level 5 to Level 6, from Level 6 to Level 7 or has been admitted directly beyond the first level of the course;
- pursued a course of study of 180 credit points at Level 7 or above;
- submitted in all specified components of assessment;
- achieved the overall learning outcomes for the award;
- achieved an average of 50% or more in modules equivalent to 180 credit points at Level 7 or above.

i) Integrated Masters Awards: Determination of Classification

Integrated Masters courses are available with the following classifications:

- First Class: overall outcome of 70%+
- Upper Second Class: overall outcome of 60% to 69%
- Lower Second Class: overall outcome of 50% to 59%
- Unclassified Degree: overall outcome of 40% to 49%

In determining the class of Integrated Masters with Honours to be recommended, a Progression and Award Board will consider performance at Levels 5, 6 and 7.

The following formula will be used:

The best 100 credits of Level 5 work at 10% weighting added to the best 100 credits of Level 6 work at 20% weighting added to the best 100 credits of Level 7 work at 70% weighting.

For students studying the Integrated Master of Architecture the following classification formula will be used:

The best 100 credits of Level 5 work at 10% weighting added to the best 100 credits of Level 6 work at 20% weighting added to the average of all 180 credits of Level 7 work at 70% weighting.

If the final weighted average for an award is within 2% of the next classification boundary then the award will be upgraded to that classification, provided that 50% or more of the credit achieved at Level 7 is in the higher classification band.

Only modules studied within the University, or within the terms of an agreed University arrangement or collaboration, can be considered when establishing the classification of an Integrated Masters course.

Work undertaken on the placement year for a sandwich degree cannot be considered when establishing an Integrated Masters classification unless it is validated as a credit bearing module or modular component at Level 5 or Level 6.

The approach to classification for Integrated Masters students referenced within the regulations is applicable for students who commence Level 4 of this type of award from August 2022.

- j) A full list of University awards, their overall credit composition and the level of the award as aligned with the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications may be found in ***Section 18: Definition of University Awards***.

4.3.6 Student Reassessment for Progression or Award Eligibility

Students who have not achieved the requirements for progression or award eligibility may be reassessed in order to reach the required standard, subject to the following provisions:

- Students are eligible for reassessment in all failed modules for the academic level.
- The opportunity for reassessment will be given once only in respect of any module during an academic level. Please see 4.2 regarding apprentice reassessment.
- All reassessment is at component level and marks achieved for any successfully completed components will remain unaltered and will contribute to the final average mark for the module.
- The maximum mark achievable for reassessed components is 40% for Levels 4-6 and 50% for Level 7. For reassessed work within EPA modules the capped mark will be in line with the Apprenticeship Standard's Assessment Plan.
- Reassessment may only be used for the recovery of failure. It may not be used to attempt to improve an existing mark.

- Where a student achieves a lower mark for the reassessed work than for the original submission, the higher original mark will stand.

4.3.7 Students Unable to Progress or Ineligible for Award Following Reassessment

If the standard for progression or award eligibility is not achieved following reassessment, Progression and Award Boards will consider student repeat opportunities.

4.3.8 Unable to Progress: Opportunities for Repeat Study

Following reassessment, students who have submitted in all components of assessment, achieved **50% or more** of the credit points for the level concerned but have achieved insufficient credit points required for level progression will normally receive a decision of 'Fail – Repeat Part Level' from the Progression and Award Board.

In these circumstances, students will re-enrol to repeat the failed modules for that level, attending the University and receiving full tuition. Students who receive a decision of 'Fail – Repeat Part Level' will retain credit and marks for successfully completed modules.

Following reassessment, students who have submitted in all components of assessment but achieved **less than 50%** of the credit points for the level concerned and are unable to progress will normally receive a decision of 'Fail – Repeat Full Level' from the Progression and Award Board.

In these circumstances, students will re-enrol to repeat the whole level, attending the University and receiving full tuition. Students who receive a decision of 'Fail – Repeat Full Level' will not retain any credit or marks for modules previously completed at that level.

If students' achievement of **less than 50%** of the credit points for the level derives largely from non-submission of assessed work or extremely poor academic performance such students may, at the discretion of the Progression and Award Board, be failed and withdrawn from the course. In such cases students may be eligible for a contained award and/ or the ratification of credit achieved.

Repeat opportunities are normally only considered at the end of a level after re-assessment opportunities have taken place and where students are not eligible to progress. Students may only repeat each level once.

4.3.9 Ineligible for Award: Opportunities for Repeat Study

At the final level of the course, and following reassessment, students who have submitted in all components of assessment but have achieved insufficient credit points required for award eligibility will normally receive a decision of 'Fail – Complete' from the Progression and Award Board. Students may only repeat each level once.

Such students will re-enrol to repeat the failed modules for that level, attending the University and receiving full tuition. Students who receive a decision of 'Fail – Repeat Part Level' will retain credit and marks for successfully completed modules. There is no 'Fail- Repeat Full Level' option at the final level of the course.

If students' achievement of **less than 50%** of the credit points at the final level derives largely from non-submission of assessed work or extremely poor academic performance such students may, at the discretion of the Progression and Award Board, be failed and withdrawn from the course. In such cases students may be eligible for a contained award and/ or the ratification of credit achieved.

4.3.10 Carrying Forward of Modules

Exceptionally, a student may be permitted to carry forward up to two standard modules into the next academic level (a maximum of 40 credits). This decision is at the discretion of the Progression and Award Board and is only invoked where a student has not been able to complete the assessment or reassessment process due to confirmed extenuating circumstances.

4.3.11 Pre-Requisite Modules

Through the course validation process, a course may identify modules which must be studied in order to undertake subsequent modules within the same level or modules taught later in the course. These are known as pre-requisite modules. In such cases, students must be specifically advised of progression or award eligibility requirements which are impacted by pre-requisite modules.

4.3.12 Modules Which Must Be Passed

The University pass mark for module achievement is 40% for Levels 4-6 and 50% for Level 7.

For all levels the Progression and Award Board may condone a failed 20 credit point module at each level of study, if the level/award learning outcomes are otherwise satisfied.

For the purposes of progression or award eligibility, credit is awarded for condoned modules.

Through the course validation process, a course may identify particular modules which are required to be passed in order to obtain a University award. In some cases, a threshold pass mark above the university standard for module achievement may be stipulated.

These modules may be pre-requisites for future study options but need not be.

4.3.13 Students' Responsibilities

Students are responsible for maintaining an awareness of their successfully completed modules and for keeping a running total of the credit they have already achieved during the level.

Students are responsible for checking the dates of examinations and submission dates for coursework and any associated re-sits and resubmission dates. This information is made available via the University's virtual learning environment.

The scheduling of reassessment opportunities will be at a School's discretion and may be different for assessed coursework and examinations.

4.3.14 Aegrotat Awards

An *aegrotat award* for incomplete study is an unclassified *award* which may be conferred in exceptional circumstances, such as in cases where a student's ability to complete their studies is permanently compromised by severe illness.

A decision on the form and level of the award must be reached by the Progression and Award Board with due regard for evidence of an appropriate threshold standard of performance.

Before a recommendation of an aegrotat award is made, the student must have signified a willingness to accept the award and have signified an understanding that the acceptance of this award waives the right to reassessment.

A student who has been offered an aegrotat award, but who chooses instead to be reassessed, may not claim the aegrotat award in the event of subsequent failure.

4.3.15 Posthumous Awards

An award may be recommended posthumously by the Progression and Award Board and be accepted by another person on behalf of a deceased student.

In reaching decisions about posthumous awards, Boards may be guided by the trajectory of performance of the student concerned.

Academic Regulations Examinations

Section 5

Section 5

Examinations

Originating Department:	Academic Quality Enhancement Office
Enquiries to:	quality@leedsbeckett.ac.uk
Approving Body:	Academic Board
Last Approved:	3 July 2024
Next due for approval:	July 2026
Document Type:	Regulation
Target Audience:	Relevant for all University staff and students and of particular relevance to: Academic staff who set examinations, academic and professional support staff engaged in invigilation and staff and students at Collaborative Partners.

Contents

5.1	Purpose	1
5.2	General Principles of Examinations	1
5.2.1	Definition of Examinations.....	1
5.2.2	Examination and Other Summative Assessment Responsibilities.....	2
5.2.3	General Principles on Moderation and Approval of Examination Papers	3
5.2.4	General Principles on the Conduct of Examinations	3
5.3	Code of Practice on Examinations	4
5.3.1	Written Examination Papers from External Bodies or Professional Bodies	4
5.3.2	Examination Timetables.....	4
5.3.3	Invigilation.....	5
5.3.4	Responsibilities of Candidates	5
5.3.5	Electronic and Other Personal Equipment	5
5.3.6	Additional information about Equipment	6
5.4	Conduct of Examination Candidates.....	6
5.5	Absence from Written Examinations.....	8
5.6	Breach of Regulations	8
	APPENDIX: ACTIONS WHICH MAY BE CONSIDERED TO BE BREACHES OF THE UNIVERSITY'S ACADEMIC REGULATIONS RELATING TO ASSESSMENT AND EXAMINATION.....	9

Section 5: Examinations

5.1 Purpose

This section of the Academic Regulations deals with examinations, including the drafting and approval of papers, timetabling, invigilation, security and confidentiality and the conduct and responsibility of students (*referred to as 'candidates' for the purposes of this section*) undertaking the examination.

Examinations are one of the methods used to assess students' achievement of learning outcomes. Examinations may take different forms including written papers and practical assessments and may be online or in person.

Procedural requirements for staff in respect of examination support are detailed within guidance produced by Registry Services.

Schools are responsible for bringing these regulations to the attention of all candidates prior to their first examination.

5.2 General Principles of Examinations

5.2.1 Definition of Examinations

For the purposes of these Regulations, an examination is defined as follows:

- a) A Formal Invigilated Examination:
 - a timed written question paper;
 - normally answered in writing;
 - answered individually by each candidate;
 - on a specific day;
 - at a specified time and place.
- b) A Formal Invigilated Practical Assessment:
 - a timed practical assessment;
 - undertaken individually by each candidate, or in a group of candidates;
 - on a specific day;
 - at a specified time and place.

In addition, assessments would normally be considered under examination regulations where the assessment is invigilated or has an identified time constraint for submission (for example online timed assessments).

Practical assessments, oral assessments and/ or assessed presentations may be delivered under examination conditions, in which case the relevant sections of this code apply.

Where such assessments are not delivered under formal examination conditions, tutors will advise students in advance of any protocols governing, for example, non-attendance or late attendance. Disabled students who have reasonable adjustments in place for examinations will be advised as to the transferability of these for any assessments (for example phase tests) which are not delivered under formal examination conditions. Decisions on transferability should be taken in conjunction with Disability Advice.

5.2.2 Examination and Other Summative Assessment Responsibilities

The Course Director (or nominee) is responsible for informing candidates in writing of the nature and form of the examination(s) through the provision of Course and Module Handbooks or equivalent information shared via the University's virtual learning environment. The same protocol applies to arrangements for informing students of the nature and form of all other summative assessment tasks.

The Dean (or nominee) is responsible for:

- a) secure arrangements for the drafting and typing of examination papers
- b) internal scrutiny of draft papers
- c) consultation with appropriate external examiners
- d) the subsequent amendment and reproduction of finalised examination papers.

The Dean (or nominee) is responsible for informing candidates of the timetable for their examinations at least 6 weeks prior to the event, unless the information relates to re-sit examinations. In these circumstances, candidates will be notified of arrangements in a timely fashion.

Normally examination timetables will be shared via the University's virtual learning environment and candidates are responsible for checking their timetable and reporting any difficulties to their Course Administrator.

Candidates are responsible for familiarising themselves with the Academic Regulations and are warned that any breach of the assessment and/ or examination regulations could result in penalties as defined in the University's Code of Practice on Academic Honesty.

University staff, staff based at collaborative partners and external examiners are each responsible for ensuring the security and confidentiality of examinations during each stage of examination activity (e.g. setting, reproduction, marking, moderating and storing of papers/ scripts).

5.2.3 General Principles on Moderation and Approval of Examination Papers

An internal team must moderate draft examination papers but must not retain copies.

Written examination papers must follow the agreed University format and rubric as defined by Registry Services.

Where the examination paper(s) contribute to the assessment of the final award at, or above, Level 4 of the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications, the draft papers must be submitted to the external examiner(s) for approval with reasonable time for the detailed consideration of the drafts and discussion with internal staff as appropriate.

In accordance with the general principles of assessment defined in section 3.2 of these regulations, after the internal marking and moderation process has concluded, the scripts/submissions, or a regulatorily defined sample, should be sent to the external examiner(s). Reasonable time will be given to consider the scripts/submissions prior to the meeting of the relevant Module or Progression and Award Board.

The same protocol applies to arrangements for sending submissions, or a regulatorily defined sample, of all other summative assessment tasks to the external examiners. Summative assessment submissions which cannot easily be shared in this way will be subject to review by the external examiner through the most practicable way that can be arranged. (For example, the examiner will normally visit the University to review artefact submissions.)

5.2.4 General Principles on the Conduct of Examinations

School staff, together with the responsible post holder from Registry Services, are responsible for the individual arrangements relating to each examination on the day of the examination.

Examination scripts, including examination submissions in other media, shall be retained by the School for one year after the date of the meeting of the Module or Progression and Award Board at which the student outcomes were considered.

Where a breach of Assessment or Examination regulations is suspected:

- a) The Senior Invigilator will record this on the candidate's script(s) and remove any object(s) which have raised suspicion concerning unfair practice.
- b) The candidate will be allowed to continue the examination but will be informed that an investigation will be conducted, in accordance with University regulations.

Equivalent intervention would be expected where a breach of assessment regulations is suspected during an online examination, wherever possible. A record of the time of the suspected breach would be made within the invigilator's report.

5.3 Code of Practice on Examinations

5.3.1 Written Examination Papers from External Bodies or Professional Bodies

Where examinations are set by an external or professional body, or to an external or professional body prescription, additional requirements to those defined within this code may apply.

5.3.2 Examination Timetables

Registry Services, in conjunction with each School, is responsible for the preparation of provisional and final timetables for all formal examinations, and allocation of suitable accommodation. In preparing examination timetables the following will be considered:

- a) Where a module is shared by a number of courses, any identical examination must be taken simultaneously.
- b) The final examination timetable will be published at least 6 weeks before the date of the first examination.
- c) Candidates will be notified of examination arrangements via the University virtual learning environment. If candidates anticipate difficulties in the scheduling of their examinations, they are requested to contact the Course Administrator in the first instance. These would include matters such as a timetable clash for examinations or requirements of religious festivals and practices.
- d) With regards religious festivals and practices, reasonable adjustments will be considered

Scheduling of examinations as specified below will *not normally* be valid grounds for review of the examination timetable. The University may schedule examinations so that:

- a) a candidate would not normally be expected to sit more than two examinations on any day;
- b) examination start times, where possible, are either 9.30 am or 2pm GMT;
- c) examinations may be located in non-University premises (or online).

5.3.3 Invigilation

Each School is responsible for the appointment of invigilators for all examinations. Staff guidance is issued by Registry Services for the conduct of invigilation of examinations and may be found on Registry Services web pages.

5.3.4 Responsibilities of Candidates

It is the responsibility of candidates to familiarise themselves and comply with University regulations.

Candidates should note these responsibilities in particular:

- a) To be considered to be registered for any assessment, a student¹ must have completed the requirements of the University in respect of registration and the payment of fees.
- b) To have their student ID cards checked by, or on behalf of, the Senior Invigilator within 30 minutes of the commencement of an examination (ID cards should have a full face photograph. Candidates who do not have their student card with them will be required to complete a verification process). Equivalent candidate verification processes will be undertaken where the examination is taken online.
- c) To make representations to their Course Administrator, in cases of difficulty.

5.3.5 Electronic and Other Personal Equipment

Electronic and other personal equipment which is permitted to be used during an examination will be specified in the examination rubric and candidates will be given advance notice of the specifications of such equipment. Candidates may not use or access equipment outside of these specifications, including mobile phones. Any attempt to do so may be construed as unfair practice.

¹ Responsibility for payment of costs associated with an apprenticeship is outlined in contractual documentation.

5.3.6 Additional information about Equipment

All candidates may request the use of the dictionaries provided by attracting the attention of the invigilator.

All candidates whose first language is not English may consult with their Course Administrator with a view to a foreign language dictionary being made available. Such consultation should take place no later than 6 weeks prior to the examination. English dictionaries are provided.

All candidates must use only the approved examination stationery supplied by the University.

All “rough work” must be undertaken on the paper provided and must be attached to, and handed in with, the candidate’s script.

All candidates must ensure that their mobile phone or other unauthorised electronic device is switched off. If the mobile phone of any candidate sounds in the examination room (or during an online examination), the Senior Invigilator will make a report to the Chair of the Module Board or Progression and Award Board detailing the incident and identifying the candidate whose phone caused the disturbance.

5.4 Conduct of Examination Candidates

Immediately prior to the commencement of the examination:

- a) Candidates must assemble outside the examination room in good time before the published commencement time of the examination. Where the examination is to be taken online, candidates will be expected to present themselves online in good time before the examination commences.
- b) Candidates must not enter the examination room until instructed to do so by the Senior Invigilator. This will be around 15 minutes before the published commencement time of the examination.

Arriving late:

- a) A candidate may be admitted up to 30 minutes after the start of the examination, but not thereafter, and must conclude his or her examination at the same time as the other candidates. These same requirements will normally apply where the examination is taken online.

During the examination:

- a) Candidates must conduct themselves in a manner that will not cause disturbance to other candidates.
- b) Candidates shall not communicate with other candidates during the examination, whether the examination is taken in person or online.
- c) Candidates must comply with instructions given to them individually, or to all candidates, by the invigilator.
- d) A candidate who wishes to attract the attention of an invigilator shall do so by raising a hand, or other equivalent means where the examination is taken online.
- e) Candidates who wish to have the “instructions to candidates” or typographical points clarified with the Senior Invigilator may do so:
 - within the first 10 minutes of the examination or
 - during any reading time allowed.
- f) In examinations in which “reading time” is allowed, throughout the specified reading time candidates may make rough notes on the stationery and annotate or highlight the examination paper. After the period of reading time has expired, the invigilator will announce the start of the examination, at which time candidates may commence writing their answers
- g) A candidate who is unwell or who needs to leave the examination room for any reason deemed adequate by the Senior Invigilator may do so under the supervision of an invigilator and return whilst the examination is in progress. Where the examination is taken online, Senior Invigilators may make specific arrangements with the candidate to ensure the avoidance of unfair practices during the examination.
- h) No candidate shall be allowed to terminate his or her examination during the first or final 30 minutes of examination time.
- i) A candidate who leaves the examination room unaccompanied by an invigilator is not allowed to re-enter the examination room. Where the examination is taken online, Senior Invigilators may make specific arrangements with the candidate to ensure the avoidance of unfair practices during the examination.

On the conclusion of the examination:

- a) Candidates will cease writing their answers when instructed to do so.
- b) Candidates will remain silent and seated until instructed to leave the examination room.
- c) Candidates will ensure that their scripts, any continuation sheets and rough work sheets are attached together ready for collection by the invigilator.
- d) Candidates will not remove any item supplied by the University other than the question paper.

- e) When authorised to do so, candidates will collect all their belongings and leave the examination room.
- f) For examinations conducted online, candidates should follow the instructions provided to submit their answers.

5.5 Absence from Written Examinations

A candidate whose illness prevents them from attending an examination is required to provide a medical certificate to this effect which must be sent without delay to the relevant person outlined in the Course Handbook.

The University operates a 'fit to sit' policy in respect of examinations which is explained further in Section 8 of the Academic Regulations: **Extenuating Circumstances and Mitigation**.

In the event of a failure of the transport service due to industrial action or severe weather conditions, candidates are required to:

- a) obtain an official note from the transport company to confirm the reason for the absence;
- b) inform the Course Director as soon as possible;
- c) hand in or post the official note without delay.

In addition to providing information as required above, candidates should also submit a request for extenuating circumstances in accordance with the **section 8 on Extenuating Circumstances and Mitigation**.

5.6 Breach of Regulations

Actions which may be considered to be breaches of the University's Academic Regulations relating to assessment and examination are set out in Section 10 of these regulations. These include cheating and other forms of unfair practice provided in the appendix at the end of this section. In the event of an alleged breach of the assessment regulations, the matter will be investigated and considered in accordance with the University Regulations.

APPENDIX: ACTIONS WHICH MAY BE CONSIDERED TO BE BREACHES OF THE UNIVERSITY'S ACADEMIC REGULATIONS RELATING TO ASSESSMENT AND EXAMINATION

1 CHEATING

Section 10: Academic Honesty of the Academic Regulations defines cheating as:

Cheating is unfair behaviour relating to an examination (in person or online). It includes, but is not limited to:

a) Actions within the examination room/online platform:

- *communicating with any other candidate during an examination*
- *copying from any other candidate during an examination*
- *communicating with any other person other than an authorised invigilator or another member of staff during an examination*
- *possession of any written or printed materials in the examination room unless expressly permitted by the examination regulations possession of any electronically stored information in the examination room unless expressly permitted by the examination regulations*
- *possession of a mobile phone or other electronic device during an examination, unless expressly permitted by the examination regulations*

b) Actions outside of the examination room/online platform:

- *gaining access to any unauthorised material relating to the examination during or before the examination*
- *obtaining a copy of a written examination paper in advance of the time and date for its authorised release.*

This list is not exhaustive.

2 OTHER FORMS OF UNFAIR PRACTICE

Section 10: Academic Honesty of the Academic Regulations defines other forms of unfair practice as:

Other forms of Unfair Practice include, but are not limited to:

- *offering a bribe or inducement to any member of staff of the University, or any external invigilator or examiner, who is connected with the student's assessments*
- *falsifying data in any piece of work*
- *the assumption by one person of the identity of another person with the intent to deceive or gain unfair advantage*
- *submitting copies of another person's work stored on an electronic device*
- *non-compliance with university research ethics procedures*
- *failure to gain ethical approval for the submitted piece of work, as appropriate.*
- *use of generative artificial intelligence tools to gain an unfair advantage*
- *other forms of intent to gain unfair advantage.*

Academic Regulations Progression and Award Boards and Module Boards

Section 6

Section 6

Progression and Award Boards and Module Boards

Originating Department:	Academic Quality Enhancement Office
Enquiries to:	quality@leedsbeckett.ac.uk
Approving Body:	Academic Board
Last Approved:	3 July 2024
Next due for approval:	July 2026
Document Type:	Regulation
Target Audience:	Relevant for all University staff and students and of particular relevance to: Academic and professional support staff responsible for the operation of Progression and Award Boards, Module Boards, Reassessment Boards and Reconvened Boards, external examiners and Collaborative Partners.

Contents

6.1	Purpose	1
6.2	General Principles of Progression and Award Boards & Module Boards	1
6.3	Code of Practice for Progression and Award Boards & Module Boards.....	3
6.3.1	Terms of Reference.....	3
6.3.2	Adjustment to Cohort Marks	3
6.3.3	Membership of Progression and Award Boards.....	4
6.3.4	Membership of Module Boards	4
6.3.5	Membership of Joint Module & Progression and Award Boards	4
6.3.6	Information to Module Boards	5
6.3.7	Discussion and Decision Making: All Boards.....	6
6.3.8	Declaration of a Matter of Principle	6
6.3.9	Assessment Outcomes	7
6.3.10	Reassessment: Joint Module & Progression and Award Boards	7
6.3.11	Reconvened Boards	7
6.3.12	Module Board: Absence of External Examiners	8
6.3.13	Progression and Award Board: Absence of External Examiners	8
6.3.14	Records.....	8
6.3.15	Progression and Award Board & Joint Module/ Progression and Award Board Decisions	9
6.3.16	Module Board Decisions	11
6.3.17	Award Classification.....	12
6.3.18	Conditional Awards	12

Section 6: Progression and Award Boards and Module Boards

6.1 Purpose

This section of the Academic Regulations defines the purpose and operation of Progression and Award Boards and Module Boards.

Progression and Award Boards are the University bodies which make decisions about student progression and student award outcomes. There are defined profiles of student achievement for progression between levels, and for the achievement of each University award. Boards use these profiles of achievement to make equitable decisions about student progression and award.

Module Boards are established by, and report to, Progression and Award Boards. They have delegated authority to confirm student module marks following assessment. Confirmed module marks are then reported to the Progression and Award Board so that student progression and award decisions may be made.

Module Boards may also confirm students' achievement of credit for standalone modules/ groups of modules where the progression and/ or awarding of students is not being considered.

Module Boards are required to consider reports concerning student performance from relevant staff, with due regard for the data analysis provided in standard Module Board reports provided for this purpose.

Prior to the ratification of module marks and the confirmation of appropriate standards of assessment, the Board will satisfy itself that appropriate moderation and scrutiny of the marks presented has been undertaken and that the University's marking conventions have been adhered to in line with the expectations of nationally agreed award standards articulated within the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications and where applicable, professional, statutory and regulatory body or apprenticeship requirements.

6.2. General Principles of Progression and Award Boards & Module Boards

Normally, undergraduate Module Boards are established within Schools at Subject Group level and are chaired by the Head of Subject concerned.

The main role of the Module Board is to provide an accurate and confirmed set of final module marks for consideration by the Progression and Award Board, taking account of academic misconduct penalties and/ or the outcomes of formal mitigation processes.

Module Boards have a core constituency of both internal academic staff who represent each module being considered and the external examiners who are associated with those modules.

Normally, undergraduate Progression and Award Boards are established at School level and are chaired by the Dean of School.

The main role of the Progression and Award Board is to consider final module marks received from the Module Board and use these to make decisions about i) student progression from one level of a course to the next, ii) student award eligibility and iii) student award outcomes. The University has profiles of achievement which students must meet in order to be considered for progression or award eligibility. These are defined later in this section.

Progression and Award Boards have a core constituency of Module Board Chairs and a chief external examiner, who ensures the consistent application of the academic regulations associated with student progression and award and who provides assurance of the maintenance of standards and the equitable and fair treatment of students.

Normally, Postgraduate student outcomes (including the first 180 taught credits of a Professional Doctorate) are considered at a joint Module/ Progression and Award Board, bringing together the business of the two separate Boards described earlier in this section in distinct phases of business.

These are generally convened at Subject Group level and are chaired by the Head of Subject concerned but groups of postgraduate courses within the Subject Group may be considered together at a Board chaired by the Course Director.

In addition, where there is postgraduate provision of significant size, Deans may decide to convene separate Module Boards reporting into a School level Progression and Award Board, in line with the undergraduate model.

The Module Board is accountable to the Progression and Award Board which receives its outputs. Progression and Award Boards are accountable to Academic Board. Exceptionally, Academic Board has the authority to review and overturn a decision of a Progression and Award Board.

6.3 Code of Practice for Progression and Award Boards & Module Boards

6.3.1 Terms of Reference

A Progression and Award Board is authorised to:

- a) assess student performance in accordance with the course and University regulations
- b) determine student progression between academic levels
- c) determine students' award eligibility and award outcome
- d) make recommendations to the University on the conferment of awards
- e) apply the outcomes of mitigation processes where relevant to the determination of student progression or award
- f) apply the outcomes of academic honesty processes where relevant to the determination of student progression or award
- g) determine the outcomes of reassessment
- h) establish Module Boards or act as a Module Board where one is not established

A Module Board is authorised to:

- a) determine the standard and accuracy of student module assessment outcomes
- b) apply the outcomes of academic honesty processes to module outcomes
- c) apply the outcomes of mitigation processes to module outcomes
- d) consider amendment of cohort module marks as appropriate
- e) confirm and record final module assessment outcomes and forward these decisions to the Progression and Award Board(s) as required
- f) record credit where the student will not be presented to a Board for progression or an award

6.3.2 Adjustment to Cohort Marks

Exceptionally, and following moderation of internal marking with due regard for relevant standards, external examiners may propose to the Module Board that the marks for a particular cohort of students on a particular module should be adjusted, or that marks at the threshold boundaries of performance should be adjusted.

Such a proposal may be made in respect of:

- the pass/fail threshold and/ or
- other classification boundaries.

In such cases it is expected that the matter will have been discussed with the internal examiners to reach agreement about the extent of adjustment.

Adjustments may also be made to the module marks of a cohort of students, following the Module Board's consideration of extenuating circumstances which are applicable to the entire cohort.

6.3.3 Membership of Progression and Award Boards

The membership of a Progression and Award Board is:

- a) the Chair (normally a Dean of School);
- b) the Chairs of associated Module Boards (normally the Heads of Subject)
- c) the Course Directors/Director of Research associated with the courses being considered;
- d) at least one external examiner, designated as Chief External Examiner;
- e) a Secretary to the Board (in attendance).
- f) Independent Assessors (as required).

6.3.4 Membership of Module Boards

The membership of a Module Board is:

- a) the Chair (normally a Head of Subject);
- b) the module leader/postgraduate research tutor (or their nominee) for each module under consideration;
- c) all external examiners concerned with the modules under consideration;
- d) Course Directors associated with the modules being considered (ex officio)
- e) a Secretary to the Board (in attendance).
- f) Independent Assessors (as required).

6.3.5 Membership of Joint Module & Progression and Award Boards

The membership of a joint Board is:

- a) the Chair (normally the Head of Subject);
- b) the Course Directors/Director of Research associated with the courses being considered;
- c) the module leader/postgraduate research tutor (or their nominee) for each module under consideration;
- d) all external examiners concerned with the modules under consideration;

- e) a Secretary to the Board (in attendance).

No Boards (of any type) can be chaired by a member of the teaching team for the courses/modules being considered.

All members of the Boards are required to be present at the meetings. If a member is absent due to illness, or other good cause, the Chair of the Board must ensure that the contribution that would be made by that member can be satisfactorily covered by other arrangements.

6.3.6 Information to Module Boards

a) Marks

The following provisions apply:

- the schedule/ spreadsheet of marks arrived at by internal examiners will be tabled as a confidential paper/ online report;
- where there is a discrepancy, the marks as moderated by the external examiner(s) may also be tabled, providing both sets of marks are shown;
- the schedule of marks will be presented in accordance with the relevant guidance.

b) Identification of Need of Further Consideration

The following students should be clearly identified:

- students for whom further evidence will be presented to the Module Board
- students who have failed a module.

c) Other Relevant Documentation

Where the Module Board will consider further evidence of student performance, relevant documentation will be prepared to permit due consideration of the matter in question. Sole reliance on oral comment at the Board itself should be avoided.

d) Information to Progression and Award Boards

Progression and Award Boards will receive complete, accurate and confirmed reports concerning module assessment outcomes as agreed by the relevant Module Boards and signed off by external examiners.

The reports will be presented to the Progression and Award Board in the form of profiles of achievement for student progression, student award eligibility and student award outcome/classification.

Progression and Award Boards will make progression and award decisions based on these confirmed profiles.

These results will not be amended at the Progression and Award Board except, exceptionally, in respect of late notification of material information concerning assessment or in respect of other material or procedural irregularities not identified at the Module Board.

Decisions undertaken by the Progression and Award Board will be signed off by the chief external examiner.

e) Shared Modules

Where a Module Board is responsible for modules that contribute to more than one award, its decisions and recommendations will be forwarded to all relevant Progression and Award Boards.

6.3.7 Discussion and Decision Making: All Boards

The Chair of the Board concerned should clearly identify the purpose and scope of the meeting and the courses of action open to the Board with due regard for the regulatory framework which governs the assessment process.

Discussions and decisions will be undertaken with due regard for documentation/ reports provided to the board.

6.3.8 Declaration of a Matter of Principle

When a Chair has identified a course or courses of action open to the Board, where necessary external examiner(s) should be asked to declare whether any of these courses of action is a matter of principle. On any matter which the external examiner(s) have declared a matter of principle, the decision of the external examiner(s) shall either:

- be accepted as final by the Board, or if agreement cannot be reached:
- be referred to Academic Board for resolution

Other than where they formally declare a matter of principle, external examiners do not have an automatic veto over the decisions of a Module Board or Progression and Award Board.

6.3.9 Assessment Outcomes

In order to facilitate timely reassessment, students may be informed of their confirmed marks resulting from module assessment following the conclusion of the Module Board.

Students will receive final confirmation of the outcomes of the assessment process from the Progression and Award Board for all levels of a course, both overall and for individual modules.

Disclosure of the confirmed marks of an individual student must be to that student only.

Progression or award decisions for registered and enrolled students will be published via the University's 'Results Online' service, within 5 working days of the Progression and Award Board. Consideration will be given to alternative disclosure methods for any student who for good reasons requests these.

For certain collaborative arrangements, the University and its partners will have agreed alternative but equivalent disclosure methods of confirmed outcomes to students.

6.3.10 Reassessment: Joint Module & Progression and Award Boards

A joint Module & Progression and Award Board will be convened to consider outstanding matters of reassessment and associated progression or award decisions.

Joint boards convened for this purpose may take place at various levels of aggregation dependant on operational requirements. The membership of a joint board convened for the purposes of reassessment is consistent with the membership described earlier in this section and may proceed with a single external examiner in attendance.

6.3.11 Reconvened Boards

A Reconvened Board will be held to consider outstanding matters associated with progression or award decisions where a quick resolution is required and there is no upcoming Progression and Award Board scheduled in an appropriate timeframe.

Reconvened Boards held for this purpose may take place at various levels of aggregation dependant on operational requirements. The membership of a Reconvened Board is consistent with the membership for Progression and Award Boards and may proceed with a single external examiner in attendance.

Reconvened Boards must be conducted in accordance with University guidance.

6.3.12 Module Board: Absence of External Examiners

If an external examiner is absent from a Module Board, the following provisions apply when other external examiners are present:

- the Chair will ensure that a written report from the external examiner is available to be tabled at the Board;
- this report will complement the observations of those external examiners present at the Board and inform the discussion.

If there is no external examiner in attendance or represented, all decisions made are subject to Chair's action and are confirmed subsequently through the written consent of the absent examiner(s) concerned.

6.3.13 Progression and Award Board: Absence of External Examiners

If the Chief External Examiner is absent from the Progression and Award Board, an alternate external examiner may support the Board or Committee's decision making.

If there is no external examiner in attendance or represented, all decisions made are subject to Chair's action and are confirmed subsequently through the written consent of the absent Chief External Examiner concerned.

6.3.14 Records

Secretaries to Module Boards, Progression and Award Boards and Joint Boards will compile a formal record of the business and decisions of the meetings. These will constitute the minutes.

A full list of membership of the Board concerned is made available at the meeting, which must be signed by all members present and will form the record of their attendance. All absences should be noted.

The minutes will be confidential, confirmed by the Chair following consultation with other Board members and will be made available to the next meeting of the Board.

External Examiner(s) may retain marks sheets, minutes and other materials, but shall be required to maintain confidentiality.

6.3.15 Progression and Award Board & Joint Module/ Progression and Award Board Decisions

Pass Award

Successful completion of final level; the student is eligible for a final award; there will not be any subsequent levels.

The award may be made with a classification, merit or distinction (if appropriate).

Contained Award

The student has not completed the final level successfully but is eligible for a contained award, which may be made with merit or distinction (if appropriate)

Pass Proceed

Successful completion of level; eligible to proceed to next level. The student does not receive an award at this point.

Award Proceed

Successful completion of level; eligible to proceed to next level. The student may receive a contained award at that level as stipulated in the course validation process.

Components Pending

Failed to achieve the requirements to progress to next level. Offered the opportunity for *reassessment* to complete the level. Re-submitted work to be completed by a specified date.

Level Incomplete

Non-progression decision. The student is not yet ready to be presented for progression.

Failed – Repeat Full Level (Full Time Students)

Failed the level. Offered the opportunity to repeat the whole level. Attendance at the institution is required.

Failed – Repeat Part Level (Full or Part Time Students)

Failed part level. Offered the opportunity to repeat those parts that have been failed. Attendance at the institution is required.

Sandwich Placement Achieved

Passed a sandwich placement, eligible to continue.

Failed Sandwich Placement

Failed the compulsory sandwich placement. Offered the opportunity to:

- repeat the placement
or
- transfer to an alternative course/pathway of study.

Failed - Withdraw

Failed the level. Required to withdraw.

Decision Deferred

The decision is being deferred until a later date for further information, e.g. marks not available, work outstanding, etc. This deferral is likely to be for a prolonged period, i.e. greater than one week.

Deferred Proceed

The decision to pass the level is deferred as a result of extenuating circumstances. Eligible to proceed to next level carrying forward up to two outstanding modules (a maximum of 40 credits).

Module Deferred (Mitigation)

Assessment of one or more modules deferred to specified later date.

Chair's Action

The decision is subject to immediate action by the Chair *where that action is agreed beforehand by the Board*.

Conditional Award

Award to be confirmed at a subsequent meeting of the Board or Reassessment Committee.

Letter of Completion

The student has been successful in accumulating credits for standalone module(s).

Exchange Student

The successful student is on an exchange and is not assessable by Leeds Beckett University (to be used when an exchange student has enrolled on a Leeds Beckett University award)

Not Assessed

The student's level is, for example, a sandwich year, for which there is no assessment.

Stage

Where courses have validated arrangements for 'stage' within their course design the following progression decisions may be made by the Progression and Award Board, as appropriate

Stage Proceed – student has passed stage and is eligible to proceed to the next stage.

Failed Stage – student has failed stage and is required to repeat failed modules part-time.

6.3.16 Module Board Decisions

Module Boards provide an accurate and confirmed set of final module marks for consideration by the Progression and Award Board, taking account of academic misconduct penalties and/ or the outcomes of formal mitigation processes. Consequently, the majority of decisions in respect of student assessment outcomes are taken by Progression and Award Boards.

However, the Progression and Award Board may devolve its authority to the Module Board concerning certain assessment decisions for operational reasons, as follows:

- a) Where a module mark is below the threshold pass, the Module Board may record the following outcome whilst confirming arrangements for reassessment:

Components Pending

Failed to achieve the requirements to progress to next level. Offered the opportunity for *reassessment* to complete the level. Re-submitted work to be completed by a specified date.

- b) Where formal mitigation outcomes of Category B are reported, the Module Board may record the following decision, whilst confirming arrangements for deferrals:

Module Deferred (Mitigation)

Assessment of one or more modules deferred to specified later date.

- c) Where reassessment opportunities have been exhausted and the module mark is below the threshold pass the module board will record:

Failed Module

Fail to achieve threshold pass.

- d) Also for operational reasons, Module Boards may also take the following decisions:

Decision Deferred

The decision is being deferred until a later date for further information, e.g. marks not available, work outstanding, etc. This deferral is likely to be for a prolonged period, i.e. greater than one week.

Chair's Action

The decision is subject to immediate action by the Chair *where that action is agreed beforehand by the Board*.

6.3.17 Award Classification

Award Classification: Bachelor with Honours

The classification of awards of Bachelor with Honours and Integrated Masters should be determined in accordance with the provisions of Section 4: Progression and Award.

Merit and Distinction

The award of merit or distinction should be determined in accordance with the provisions of **Section 4: Progression and Award**.

6.3.18 Conditional Awards

Awards without Degree Classification

If a student's final award cannot be determined at the Progression and Award Board the following provisions apply:

- whenever possible, a conditional award should be made (e.g. award subject to passing a placement/teaching practice);
- where this is done it is not necessary to reconvene the whole Board in order for the award finally to be determined;
- the Board should formally endorse Chair's Action in respect of such a conditional award.

Honours Degree Classification

Where Honours Degree classification is to be decided, the above apply with the additional requirement that the external examiner(s) present at the Board must be associated with the decision. Such "association" may be by oral agreement followed by written confirmation.



LEEDS
BECKETT
UNIVERSITY

Academic Regulations

Disabled Students

Section 7

leedsbeckett.ac.uk

Section 7

Disabled Students

Originating Department:	Academic Quality Enhancement Office
Enquiries to:	quality@leedsbeckett.ac.uk
Approving Body:	Academic Board
Last Approved:	3 July 2024
Next due for approval:	July 2026
Document Type	Regulation
Target Audience:	Relevant for all University staff and students and of particular relevance to: Academic and professional support staff responsible for efficient working practices in relation to students who have declared a disability or impairment; to Collaborative Partners and the Students' Union Advice Service.

Contents

7.1	Purpose	1
7.2	General Principles: Disabled Students	1
7.3	Code of Practice: Disabled Students	1
7.3.1	Disabled Student	1
7.3.2	Reasonable Adjustments for Learning, Teaching and Assessment	2
7.3.3	Determining and Implementing Reasonable Adjustments	3
7.3.4	Accountability for ensuring the implementation of reasonable adjustments	4
7.3.5	Mitigation and Extenuating Circumstances	4
7.3.6	Confidentiality and Consent	4

Section 7: Disabled Students

7.1 Purpose

The purpose of these regulations is to outline our duty under the Equality Act 2010 to anticipate the needs of disabled students and make reasonable adjustments to ensure they are not at a substantial disadvantage in comparison to other students who are not disabled.

7.2 General Principles: Disabled Students

The University strives to apply the Social Model of Disability and make all of its provisions as inclusive and accessible as possible for all. All universities have an anticipatory duty to make reasonable adjustments for disabled students, which requires them to proactively consider what adjustments might be reasonable, whether or not a particular disabled student has raised an issue. However, it is not always possible to anticipate the needs of every student who has a disability and, in those circumstances, more specific reasonable adjustments may need to be made.

The need for individual reasonable adjustments is considered on a case-by-case basis and what is reasonable in each case will vary depending on a variety of factors, such as the disability, the substantial disadvantage that is faced and the extent to which it is practicable to make adjustments, including reasonable adjustments to teaching, learning and assessment, as appropriate.

7.3 Code of Practice: Disabled Students

7.3.1 Disabled Student

The Equality Act 2010 defines a person as having a disability if:

- a) they have a physical or mental impairment; and
- b) the impairment has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on their ability to perform normal day-to-day activities.

In this context “long term” means the impairment is likely to last for the rest of their life or at least 12 months.

This may include students who:

- a) Have a disability or long-term condition at the point of application;
- b) Become disabled after starting their course; or
- c) Become aware of a need for support arising from an existing disability.

7.3.2 Reasonable Adjustments for Learning, Teaching and Assessment

a) Identifying the need for reasonable adjustments

All students will receive a statement of the minimum inclusive practice of their school. Where a student believes that the level of inclusive practice offered is insufficient for their needs, they should discuss this with their tutor and the Disability Advice team at the earliest possible opportunity, if possible identifying adjustments that they feel may assist.

We strongly recommend that applicants and students disclose their disability to the University at the earliest possible opportunity to ensure that appropriate support and reasonable adjustments can be put in place. It is particularly important that disabilities that may not be apparent to the University, such as 'hidden' physical or mental health conditions, are disclosed to the University to ensure the University is aware of the need to make reasonable adjustments.

Where a student feels unable to engage with the Disability Advice team as a result of their disability, students can request that their tutor engage the advice of the Disability Advice team on their behalf.

Where a student has not disclosed a disability, but a member of staff believes that a disabled student's needs are not being met by current practice, they will seek to have a conversation with the student to discuss their needs and where necessary the advice of the Disability Advice team.

Where engagement with the student may not be possible, for example, due to a fluctuating condition, the University will evaluate and implement reasonable adjustments for learning, teaching and assessment in absentia.

b) Timescales

At the beginning of each academic year, the University publishes timescales for the implementation of reasonable adjustments for formal examinations. Requests for reasonable adjustments for formal examinations must be made within the timescales specified by the University to ensure there is sufficient time to implement the reasonable adjustment.

Where a student's request for reasonable adjustments falls outside of these published timelines, the University may not be able to make the adjustments in time for the scheduled assessment, in which case the School will consider if the formal examination can be sat at a later date or an alternative assessment provided.

c) Evidence

All students are strongly encouraged to provide formal evidence of a disability to the Disability Advice team, to assist with the University's understanding of their disability and what adjustments would best address their requirements. Where the student is unable or unwilling to provide evidence to the Disability Advice team, the University will consider all other empirical evidence available to it when deciding what reasonable adjustments are appropriate.

7.3.3 Determining and Implementing Reasonable Adjustments

The Disability Advice team will draw on their professional experience, sector knowledge and relevant codes of practice in assessing how a student's disability may impact their participation in their chosen course, in order to identify appropriate reasonable adjustments. The designated Disability Advisers will work with schools to identify any limitations to adjustments that can reasonably be made.

In some instances, particular types of academic, medical or other assessments are legitimately required to determine whether a student has a particular level of competence or ability (a 'competence standard')(for example, a practical or oral assessment, where practical or oral communication skills are the competence standards being measured). Where the specific method of assessment is the competence being determined, the University will not usually be able to make reasonable adjustments to the assessment.

There is also no requirement for the University to make reasonable adjustments in the limited circumstances where those adjustments would result in a significant disadvantage for other students. Reasonable adjustments may entail an element of more favourable treatment of disabled students.

The agreed reasonable adjustments will be formally documented and communicated by the Disability Advice team to the student, course team and other relevant services.

7.3.4 Accountability for ensuring the implementation of reasonable adjustments

The Dean of School is accountable for ensuring reasonable adjustments are implemented. The Dean may nominate a member of their leadership team to take managerial responsibility for ensuring the implementation of adjustments to learning, teaching, and assessment.

7.3.5 Mitigation and Extenuating Circumstances

Disabled students do not need to apply for mitigation for reasonable adjustments to be implemented.

In the following exceptional circumstances, disabled students will not normally be required to apply for mitigation:

1. their extenuating circumstances relate to a disability^[1] that has an adverse effect on their ability to undertake assessments; and
2. that disability has previously been disclosed to the University (or the University was aware of through other empirical evidence); and
3. reasonable adjustments were not implemented in time for the assessment.

Instead, the School will apply a form of mitigation appropriate in all the circumstances.

Provided that the agreed reasonable adjustment arrangements have been fully implemented, a student will not normally be permitted to request further extenuating circumstances to be taken into account where these relate to the disability for which the arrangements were made.

[1] a physical or mental impairment that has a substantial and long term (namely it has lasted or is likely to last at least 12 months)

Temporary illness or injury

Universities are not required under the Equality Act to make reasonable adjustments for students suffering from a physical or mental disability that is not long-term. Students who have a short-term illness or injury, should contact their School to see if they are able to provide any support, but in many instances, students will need to apply for mitigation (see Section 8).

7.3.6 Confidentiality and Consent

The Disability Advice team will share the Reasonable Adjustment Plan with the course team and the student. The Reasonable Adjustment Plan will include a brief description of the

disability for which adjustments are being recommended, but will not include any detailed information about the disability, or attach any evidence provided of the disability (which will not be shared without a student's explicit consent).



LEEDS
BECKETT
UNIVERSITY

Academic Regulations Extenuating Circumstances and Mitigation

Section 8

leedsbeckett.ac.uk

Section 8

Extenuating Circumstances and Mitigation

Originating Department:	Academic Quality Enhancement Office
Enquiries to:	quality@leedsbeckett.ac.uk
Approving Body:	Academic Board
Last Approved:	2 July 2025
Next due for approval:	July 2026
Document Type	Regulation
Target Audience:	Relevant for all University staff and students and those of our partners and of particular relevance to: Mitigation co-ordinators, mitigation panel chairs and panel members and any other colleagues involved in the extenuating circumstances and mitigation processes.

Contents

8.1	Purpose	1
8.2	General Principles of Student Progression and Award	1
8.2.1	Fit to sit/submit	1
8.2.2	Due Consideration	2
8.2.3	Students with a disability	2
8.2.4	Mitigation Panels	2
8.2.5	Responsibilities of Students	3
8.2.6	Non-submission	3
8.3	Code of Practice on Extenuating Circumstances and Mitigation	3
8.3.1	Extenuating Circumstances	3
8.3.2	Mitigation.....	3
8.3.3	Authorised Absence from Assessment.....	4
8.3.4	Responsibility of Students	4
8.3.5	Responsibility of the University	5
8.3.6	Formal Notification	5
8.3.7	Requests for Extenuating Circumstances	6
8.3.8	Mitigation at the point of Assessment	6
8.3.9	Length of Extensions.....	6
8.3.10	Mitigation: Coursework, Examinations or Other Scheduled Assessments	7
8.3.11	Extenuating Circumstances affecting a Cohort of Students	8
8.3.12	Mitigation Panels	8
8.3.13	Membership of Mitigation Panels	9
8.3.14	Report from the Mitigation Panel	9
8.3.15	Progression and Award.....	10
8.3.16	Confidentiality and Retention of Information	10

Section 8: Extenuating Circumstances and Mitigation

8.1 Purpose

This section of the Academic Regulations defines the regulations for the application of extenuating circumstances and mitigation.

Leeds Beckett University recognises that circumstances may arise in which students are unable to complete or submit assessment. These are known as extenuating circumstances. Students may submit details of their circumstances to request an extension or apply for mitigation to lessen the harmful effect of their extenuating circumstances on assessment outcomes.

8.2 General Principles of Student Progression and Award

8.2.1 Fit to sit/submit

The University operates a fit to sit/submit principle in relation to extenuating circumstances and mitigation. This principle is that by sitting or submitting an assessment the student has declared themselves fit to participate in the assessment. Therefore, claims of extenuating circumstances relating to that assessment will not, normally, be considered.

A declaration of fit-to-sit can be withdrawn in the following circumstances:

- a) where a student informs a member of the course team that they are not fit to sit or submit
- b) where a student becomes unwell during the assessment and requests to be excused
- c) where observed behaviour, empirical evidence and/or medical documentation determines a student was not fit to sit/submit the assessment
- d) where a student is affected in their ability to accurately assess their fitness to sit.

In these circumstances where a fit-to-sit/submit declaration has been withdrawn, the student may apply for mitigation or, for disabled students, refer to section 8.2.3.

Declarations of fitness to sit can only be registered prior to each assessment undertaken and consecutive assessments scheduled to be completed within the same working day will each register a declaration separately.

8.2.2 Due Consideration

In considering the assessment of students, the University will duly consider extenuating circumstances which might have affected a student's performance.

8.2.3 Students with a disability

Disabled students do not need to apply for mitigation for reasonable adjustments to be implemented.

In the following exceptional circumstances, disabled students will not normally be required to apply for mitigation:

1. their extenuating circumstances relate to a disability^[1] that has an adverse affect on their ability to undertake assessments; and
2. that disability has previously been disclosed to the University (or the University was aware of through other empirical evidence); and
3. reasonable adjustments were not implemented in time for the assessment.

Instead, the School will apply a form of mitigation appropriate in all the circumstances.

Provided that the agreed reasonable adjustment arrangements have been fully implemented, a student will not normally be permitted to request further extenuating circumstances to be taken into account where these relate to the disability for which the arrangements were made.

[1] a physical or mental impairment that has a substantial and long term (namely it has lasted or is likely to last at least 12 months)

8.2.4 Mitigation Panels

The University authorises the establishment of mitigation panels, in accordance with current University guidance, to:

- e) consider extenuating circumstances
- f) make appropriate recommendations to the relevant Progression and Award Board.

For collaborative partners, panels will be established at an appropriate level as determined by the University.

8.2.5 Responsibilities of Students

It is the responsibility of the student to bring extenuating circumstances to the University's attention in accordance with University Regulations and guidelines.

8.2.6 Non-submission

Where a student has not declared themselves fit to sit/submit and has not completed an extension request or an authorised absence request the respective assessment(s) will normally be recorded as non-submission(s). In this circumstance, the school will discuss this with the student to determine appropriate support and guidance.

8.3 Code of Practice on Extenuating Circumstances and Mitigation

8.3.1 Extenuating Circumstances

Students may submit requests for consideration of extenuating circumstances in respect of their:

- a) inability to submit assessed coursework on the required date
- b) inability to sit an examination or other scheduled assessment on the required date.

The same extenuating circumstances may not be claimed more than once for the same assessment.

8.3.2 Mitigation

If the submitted extenuating circumstances are found to be valid, mitigation in respect of these will be considered in accordance with the University Regulations. There are two types of mitigation:

- a) mitigation at the point of assessment in respect of coursework submissions will be considered and determined by a mitigation Co-ordinator, and a report of any mitigation granted will be made to the relevant mitigation panel
- b) other mitigation determined by a mitigation panel which must be submitted to the relevant mitigation panel and outcomes are forwarded to the appropriate Progression and Award Board. The details of the extenuating circumstances themselves are not disclosed to the Board.

Any request for an appeal hearing on the grounds of these extenuating circumstances will normally be rejected where a student without good reason, fails to seek consideration of extenuating circumstances in accordance with university regulations and guidance.

8.3.3 Authorised Absence from Assessment

Students are permitted to seek permission for an authorised absence from assessment in relation to circumstances which are outside the fit to sit/submit principle. Such circumstances may include, but are not limited to, jury service, UK visa and immigration interviews, and court proceedings.

Students must request authorised absence from assessment from the designated member of academic staff for approval and the request must be supported by original documentary evidence. All requests for authorised absence will be presented to the mitigation panel for information and will be recorded in the University's student record system.

8.3.4 Responsibility of Students

It is the responsibility of students to:

- a) declare themselves fit to sit/submit by attending or submitting assessment.
- b) Inform the University of any extenuating circumstances which they wish to be taken into consideration in respect of inability to submit assessed coursework and/or sit examinations or other scheduled assessment.
- c) Ensure the request is submitted electronically via the online system for mitigation requests and a receipt for this is obtained.
- d) Ensure the request is supported by original documentary evidence.
- e) Ensure that the evidence is submitted with the request and normally no later than 5 working days of the request for extenuating circumstances being received by the University.
- f) Ensure the request clearly states the module or modules affected and the specific assessment(s) affected.
- g) Ensure the request clearly states the date(s) for or between which the submitted extenuating circumstances are being claimed. Failure to do so may result in the mitigation panel being unable to recommend any mitigation.

8.3.5 Responsibility of the University

a) Information

It is the responsibility of the Dean of School to ensure that students have access to the following information:

- the current University Regulations and associated guidance
- the name of the person(s) designated to receive requests for consideration of extenuating circumstances
- the location of the online submission point for extenuating circumstances requests
- sufficient advance notice of the dates by which such submissions must be submitted to enable them to be presented
- appropriate sources of advice and guidance.

b) Discussion with University Staff

Discussion of problems or difficulties with a member or members of University staff does not in itself constitute a submission of extenuating circumstances.

c) Statements from University Staff

Any relevant statement to be presented to a mitigation panel as original documentary evidence arising from previous discussion with or disclosure to a member of University staff:

- needs to be requested from that member of staff by the student
- be in writing
- be submitted by the student

8.3.6 Formal Notification

A student who has not undertaken assessment because they consider themselves to be unfit must make a request for consideration of their extenuating circumstances at the earliest possible time and normally no later than 5 working days from the date of assessment.

Where a student has declared themselves fit to sit/submit but later deems their declaration to have been incorrect they will, in exceptional circumstances (for example, becoming ill during an examination), be permitted to submit extenuating circumstances within 5 working days of the date of assessment.

This time period may be extended for students who are unable to notify the university for a disability-related reason.

8.3.7 Requests for Extenuating Circumstances

All requests for the consideration of extenuating circumstances, including requests for extensions to submission deadlines for coursework, must adhere to the following:

- a) Be submitted electronically via the online system for mitigation requests in accordance with guidance issued by the University.
- b) Independent documentary or medical evidence will normally be required to be submitted in support of mitigation requests. This should be attached to the online submission.
- c) In exceptional circumstances, third party submission of extenuating circumstances will be accepted, provided they are accompanied by confirmation of the student's inability to submit themselves.

8.3.8 Mitigation at the point of Assessment: Coursework - inability to meet coursework submission date

Students may seek an extension to a coursework submission date, where they have valid extenuating circumstances in respect of being unable to meet the relevant submission deadline.

Such requests must be submitted to the person designated to receive them, identify the circumstances and provide independent documentary evidence.

Such requests will be considered by a designated member of academic staff. The outcome of the consideration will be that the extension will be permitted or not permitted. There is no appeal against the outcome of this consideration through the regulations for an Appeal against a Decision of a Progression and Award Board or Module Board (see Section 9 of the University Regulations).

8.3.9 Length of Extensions

The length of the extension given will normally be:

- For 5 working days only – “working days” includes weekdays and vacations.

Saturday, Sundays, Bank Holidays and other days when the University is closed are not classed as working days.

If the student requests a longer period of time and the member of staff considering the request finds this to be justified, the length of the extension given may be exceptionally extended to 10 working days.

Such an extension, when permitted, will normally be the sole form of mitigation allowed in respect of these particular extenuating circumstances.

All extensions, where granted, must be reported to the School mitigation panel and recorded in the University's student record system.

An extension will not normally be given after the date on which the coursework should have been submitted. The member of staff considering such requests can exceptionally allow a student to submit a request for an extension up to one working day after the submission date.

8.3.10 Mitigation: Coursework, Examinations or Other Scheduled Assessments

a) Mitigation: Coursework

A student who is unable to meet a coursework deadline may submit their extenuating circumstances to the mitigation panel where:

- their circumstances are valid and
- an extension to their course work deadline is not a suitable remedy or has already been exhausted

In cases where an extension has already been granted the student would need to demonstrate that their circumstances had changed in some way and how this had impacted upon their ability to submit assessment.

b) Absence from Examinations or Other Scheduled Assessments

A student who was absent from an examination or other scheduled assessment and considers that they have valid extenuating circumstances in respect of this, must request consideration of those circumstances in accordance with University Regulations.

If the circumstances are found to be valid, the mitigation panel will permit the student to take the assessment as if at the first attempt (deferral) at the next available opportunity.

No special examination or other scheduled assessment will, normally, be provided for such students.

c) Mitigation: Examinations

If the circumstances are found to be valid, the mitigation panel will permit the student to take the examination as if at the first attempt (deferral) at the next available opportunity.

No special examination will be provided for such students.

8.3.11 Extenuating Circumstances affecting a Cohort of Students

a) Presentation to Module Boards or Progression and Award Board

Extenuating circumstances which may have affected the performance of a cohort of students will be presented to the relevant Progression and Award Board or Module Board acting on behalf of a Progression and Award Board.

b) Notification

The Course Director (or equivalent) (or nominee) is responsible for informing the Committee or Board of such circumstances.

c) Consideration

Consideration of such circumstances will be conducted in accordance with Section 6 of the University Regulations: Progression and Award Boards and Module Boards. Where the circumstances are deemed to warrant this, the marks of the entire cohort may be adjusted upwards.

8.3.12 Mitigation Panels

Mitigation panels will be established in order to:

- a) consider extenuating circumstances
- b) make appropriate recommendations to the relevant Progression and Award Board.

For collaborative partners, panels will be established at an appropriate level as determined by the University.

Mitigation Panels will meet as often as the Dean of School considers necessary and always prior to the Progression and Award Board where the outcomes of the Panel will be considered.

8.3.13 Membership of Mitigation Panels

The minimum membership requirements for all mitigation panels is:

- a) Senior member of academic staff or senior professional support staff nominated by the Dean of School (Chair)
- b) At least two members of academic staff internal to the School
- c) A senior member of support staff (if not already allocated to the Chair role above)
- d) A secretary to the panel (in attendance)

The minimum composition of the panel would therefore be 2 members of academic staff, one member of professional support staff and secretary to the panel.

Mitigation Panels will be conducted, and their proceedings recorded in accordance with guidance issued by the University.

The Panel will receive, for information, a report of authorised absences granted by the designated officer.

The Panel will consider the degree of seriousness of the extenuating circumstances accepted and the assessments which were evidenced by those relevant circumstances.

The Panel will categorise the seriousness of extenuating circumstances as follows:

- a) Category A – Very serious
- b) Category B – Sufficiently serious to defer assessment
- c) Rejected – the Panel will reject claims which are late, not substantiated by original documentary evidence or are not deemed sufficiently serious to warrant deferral.

All outcomes of the Panel will be notified to students in writing in accordance with University guidance.

8.3.14 Report from the Mitigation Panel

The mitigation panel will make a report to the relevant Progression and Award Board in respect of each student:

- a) identifying the assessments which were affected by the extenuating circumstances and

- b) categorising the seriousness of the extenuating circumstances in respect of those assessments. The Progression and Award Board will consider the decisions advised by the Panel and discuss appropriate action in respect of the students.

The Panel will also present to the Progression and Award Board a report on all extensions to coursework assessment deadlines granted at the point of assessment and all outcomes of requests for authorised absence granted by the designated officer.

The Panel may make no recommendations to the Progression and Award Board beyond those reports specified here. The Progression and Award Board may not amend the reports of the Mitigation Panel.

8.3.15 Progression and Award

The mitigation permitted by the Board will normally be deferral of assessment to permit the student to be assessed as if for the first time.

Category A mitigation permits the Board to consider alternative forms of mitigation as follows:

- a) consider the student to have passed the assessment where the Board is satisfied as to the student's progress overall relating to the level and the student's overall achievement of the learning outcomes.
- b) Allocate a mark where the Board is satisfied that the student's achievement overall in the course of study is of high quality and the record of work relating to the level is good. The allocated mark may be the average of the student overall, the average for that cohort of students or another mark. The student will be given the choice between accepting the mark and being assessed again as if for the first time.
- c) Allow the student to be reassessed in a module where the student has passed but where the grade or mark attained is lower than might reasonably be expected from the student's overall performance. The Board may also, in these circumstances, raise the mark.
- d) Deem the student to have passed the assessment(s) in question and offer the relevant award where the Board is satisfied as to the student's progress overall in the work relating to the course of study and it is the final stage.
- e) An aegrotat award may be offered (see section 4 of the University Regulations).

8.3.16 Confidentiality and Retention of Information

Submissions giving details of extenuating circumstances and discussion of extenuating circumstances by Mitigation Panels or Exam Boards will be confidential to the members of

staff who are involved in the mitigation process (including the designated officer and the members of the Mitigation Panels), except where sharing of the information is necessary and has a lawful basis under UK data protection law. Examples of where information may need to be shared more widely than the mitigation panel include:

- a) Where the needs of a Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body requires wider disclosure.
- b) Where the decision of a Progression and Award Board requires wider disclosure, for example to the External Examiner.
- c) Where a student subsequently requests and is granted, an Appeal Hearing.
- d) Where investigation of matters under the general student regulations requires wider disclosure.
- e) Where there is a potential threat to life.

Records of extenuating circumstances will be securely for the student's duration of study plus one year.

These provisions also apply to requests for mitigation at the point of assessment.

Such information will be retained for the purposes of an Appeal against a Decision of a Progression and Award Boards or Module Boards (if appropriate).

At the end of the period of retention, records of extenuating circumstances will be destroyed.



LEEDS
BECKETT
UNIVERSITY

Academic Regulations

Academic Appeals

Section 9

leedsbeckett.ac.uk

Section 9

Appeals

Originating Department:	Academic Quality Enhancement Office
Enquiries to:	boe-appeals@leedsbeckett.ac.uk
Approving Body:	Academic Board
Last Approved:	3 July 2024
Next due for approval:	July 2026
Document Type	Regulation
Target Audience:	Relevant for all University staff and students, staff and students at Collaborative Partners and members of our Board of Governors.

Contents

9.1	Purpose	1
9.2	Student Rights and Responsibilities	1
9.3	Grounds for Appeal	4
9.4	Timescales for Appeal	11
9.5	Submission of Information and Evidence for Appeal	12
9.6	University Consideration of a Request for an Appeal Hearing	13
9.7	Informal Resolution	14
9.8	Review Stage	15
9.9	Completion of Procedures Letter and Use of the Office of the Independent Adjudicator	15
9.10	Membership of Appeal Panels	16
9.11	Preparing for an Appeal Hearing	17
9.12	Conduct of the Appeal Hearing	21
9.13	Confidentiality and Retention of Information	27

Section 9: Academic Appeals

9.1 Purpose

This section of the Academic Regulations makes provision for students who have valid grounds to appeal against the decision of Module Boards, Progression and Award Boards, Research Degrees Sub-Committee or Academic Misconduct Boards. The section sets out students' rights and responsibilities in the Appeal Process, how the University will deal with student requests for an Appeal Hearing, and possible outcomes of the process.

9.1.1 Students with a disability

The University has an obligation to make reasonable adjustments to this procedure in relation to students who have a disability.

9.2 Student Rights and Responsibilities

Scope of the Appeals Regulations

9.2.1 Student academic outcomes are determined by:

- Module Boards;
- Progression and Award Boards;
- Research Degrees Sub-Committee;
- Appeal Panels; or
- Academic Misconduct Boards (withdrawal only, see section 10, Academic Honesty)

Acting in accordance with the Academic Regulations of the University.

9.2.2 Appeals against the decision of Module Boards, Progression and Award Boards, Research Degrees Sub-Committee or an Academic Misconduct Board will be permitted where the University has agreed that there are valid grounds for such an appeal.

9.2.3 An individual or group of students seeking redress in respect of a grievance relating to their position as student(s) of the University, should invoke the Student Complaints Procedure. The outcome of the Student Complaints Procedure may provide grounds for appeal, either in itself or in association with other factors. Where any student who has invoked the Student Complaints Procedure lodges a Request for an Appeal Hearing before the Complaints Procedure has been concluded, the Appeal process will take

precedence on account of its significance for the determination of progression or award.

Student Rights

- 9.2.4 All students have the right to seek an Appeal Hearing to reconsider a decision of Module Boards, Progression and Award Boards, Research Degrees Sub-Committee or an Academic Misconduct Board acting in accordance with the academic regulations of the University without risk of disadvantage. Appeal Hearings may only proceed where the University has agreed that there are valid grounds for the appeal. [See Section 9.3 below].
- 9.2.5 The University will accept a request for an Appeal Hearing from students collectively. The Group may elect a spokesperson to liaise with the University on behalf of the group or communicate individually. In both cases the University will ensure communication is maintained with all members of the group to ensure the request fairly represents the views of all members of the group.
- 9.2.6 Students have the right to be accompanied and/or represented at all stages of the process provided that the companion or representative is not a professionally contracted advocate (with the exception of Staff of the Students' Union).
- 9.2.7 Students have the right to full information on the regulations and procedures in respect of Appeals; and to advice on their nature and operation.
- 9.2.8 A student whose case is under consideration within these regulations and procedures has the right to continue with his or her studies, subject to regulation 9.2.13 below.

Student Responsibilities

- 9.2.9 It is the responsibility of a student to draw to the attention of the University any factors which they consider may have adversely affected their performance in assessments. This should be done as soon as possible in order that any due remedial action within the University Academic Regulations may be taken. Failure to seek remedial action or otherwise draw the attention of the University to relevant circumstances may lead to the rejection of a Request for an Appeal Hearing. This is particularly the case in respect of:
- perceived deficiencies in the management of a course
 - disclosure of extenuating circumstances.

[Further details of this are found in Section 9.3 below].

9.2.10 It is the responsibility of the student to:

- ascertain his or her assessment outcomes
- submit all documentation required in respect of the appeal process
- submit any evidence connected with the appeal process
- arrange for accompaniment or representation (if required)
- provide accurate details of contact address, e-mail address (if available) and telephone number.

Information, Advice and Guidance on the Appeals Process

9.2.11 The University will make full information on these regulations and procedures available to students. This information to students will also identify sources of University advice to students on these regulations and their operation. This advice will be limited to advice on the requirements and operation of the regulations and procedures and will not extend to assistance with the preparation of a Request for an Appeal Hearing which remains the responsibility of the individual student; or to assistance with any Appeal Hearing.

9.2.12 A student who is considering seeking an Appeal Hearing is strongly advised to contact the Students Union. Staff of the Students Union are able to give advice on the regulations and their operation. They may also assist with the identification and framing of the grounds on which the appeal is sought; and/or advise or represent the student during any subsequent Appeal Hearing.

9.2.13 A student whose case is under consideration within these regulations and procedures normally shall have the right to continue with his or her studies until such time as a final decision is reached, unless this conflicts with requirements in respect of professional practice. The determination of the requirements of professional practice will be taken by the relevant Dean of School (or nominee) on the advice of appropriate members of staff. The right to continue studies is intended to ensure that a student whose appeal is successful is not academically disadvantaged. Accordingly:

- it shall not be interpreted as acceptance of the student on a subsequent level of the course of study; and
- satisfactory progress during such attendance is not admissible as evidence in any stage of the appeal process.

This right shall not apply to any student¹ whose fees, charges and other debts have not been paid within the academic session in which the debts were incurred, or the period of the course of study. The University Secretary's Office will make the administrative arrangements necessary to ensure that the student's formal status is appropriate for this purpose.

Meeting Expenses Incurred through Appeal

9.2.14 Subject to the limits below, the University will meet reasonable and proportionate expenses necessarily incurred by:

- any appellant; and
- one accompanying person where the student would otherwise be attending the appeal alone.

The University will require appropriate documentary evidence, including receipts, in support of all such expenses.

The University will not meet, and is not liable for, the following:

- expenses incurred by an appellant who fails to attend a hearing
- travel expenses of an accompanying person travelling from outside the UK
- costs of legal advice
- expenses of any Officer of the Students Union
- expenses of any friend of the appellant, where the appellant is accompanied or represented by the Students Union.

The University Secretary will make a decision, which shall be final, in respect of a dispute over:

- the legitimacy of a specified expense
- the amount claimed
- the validity of supporting evidence.

9.3 Grounds for Appeal

9.3.1 Permission for an Appeal Hearing against a decision of a Module Board, Progression and Award Board, Research Degrees Sub-Committee or Academic Misconduct Board

¹ Responsibility for payment of costs associated with an apprenticeship is outlined in contractual documentation.

acting in accordance with the academic regulations of the University will only be granted where a student can show valid grounds for such an appeal.

- 9.3.2 It is the student's responsibility to provide the University with sufficient information for a decision on acceptance or rejection of grounds for appeal to be made. The evidence which it is intended to submit need not necessarily be included in the Request for an Appeal Hearing, but the nature of such evidence needs to be identified. The submission of evidence must take place within 5 working days of the appeal request being submitted.

Academic Judgement

- 9.3.3 Disagreement with the academic judgement of a Module Board, Progression and Award Board, Research Degrees Sub-Committee or Academic Misconduct Board cannot, in itself, constitute a valid ground for appeal. The Appeal process within the University may result in an amendment to the decisions of a Module Board, Progression and Award Board, Research Degrees Sub-Committee or Academic Misconduct Board. Where this is the case, it should be clearly understood that this is not a review of the soundness of the original academic judgement made in respect of the assessment or assessments in question. An amendment to a decision of a Module Board, Progression and Award Board, Research Degrees Sub-Committee or Academic Misconduct Board is a recognition that, while extraneous or more recently disclosed circumstances make it appropriate to change the final decision in respect of a student, the integrity and soundness of the initial academic judgement itself is not thereby questioned.

Valid Grounds for Appeal – Taught Undergraduate and Postgraduate Courses

- 9.3.4 There are 4 categories of valid grounds for appeal. These are:

- computational error
- material procedural or administrative error
- course management deficiencies
- extenuating circumstances, which, for valid reasons, were not previously disclosed.

Further information on each of these grounds can be found below.

Computational Error

- 9.3.5 A student who has reason to believe that a computational error has been made in respect of their results, should lodge a Request for an Appeal Hearing, stating:

- the reasons for the belief that a computational error has taken place
- what they think the computation should have been and why.

The University Secretary's Office will raise the query with the School/Partner concerned. If the belief is found to be correct, appropriate action to rectify the matter will be taken by the Dean of School (or nominee); the student notified of this; and the matter deemed to be concluded informally without the need for an Appeal Hearing. If the School/Partner maintains the computation is correct, and the student does not accept this view, the matter will proceed to appeal.

Material Procedural or Administrative Error

9.3.6 An Appeal Hearing on the grounds of material procedural or administrative error might arise in relation to concerns about:

- the conduct of assessments or examinations
- the proceedings of the Module Board, Progression and Award Board, Research Degrees Sub-Committee or Academic Misconduct Board.

A student who has reason to believe that a material procedural or administrative error has been made, should lodge a Request for an Appeal Hearing, stating:

- details of the procedural or administrative error which they believe has occurred
- in what way this was material to the determination of their results
- in what way they feel disadvantaged on account of this alleged error
- what evidence there is of the error, and, if available, evidence of adverse consequences of it.

Course Management Deficiencies

9.3.7 The University expects that students will seek to have any perceived deficiencies in the management of the course of study rectified through the available mechanisms or procedures at the time when they were thought to have occurred.

A student seeking an Appeal Hearing on the grounds of material deficiencies in the management of a course, or any component of a course, should lodge a Request for an Appeal Hearing stating:

- details of the alleged deficiencies
- the time when they took place

- in what way these deficiencies were material to the determination of his or her results
- in what way they feel disadvantaged on account of this alleged irregularity
- what action the student took to have these deficiencies rectified and the outcome of this
- or (as relevant)
- why the student did not seek to rectify the deficiencies through course mechanisms or other University procedures.

Permission for an Appeal Hearing to take place on the grounds of course management deficiencies will be granted only where the student can show one of the following:

- the mechanisms available within the management of the course were not made available to them
- that the mechanisms did not remedy the deficiencies
- that there were valid reasons why they did not use these mechanisms
- that there were valid reasons why the concern was not raised through other University procedures.

Previously Undisclosed Extenuating Circumstances

9.3.8 The University expects that any extenuating circumstances which a student wishes to have taken into account are disclosed prior to the meeting of a Module Board, Progression and Award Board, Research Degrees Sub-Committee or Academic Misconduct Board acting in accordance with the academic regulations of the University. For extenuating circumstances to be considered at an Appeal Hearing, evidence needs to be produced by the student showing that they were:

- unable to do this;
or
- for valid reasons, unwilling to do this.

Simple unwillingness to disclose personal circumstances is insufficient for permission for an Appeal Hearing to be given on these grounds. For a claim of valid reasons for non-disclosure to be accepted, it is normally expected that

- the circumstances themselves were exceptionally serious, or had an exceptionally serious impact on the student's academic performance;
and
- there were substantial and grave reasons why the student was unwilling to disclose them.

A student who seeks an Appeal Hearing on the grounds that previously undisclosed extenuating circumstances have adversely affected their results, should lodge a Request for an Appeal Hearing stating:

- the nature of the extenuating circumstances
- evidence of the extenuating circumstances
- the reasons why they were unable to submit these prior to the meeting of the Module Board, Progression and Award Board, Research Degrees Sub-Committee or Academic Misconduct Board, and evidence of the reasons or (as relevant)
- the reasons why they were unwilling to do this, and any supporting evidence for this claim.

Valid grounds for Appeal – Research Students

9.3.9 The principles for considering appeal requests from research students are the same as those for undergraduate students. However, the grounds available for appeal, the constitution of the Research Appeal Panel and role of the Research Degrees Sub-Committee reflect key differences between undergraduate and postgraduate research study. The specific arrangements for research appeals are set out below.

Right of appeal

9.3.10 Research students may appeal against the following:

- A Confirmation of Registration or Progression Meeting decision
- A decision to withdraw the student from study
- An examination decision

Grounds for appeal – research students

9.3.11 Permission for an Appeal Hearing against a decision of Research Degrees Sub-Committee will only be granted where a student can show grounds for such an appeal. There are four categories of valid grounds for appeal by research students:

- Procedural irregularity
- Inadequate supervision
- Unfair or improper assessment
- Previously undisclosed extenuating circumstances

Further information about each ground is provided below.

Procedural irregularity

9.3.12 An Appeal Hearing on the ground of procedural irregularity might arise in relation to concerns about:

- The conduct of a Confirmation of Registration meeting, a Progression meeting or a viva voce examination.
- The proceedings of the Research Degrees Sub-Committee

A student who has reason to believe that a procedural irregularity has occurred should submit a Request for an Appeal stating:

- details of the procedural irregularity which they believe has occurred
- in what way this has affected the determination of their results
- in what way they believe they were disadvantaged as a result of the irregularity
- what evidence there is of the error and, if available, evidence of any adverse consequences.

Inadequate supervision

9.3.13 The University expects that research students will seek to have any perceived deficiencies in supervision rectified through the available mechanisms at the time that they were believed to have occurred.

A student seeking an Appeal Hearing on the ground of inadequate supervision should submit a Request for an Appeal Hearing stating:

- details of the alleged inadequacies
- when they occurred
- in what way these inadequacies were material to the determination of their results
- in what way they believe they have been disadvantaged by the supervision
- what action the student took to have these issues rectified and the outcome of this action
or (as relevant)
- why the student did not seek to rectify the inadequacies through the available mechanisms and University procedures.

Permission for an Appeal Hearing on the ground of inadequate supervision will only be granted where the student can show one of the following:

- the mechanisms available within the management of the research were not made available to them
- the mechanisms did not remedy the inadequacies
- there were valid reasons why they did not use these mechanisms
- there were valid reasons why the concern was not raised through other University procedures.

Unfair or improper assessment

9.3.14 Students may not challenge the academic judgement of their supervisory team, internal and external examiners or the Research Degrees Sub-Committee.

A student seeking an Appeal Hearing on the ground of unfair or improper assessment should submit a Request for an Appeal Hearing stating:

- details of when the assessment took place
- why they believe that there was unfair or improper assessment on the part of one or more of the examiners
- in what way the conduct of the assessment was material to the determination of their results.

Permission for an Appeal Hearing on this ground will only be granted where the student provides evidence of unfair or improper assessment on the part of one or more of the examiners or decision makers at assessment points leading to final examination (e.g. Confirmation of Registration, or Progression meeting).

Previously undisclosed extenuating circumstances

9.3.15 The University expects that any extenuating circumstances which a student wishes to have taken into account are disclosed prior to the meeting of the Research Degrees Sub-Committee or Academic acting in accordance with the academic regulations of the University. For extenuating circumstances to be considered at an Appeal Hearing, evidence needs to be produced by the student showing that they were:

- unable to do this;
or
- for valid reasons, unwilling to do this.

Simple unwillingness to disclose personal circumstances is insufficient for permission for an Appeal Hearing to be given on these grounds. For a claim of valid reasons for non-disclosure to be accepted, it is normally expected that:

- the circumstances themselves were exceptionally serious, or had an exceptionally serious impact on the student's academic performance;
- and
- there were substantial and grave reasons why the student was unwilling to disclose them.

A student who seeks an Appeal Hearing on the grounds that previously undisclosed extenuating circumstances have adversely affected their results, should lodge a Request for an Appeal Hearing stating:

- the nature of the extenuating circumstances
- evidence of the extenuating circumstances
- the reasons why they were unable to submit these prior to the meeting of the Research Degrees Sub-Committee, and evidence of the reasons or (as relevant)
- the reasons why they were unwilling to do this, and any supporting evidence for this claim.

9.4 Timescales for Appeal

- 9.4.1 All Requests for an Appeal Hearing should be submitted within the maximum submission time of 15 working days after the formal publication of decisions of a Module Board, Progression and Award Board, Research Degrees Sub-Committee or Academic Misconduct Board. "Working Days" includes weekdays and vacations. Saturdays, Sundays, Bank Holidays, Customary Days, and other days when the University is closed are not working days for the purposes of these regulations.
- 9.4.2 The University intends to determine whether there are valid grounds for seeking an Appeal Hearing. We will aim to complete the adjudication process within 20 working days wherever possible. In any case, we will always aim to complete the full appeal within 90 calendar days. The University endeavours to meet the timescales but accepts no liability for failure to do so.
- 9.4.3 In exceptional cases, or where it becomes apparent that an appeal is likely to be complex and protracted; or where relevant evidence cannot be speedily obtained and presented; variation of the expected timescales should be agreed between the student and the University.

9.4.4 A Request for an Appeal Hearing must be lodged with the University Secretary's Office within 15 days as specified above. Permission for an Appeal Hearing to take place will not normally be given in respect of a request lodged outside of these timescales, and late submissions will normally be rejected as out of time, unless a student can show good and valid reasons for its late submission. The University Secretary (or nominee) has the discretion to extend the deadline for submission of the Request for an Appeal Hearing in exceptional circumstances where the student has shown serious and valid reasons for:

- the late submission
- the failure to contact the University Secretary's Office prior to the deadline.

9.5 Submission of Information and Evidence for Appeal

9.5.1 The nature of the information and evidence required in support of the appeal request is identified in Section 9.3 above. The purpose of the submission of information and evidence at this point is twofold:

- it enables the University to reach a decision on whether or not valid grounds for appeal exist;
- and, where an Appeal Hearing is granted
- it is forwarded to the School/Partner in question to enable them to prepare an Appeal Response, which will be sent to the student prior to the Appeal Hearing itself.

9.5.2 Acceptance of submissions without evidence, or indication of evidence (as appropriate) is at the discretion of the University Secretary, who will appoint a designated officer to make a decision on such submissions and notify the student accordingly. This decision is final.

9.5.3 Requests for an Appeal Hearing should also, if possible, include the names of any persons the student would hope to call as a witness at an Appeal Hearing, and the expected nature of that evidence. The University recognises that this may not be appropriate until after the student has received the Appeal Response from the School/Partner.

9.5.4 It is expected that the evidence to be used at any Appeal Hearing is either disclosed or identified at the point of submission of the request for an Appeal Hearing. No new *matter* (e.g. different grounds for appeal) will be permitted at the Appeal Hearing. At the discretion of the Chair of the Appeal Panel, supplementary evidence germane to

the issue raised may be permitted, where this arises in reply to the Appeal Response, or for some other good reason. (See Regulation 9.11.9)

9.6 University Consideration of a Request for an Appeal Hearing

9.6.1 All appeal submissions will be acknowledged by email within three working days and the date by which a final outcome should be available will be confirmed. Students can normally expect to receive the outcome within 20 working days of submitting a request. If this is exceeded, the student will be advised and a revised deadline provided.

9.6.2 Requests for an Appeal Hearing will be considered to establish whether valid grounds exist on which an Appeal Hearing may be granted. This will be done on the basis of:

- the statements made in the Request for an Appeal Hearing; and
- the evidence submitted.

Consideration at this point concerns the establishment of the validity or otherwise of the grounds claimed for an Appeal Hearing and does not extend to any judgement on the merits of any permitted Appeal Hearing, which is a matter for the designated Appeal Panel.

The University Secretary or nominee of appropriate seniority will consider the Request for an Appeal Hearing and will decide:

- that valid grounds exist;
or
- that valid grounds do not exist.

The nominee may be a designated senior member of University staff but not from the same academic subject area as the student requesting an Appeal Hearing. A list of designated staff is maintained by the University Secretary's Office.

The request will be reviewed by another designated senior member of staff. This reconsideration will result in:

- an Appeal Hearing being granted;
or
- the Appeal Hearing being rejected
or
- the matter being referred for further, final, consideration

If both designated senior members of staff did not concur on the decision reached, the matter will be referred for consideration by the University Secretary (or nominee). The University Secretary (or nominee) will decide:

- that valid grounds exist, in which case an Appeal Hearing is granted at this stage or
- that valid grounds do not exist, in which case the Request for an Appeal Hearing is rejected.

The decision of the University Secretary (or nominee) ends the process of consideration of grounds. Students may request a review of the decision to reject their request for an Appeal Hearing (see Section 9.7 below)

No Detriment to Academic Outcomes

- 9.6.3 A decision to reject an appeal shall not adversely affect a student's Academic Outcomes decided by a Module Board, Progression and Award Board, Research Degrees Sub-Committee or Academic Misconduct Board, except in cases where it has been found that an incorrect mark or other material information has been presented to the Module Board and/or Progression and Award Board.

9.7 Informal Resolution

- 9.7.1 Where it has been found that valid grounds for appeal do exist, the University Secretary's Office will seek to determine whether the case may be resolved informally without the need to convene an Appeal Hearing.
- 9.7.2 Informal resolution will be sought at appropriate points in the process, including, but not exclusively following, Initial Consideration, Review of initial decision, Final consideration and upon compilation of the School Response.

The Dean or their nominee will be the point of contact for all matters relating to Informal Resolution within each School.

Where a student is not satisfied with any proposed informal resolution, the formal appeals process will be reinstated. The outcome will be notified to the student within 20 working days from the date of the rejection of the informal resolution.

9.8 Review Stage

9.8.1 Students may request a review of the decision to reject their request for an Appeal Hearing on the grounds of:

- procedural irregularity; and/or
- that new evidence is available which was not available at the time that the appeal request was submitted.

A Request for review must be submitted within 10 working days of the notification of the outcome of the Request for an Appeal Hearing.

Requests for review will be considered by the University Secretary or designated senior member of University staff. The designated member of staff will have no prior involvement in the case and will not be from the same academic subject area as the student.

The University Secretary or nominee of appropriate seniority will consider the Request for a Review and will decide:

- that valid grounds exist, in which case an Appeal Hearing is granted;
or
- that valid grounds do not exist, in which case the Request is rejected.

9.9 Completion of Procedures Letter and Use of the Office of the Independent Adjudicator

9.9.1 Where it is decided that no valid grounds for appeal exist following the Review Stage, the student will be notified in writing of the finding and the reasons for it, and informed that the process is now at an end. This communication will be a formal “Completion of Procedures” letter for the purposes of any application to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator. Where a student does not request a Review, a “Completion of Procedures” letter will be issued at the expiry of the deadline for submitting a request for a Review. A student whose Request for an Appeal Hearing has been rejected by the University has the right to refer the matter to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator. See Appendix A for details on this.

9.10 Membership of Appeal Panels

Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught Courses

9.10.1 Appeals against a decision of a Module Board, Progression and Award Board or Academic Misconduct Board will normally be heard by an Appeal Panel of three members, which will consist of:

- a Dean or their nominee
- two further members who are Heads of Subject

One of whom shall be appointed as Chair.

No member of the Appeal Panel shall be drawn from the appellant's Academic Subject area.

In exceptional circumstances (absence due to illness or other unforeseen circumstance) an Appeal Hearing panel may be heard by the Chair and one panel member. If the panel falls below this membership requirement the Appeal Hearing cannot proceed and must be re-scheduled.

9.10.2 A representative of the University Secretary's Office with appropriate experience shall be in attendance at all hearings. The remit of this representative is to seek to clarify facts (if appropriate); to advise; and, where necessary, to direct the Appeal Panel to ensure consistency of outcomes and the avoidance of perverse decisions. A perverse decision is one which is grossly inconsistent with the evidence presented; proposes a disproportionate remedy outside the normal scope of the University regulations, or fails to give a reasonable remedy in the light of the circumstances

In the event of non-resolvable differences between the representative of the University Secretary's Office and the Appeal Panel, the Chair of the Appeal Panel will inform the University Secretary. The University Secretary will remit the matter for consideration and determination of outcome to the Chair of Academic Board, whose decision on the matter shall be final.

Research Appeal Hearings – Panel Membership

9.10.3 Appeals made by research students will normally be heard by a Research Appeal Panel of three members which will consist of:

- Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research & Enterprise) or nominee

- Two Directors of Research

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (or nominee) will chair the hearing. No member of the Research Appeal Panel shall be drawn from the appellant's academic subject area.

In exceptional circumstances, (e.g. absence due to illness or other unforeseen circumstance) an appeal may be heard by the Chair (or nominee) and one panel member. If the Panel falls below this requirement, the hearing must be rescheduled.

A Senior Representative of the Graduate School may, if requested, attend to ensure compliance with the Research Regulations.

A representative of the University Secretary's Office with appropriate experience shall also be in attendance. The remit of this representative is to seek to clarify facts (if appropriate); to advise; and, where necessary, to direct the Research Appeal Panel to ensure consistency of outcomes and the avoidance of perverse decisions. A perverse decision is one which is grossly inconsistent with the evidence presented; proposes a disproportionate remedy outside the normal scope of the University regulations or fails to give a reasonable remedy in the light of the circumstances.

In the event of non-resolvable differences between the representative of the University Secretary's Office and the Research Appeal Panel, the Chair of the Panel will inform the University Secretary. The University Secretary will remit the matter for consideration and determination of outcome to the Chair of Academic Board, whose decision on the matter shall be final.

Decisions of the Research Appeal Panel

9.10.4 The Research Appeal Panel will determine whether the appeal is upheld or not upheld.

Where an appeal is upheld, the Research Appeal Panel will refer the matter to the Research Degrees Sub-Committee to determine an appropriate remedy.

9.11 Preparing for an Appeal Hearing

Student Responsibilities Following Notification of an Appeal Hearing

9.11.1 Where an appeal has been granted the student will be notified by email and the School will have 15 working days from the date of the decision to resolve the matter locally.

If this is exceeded, the student will be advised and a revised date provided by which the hearing will take place.

9.11.2 A student may choose:

- to attend and participate in the Appeal Hearing in person
- to have the appeal considered through written submission(s) only, without personal attendance. Where a student chooses this option they must inform the University Secretary of this in writing at the time of submission of the Request for an Appeal Hearing. Unless such notification is received it will be assumed that the student will be attending the Appeal Hearing in person, and the regulations below relating to attendance will operate.

9.11.3 In exceptional circumstances, for example a student being resident abroad or having serious mobility difficulties, the University Secretary has the discretion to permit a telephone/video conference to be used. It is the student's responsibility to seek this permission from the University Secretary, and it should be understood that ordinary timescales cannot apply to such arrangements. Should this process be agreed, a variant on the normal conduct of the hearing will be used for the determination of the appeal.

9.11.4 The appeal processes are designed to provide for the prompt hearing of any appeal. A student granted an Appeal Hearing is required to give contact information; and is deemed to have agreed to access that form of contact (e-mail or letter) regularly; and to contact the University Secretary's Office if expected communications have not been received, or if any other material difficulties arise which may impede the process.

Identification of Witnesses

9.11.5 It is the responsibility of the student to inform the University at the earliest opportunity of the name of any witness which they would wish to call at the Appeal Hearing, and the expected nature of the evidence. Witnesses not identified within the prescribed timescales will not be permitted to attend the hearing. It is the responsibility of the student to ensure the attendance of any witnesses at the Appeal Hearing. If a witness is unable to attend the hearing, the student may present a written statement from the witness, provided that the identity of the witness has previously been disclosed. The non-availability of a witness will not be a valid reason for a change to the date of the Appeal Hearing, unless the University Secretary's representative at the Appeal Hearing decides that the evidence of the witness is essential to the determination of the facts of the matter.

Date of Appeal Hearing

9.11.6 A date for the Appeal Hearing will be sent to the student. It is the responsibility of the student to be available on this date, unless they have chosen to have the hearing conducted through written representations only. It will not normally be possible for this date to be changed, and this will only be done in respect of exceptional circumstances, for example medical treatment. Holiday arrangements do not constitute a valid reason for seeking to change the date of the Appeal Hearing.

Where a student anticipating an award of the University has asked for, and been given, a postponement of the Appeal Hearing; it is unlikely that the re-arranged hearing will take place before the relevant award ceremony.

If a student fails to attend for the Appeal Hearing, or, where this has been arranged, is unavailable by telephone; the Chair of the Appeal Panel will determine either

- to proceed on the basis of the written evidence available; or
- to terminate the Appeal Hearing and dismiss the appeal.

The decision of the Chair of the Appeal Panel is final. Where the Chair of the Appeal Panel has taken the decision that the Hearing should be terminated and the appeal dismissed, the matter will be deemed concluded at this point; unless the University Secretary accepts that there were good grounds for the student's absence or non-contactability, and arranges for another hearing to take place.

It is the responsibility of the student to inform the University Secretary of the reasons for the absence or non-contactability and seek a re-arranged hearing. Such re-arrangement is at the discretion of the University Secretary, whose decision on the matter is final.

Refusal of Re-arranged Hearing

9.11.7 Where a re-arranged Appeal Hearing is refused the student will be notified in writing of the refusal and the reasons for it and informed that the process is now at an end. This communication will be a formal "Completion of Process" letter for the purposes of any application to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator. A student whose appeal has been terminated without an Appeal Hearing taking place has the right to refer the matter to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator. See Appendix A for details on this.

Information to the School/Partner and Appeal Response

9.11.8 Once permission for an Appeal Hearing to take place has been granted the submission and evidence contained in the Request for an Appeal Hearing (Student Submission) will be sent to the Dean or their nominee.

The Dean or their nominee is responsible for undertaking an investigation within the School/Partner and producing the Appeal Response (School Response) to the Student Submission. This investigation is conducted between appropriate academic colleagues and does not involve an interview with the student who is appealing.

The Appeal Response will be sent to the student to enable them to prepare for the Appeal Hearing. The Appeal Response is the substantive response to the matter raised by the student. The School/Partner will not normally be able to raise any new matter or use further evidence in the Appeal Hearing itself.

The Dean or their nominee will propose an experienced member of staff to represent the School at the Appeal Hearing. This person must have been present at the meeting of the Module Board, Progression and Award Board or Research Degrees Sub-Committee in question. The Dean or their nominee should notify the University Secretary's Office of any member of staff who will be attending the hearing at the time when the School/Partner Response is submitted, in order that the student can be informed of their identity.

If the School/Partner fails to make a response within the required timescale, the Appeal will be considered to be non-contested, and the matter referred to an Appeal Panel for remedy only.

Information from the Student

9.11.9 On receipt of the Appeal Response, the student should notify the University Secretary's Office if they

- wish to produce evidence in reply to the Appeal Response, indicating what that evidence will be
- wish to call a witness or witnesses in reply to the Appeal Response, indicating the nature of the proposed testimony.

Agreement by the School/ Partner to Informal Resolution

9.11.10 The Dean or their nominee, after consultation with colleagues, and the external examiner(s) if relevant, may accept that the student's appeal is well founded. In such a case, the University Secretary or their nominee should propose a remedy to the student. It is expected that such a proposed remedy will be in accord with decisions normally taken by a Progression and Award Board. Such a remedy will be deemed to resolve the appeal informally.

Where the proposal would involve the recommendation for an award of the University above the level of Certificate of Higher Education, or an amendment to the classification of a Bachelor Degree with honours, or the designation of Merit/Distinction to a Masters award, the Dean or their nominee must consult with the external examiner(s), and confirm to the University Secretary that this has taken place.

The University Secretary's Office is responsible for ensuring that this consultation has taken place.

Where the external examiner does not agree with a proposal to recommend an award of the University, or amend a degree classification or designation the matter will be remitted for consideration by an Appeal Panel.

If the student accepts the proposed remedy, the matter is terminated at this point; and the appropriate amendment made to the minutes of the Progression and Award Board;

If the student does not agree with the remedy proposed through informal resolution, an Appeal Panel will be convened. The Student and a representative of the School will be invited to attend the Appeal Hearing to discuss a suitable remedy.

9.12 Conduct of the Appeal Hearing

9.12.1 The Appeal Hearing will be conducted in accordance with the procedures which accompany this section of the regulations.

9.12.2 All Appeal Panels will seek to carry out their remit by:

- seeking to establish the facts of the matter
- seeking to establish the degree of gravity of the circumstances

- on the basis of the evidence presented, reach a finding that an appeal is upheld or rejected
- determine a course of action in respect of appeals which have been upheld.

9.12.3 Where the grounds for appeal concern previously undisclosed extenuating circumstances, the Appeal Panel in seeking to carry out the remit above, will pay particular attention to:

- seeking to establish the facts of the matter in respect of the extenuating circumstances claimed
- seeking to establish, on the basis of the evidence presented, whether there were good grounds for the previous non-disclosure of these circumstances
- on the basis of the above consideration, reach a finding that an appeal is upheld or rejected
- where an appeal is upheld, determine the gravity of the extenuating circumstances themselves, in accordance with University Codes of Practice for Taught Students Section 9
- in the light of this determination of gravity, determine any appropriate course of action.

9.12.4 Where the grounds for appeal are other than those relating to previously undisclosed extenuating circumstances, the essence of the Appeal Hearing process is that the School/Partner will be invited to respond to the substance of the appeal (Appeal Response) and members of staff of the School/Partner will be eligible to participate in an Appeal Hearing and contest the appeal.

9.12.5 Where the grounds relate to previously undisclosed extenuating circumstances, the School will be invited to send a representative to attend the Appeal Hearing to comment on matters relating to the course and the implementation of any proposed outcomes of the Appeal.

9.12.6 Appeal Panels are required to consider each appeal on its individual merits and the circumstances of the case; and, where appropriate, to determine an appropriate remedy for the particular circumstances in question, in accordance with these regulations. No precedent may arise from an appeal, and no precedent may be cited in the course of an appeal.

Standard of Proof

9.12.7 Where the facts of the matter are at issue, the standard of proof required by the Appeal Panel in respect of all appeals, is that of “balance of probabilities”.

Adjournment

9.12.8 The Chair of the Appeal Panel has the authority to adjourn the Appeal Hearing should the need for this become apparent, for example to seek further clarification of evidence produced.

Information to the Appeal Panel

9.12.9 The Appeal Panel will be provided with the following information:

- the minutes of the relevant Module Board, Progression and Award Board, Research Degrees Sub-Committee or Academic Misconduct Board
- details of the student's academic profile
- outcomes of any requests for consideration of extenuating circumstances made by the student where these apply to any assessments which are the subject of the appeal
- the course regulations.
- Course Handbook
- Any other information from the student file which the School determines is relevant to its case.

Where the ground of appeal concerns previously undisclosed extenuating circumstances, the panel will also receive:

- minutes of the relevant Mitigation Panel (to ensure that double-mitigation is not being sought)

The Appeal Panel shall have the right to access any other information it considers may be relevant.

Evidence in Person

9.12.10 The Appeal Panel will hear evidence from:

- the student
- all other appropriate persons.

And – for all grounds for appeal which do not involve previously undisclosed extenuating circumstances:

- the School representative proposed by the Dean or their nominee

Written Evidence

9.12.11 The Appeal Panel will consider:

- written evidence produced by the appellant (Student Submission)
- written witness statements.

And – for all grounds of appeal which do not involve previously undisclosed extenuating circumstances:

- written evidence produced by the School/Partner (Appeal Response)

Decisions on Conclusion of the Hearing and Any Consequent Action

9.12.12 At the conclusion of the hearing, the Appeal Panel will reach one of these decisions:

- the appeal is upheld
- the appeal is rejected.

Where the appeal is upheld, the Panel will also determine any appropriate action in respect of this finding. Where the appeal is on the grounds of hitherto undisclosed extenuating circumstances, the Appeal Panel will first categorise the grounds themselves as provided for in the Code of Practice for Taught Students Section 2.7, before determining appropriate action.

Notification to the Student

9.12.13 The decision and any action arising from an Appeal Hearing will be notified to the student in writing within 5 working days. Where the Appeal Panel proposes to recommend an award of the University above the level of Certificate of Higher Education, or amend the classification of a Bachelor degree with honours, or the designation of Merit/Distinction to a Masters Award, the student will be informed that such a recommendation or amendment is subject to consultation with the external examiner.

Where some delay is anticipated in reaching a decision on any proposed action arising from an upheld appeal, the student should be advised of this, and given an indication of when it is anticipated the matter will be concluded.

Research awards of the University cannot be made without successful completion of the relevant examination process.

No Amendment to a Student's Academic Outcome

9.12.14 An Appeal Panel may decide that the appeal itself is upheld, but that the circumstances do not warrant an amendment of the decision on the student's Academic Outcomes reached by the Module Board, Progression and Award Board, Research Degrees Sub-Committee or Academic Misconduct Board. In such a case, the Appeal Panel will determine whether any other outcome, for example an apology, is appropriate.

Amendment to an Academic Outcome

9.12.15 If the Appeal Panel determines that an amendment should be made to an Academic Outcome as determined by the Module Boards, Progression and Award Boards, Research Degrees Sub-Committee or Academic Misconduct Board, this should be one of the actions authorised under the Code of Practice for Taught Students, Sections 2.5, or 3 in the case of research students, of the University Academic Regulations.

Consultation with the Chair of the Progression and Award Board

9.12.16 If the Appeal Panel considers that it is appropriate, members may consult with the Chair of the Module Board, Progression and Award Board or Academic Misconduct Board. This would normally be solely for the purpose of ensuring consistency of treatment with other students.

Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body Courses

9.12.17 Where the course of study is accredited by a Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body, the Appeal Panel must consult with the Chair of the Progression and Award Board or the relevant Dean of School or nominee to ensure that any proposed amendment to the decision is compatible with the requirements of the Body in question.

Consultation with External Examiners

9.12.18 Where the Appeal Panel proposes the recommendation of an award of the University above the level of Certificate of Higher Education, or that an amendment be made to the classification of a Bachelor degree with honours, or that the designation of Merit/Distinction be given in respect of non-honours awards, this may be done only after consultation with the External Examiner for the course of study, or the Chief External Examiner where there are several. The written consent of the external

examiner is required for the above. This may be by oral agreement followed by written confirmation.

Where an external examiner does not agree with a proposal to recommend an award of the University; amend the classification of a Bachelor degree with honours; or designate Merit or Distinction for non-honours awards, the Chair of the Appeal Panel will inform the University Secretary. The University Secretary will remit the matter for consideration and determination between the Chair of Academic Board and the external examiner. The Chair of Academic Board's decision on the matter shall be final.

Errors or Irregularities Affecting More than One Student

9.12.19 If the Appeal Panel has reason to believe that an error or irregularity raised during the Appeal Hearing may have adversely affected the performance of more than one student, the Chair of the Appeal Panel shall discuss the finding with the Dean or their nominee or nominee. The purpose of that discussion will be to establish whether or not more than one student was adversely affected, and if so, what remedial action might be appropriate in respect of other students. Where the circumstances are found to have affected the entire cohort of students, the matter shall be reported to the University Secretary. The University Secretary will inform the Chair of the Academic Board, who, after consultation with such colleagues as are deemed appropriate, will determine a course of action to be taken.

The course of action to be taken will be determined in the light of the circumstances of the case and the need for equitable and fair treatment of students of the University; and includes the authority to annul an examination, or any other assessment or part of it. In order to provide for equitable and fair treatment of students of the University, any course of action determined on in such a case is not limited to action which is currently provided for within the academic regulations.

Conclusion of the Appeal Process

9.12.20 The decision of the Appeal Panel, or Chair of Academic Board where relevant, is final; and ends the process of appeal. There is no further appeal mechanism available in the University. On conclusion of the process, all students who have had an Appeal Hearing will receive a formal letter from the University, setting out:

- the decision
- a summary of the reasons for the decision
- notification of any outcome arising from the decision

- confirmation that the process is now at an end. This communication will be a formal “Completion of Procedures” letter for the purposes of any application to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator.

Office of the Independent Adjudicator

9.12.21 A student whose Appeal has been rejected by the University, or who is otherwise dissatisfied with the process or its conduct, has the right to refer the matter to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator. See Appendix A for details on this.

Amendment to Minutes of Progression and Award Boards and the Student Record System

9.12.22 Where the outcome of the Appeal Hearing is an amendment to the Academic Outcome of the student, the University Secretary or nominee will so inform the Dean or their nominee in order that the necessary addendum to the Minutes of the Board or Committee and student record system, recording that amendment, can be made.

Report to Schools on Outcomes

9.12.23 The University Secretary (or nominee) will inform each Dean or their nominee of the outcome of Appeals to facilitate future enhancement of the student experience. This information will be anonymised to maintain student confidentiality.

Report to the Academic Board

9.12.24 The University Secretary will make an annual report to the Academic Board of the University or its Committees on the Appeal Process.

9.13 Confidentiality and Retention of Information

Submissions giving details of appeals and discussions by Appeal Panels will be confidential to the members of staff who are involved in the appeal process, except where sharing of the information is necessary and has a lawful basis under UK data protection law. Examples of where information may need to be shared more widely than the Appeal Panel include:

- a) Where the needs of a Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body requires wider disclosure.
- b) Where the decision of a Progression and Award Board requires wider disclosure, for example to the External Examiner.

- c) Where investigation of matters under the general student regulations requires wider disclosure.
- d) Where there is a potential threat to life.

Records of appeals will be retained for the student's duration of study plus one year.

At the end of the period of retention, records of extenuating circumstances will be destroyed.

APPENDIX A: APPLICATION TO THE OFFICE OF THE INDEPENDENT ADJUDICATOR

9.A1 A student who is dissatisfied with the academic appeal process or its conduct has the right to submit an application to the Independent Adjudicator that their dissatisfaction be reviewed independently of the University.

9.A2 This right may be exercised only once the internal processes have been exhausted.

9.A3 The University issues a "Completion of Procedures" letter when:

- permission to appeal has not been granted;
or, as relevant
- at the conclusion of an Appeal Hearing or earlier resolution.

This letter is the formal University confirmation that the internal process is at an end.

9.A4 A Framework Application Form must be completed in order to make a submission to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator.

9.A5 This must be received within 12 months of the date of the "Completion of Procedures" letter.

9.A6 The Office of the Independent Adjudicator will not review:

- Admissions
- Academic judgement
- Student employment
- Matters which have already been considered by a court or tribunal and where the proceedings have been concluded
- Matters which are being considered by a court or tribunal where the proceedings have not been **stayed**
- Matters which have not materially affected the complainant as a student
- Matters which they have already dealt with
- Complaints where the main issues complained about took place more than three years before the complaint is received by the OIA.

9.A7 Further information on the Office of the Independent Adjudicator and its services is available on www.oiahe.org.uk.



LEEDS
BECKETT
UNIVERSITY

Academic Regulations

Academic Honesty

Section 10

leedsbeckett.ac.uk

Section 10

Academic Honesty

Originating Department:	Academic Quality Enhancement Office
Enquiries to:	quality@leedsbeckett.ac.uk
Approving Body:	Academic Board
Last Approved:	2 July 2025
Next due for approval:	July 2026
Document Type:	Regulation
Target Audience:	Relevant for all University staff and students and of particular relevance to: Academic Honesty Leads and any other colleagues involved in the investigation of unfair practice, including Collaborative Partners.

Contents

10.1	Purpose	1
10.2	General Principles of Academic Honesty	1
10.3	Code of Practice for Academic Honesty	2
10.3.1	Definitions	2
10.3.2	General Provisions	4
10.3.3	Suspected Cases	5

Section 10: Academic Honesty

10.1 Purpose

Academic honesty is a fundamental principle within the University and is strongly linked to good academic practice. This section of the Academic Regulations defines the University's approach to maintaining the academic honesty of students' work and safeguarding against breaches of academic honesty. The University has processes to investigate alleged breaches of academic honesty and, where a breach of academic honesty is admitted or found, applies appropriate penalties as defined in this code.

The University seeks to educate its students about academic honesty prior to assessment to both reduce breaches of academic honesty and to highlight the severity with which certain offences will be dealt. Academic judgement regarding the nature and severity of the case will be applied prior to investigation of a suspected breach of academic honesty.

10.2 General Principles of Academic Honesty

The University will promote academic honesty and will focus on educating students about good academic practice from the start of their course. Students will be required to develop good academic practice throughout the duration of their study at Leeds Beckett University.

The University will ensure that students are treated fairly when being assessed and that any student suspected of a breach of academic honesty will be investigated and will have a fair hearing. Normally, where a mark has been confirmed by either a Module Board or a joint Module/ Award Board, it is beyond the scope of these regulations.

Opportunities for further education about academic honesty and good academic practice will be provided to students who have admitted to breaching, or been found to have breached, these regulations

Penalties applied to students are appropriate to:

- a) The gravity of the case
- b) The circumstances of the case
- c) The level at which the offence took place
- d) Whether the offence was a repeat offence

There are two categories of investigation (minor and major offence) which relate to the nature and severity of the suspected offence.

Clear definitions of offences covered by these regulations will be provided to students. Students will be informed of the consequences of breaching the regulations in respect of academic honesty. Professional Body accreditation may have an impact upon the nature of the penalty or the consequences of breaching academic honesty. All students so affected will be made aware of this.

All forms of assessment are subject to these regulations (see Section 3). A suspected breach of academic honesty in relation to a taught award will be investigated through local processes. A suspected breach of academic honesty in relation to a research award will be investigated by the Research Degrees Sub-committee.

A suspected breach of academic honesty, whether intentional or unintentional, is a matter of academic judgement and may be considered a breach of these regulations.

Any student suspected of a breach of academic honesty will be provided with information about the alleged offence which explains why they are being investigated.

Any student with a suspected breach of academic honesty will have the right to submit extenuating circumstances in explanation of their actions. Where extenuating circumstances are accepted they will be taken into consideration in determining the penalty. Full details can be found in the guidance that accompanies these regulations.

Once an investigation into a possible offence commences, the student may not invoke the Student Complaints Procedure on any matter directly related to the proceedings.

In the event of a finding that no offence has occurred, the documentation associated with the allegation will be shredded/deleted immediately.

Where an offence has been admitted or found, all documentation associated with the case will be retained in accordance with the retention policy.

10.3 Code of Practice for Academic Honesty

10.3.1 Definitions

Poor Academic Practice

Poor academic practice occurs when the standard of referencing is not at the level required by the nature of the assessment. Poor academic practice is normally dealt with via the

marking process. Feedback, including opportunities for further education about academic honesty and good academic practice, should be provided.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is the substantial, unacknowledged, incorporation in a student's work of material derived from the work (published or unpublished) of another. "Work" includes, but is not limited to, materials in all formats and sources including print, electronic, online, audio visual etc.

Examples of plagiarism include:

- a) the inclusion in a student's work of substantial extracts from another person's work without the use of quotation marks
- b) the substantial summarising of another person's work without acknowledgement
- c) the substantial and unauthorised use of the ideas of another person without acknowledgement

Self-Plagiarism

Self-plagiarism occurs when a student submits their own work which has already received credit. This may be part of a piece of work or the entire piece of work.

Self-plagiarism does not apply in circumstances where students are required to complete reassessment or repeat a module(s).

Collusion

Collusion occurs when a student collaborates with another student in the completion of work which is then submitted as unaided work by either student.

Cheating

Cheating is unfair behaviour relating to an examination. It includes, but is not limited to

- a) Actions within the examination room/online platform:
 - communicating with any other candidate during an examination
 - copying from any other candidate during an examination
 - communicating with any other person other than an authorised invigilator or another member of staff during an examination

- possession of any written or printed materials in the examination room unless expressly permitted by the examination regulations possession of any electronically stored information in the examination room unless expressly permitted by the examination regulations
- possession of a mobile phone or other electronic device during an examination, unless expressly permitted by the examination regulations

b) Actions outside of the examination room/online platform:

- gaining access to any unauthorised material relating to the examination during or before the examination
- obtaining a copy of a written examination paper in advance of the time and date for its authorised release.

Contract Cheating

Contract cheating occurs when a student instructs a third party to do some or all of a piece of work (paid or unpaid).

Other Forms of Unfair Practice

Other forms of Unfair Practice include, but are not limited to:

- a) offering a bribe or inducement to any member of staff of the University, or any external invigilator or examiner, who is connected with the student's assessments
- b) falsifying data in any piece of work
- c) the assumption by one person of the identity of another person with the intent to deceive or gain unfair advantage
- d) submitting copies of another person's work stored on an electronic device
- e) non-compliance with university research ethics procedures
- f) failure to gain ethical approval for the submitted piece of work, as appropriate.
- g) use of generative artificial intelligence tools to gain an unfair advantage
- h) other forms of intent to gain unfair advantage.

10.3.2 General Provisions

Standard of Proof

The standard of proof required at any stage of investigation is that of "the balance of probabilities".

Timescales for Investigations

The University intends to deal speedily with any suspected breach of academic honesty and has developed a service standard for investigating suspected breaches. The full service standard can be found in the guidance which accompanies these regulations. The University undertakes to endeavour to meet the timescales of the service standard, but accepts no liability for failure to do so.

In exceptional cases, or where it becomes apparent that investigation of an alleged breach of academic honesty is likely to be complex and protracted; or where relevant evidence cannot be speedily obtained and presented; variation of the expected timescales should be agreed between the student and the University.

Academic Honesty Lead

In order to provide a consistent approach to the promotion of good academic practice and investigation of cases, each Dean of School or equivalent will appoint one or more Academic Honesty Leads at school or subject level as deemed appropriate.

The role of the Academic Honesty Lead is to:

- a) provide advice and guidance to members of staff on academic honesty related issues
- b) determine the level at which cases should be managed
- c) manage the Minor Offence process
- d) assist with the delivery of staff development on academic honesty related issues

Consideration of Individual Cases

Each case will be considered on its own merits, and on the basis of:

- a) The gravity of the case
- b) The circumstances of the case
- c) The level at which the offence took place
- d) Whether the offence was a repeat offence

10.3.3 Suspected Cases

Making an Allegation

A suspected breach of academic honesty may be identified by a member of staff of our university or of a collaborative partner.

Taught awards may be investigated following submission of assessment or examination.

Research awards may be investigated prior to or following submission for examination.

Determination of Process

Categorisation of the suspected breach of academic honesty and determination of how it should be investigated is made by the appropriate Academic Honesty Lead and the member of staff identifying the suspected case.

The possible processes for investigation are:

Minor Offence

Examples of minor offences include, but are not limited to:

- Repeat instances of poor academic practice*
- Cheating
- Collusion

** This will not normally include students at Level 4 or the start of Level 7.*

Major Offence

Examples of major offences include, but are not limited to:

- Contract cheating
- Falsification of data

Minor Offence

A minor offence meeting will be conducted by the Academic Honesty Lead.

A student will be given the following information in writing, at least 5 working days in advance of a request to attend a minor offence meeting:

- a) The reason for their attendance being required
- b) A copy of any relevant report or other evidence
- c) The right to seek advice from the Students' Union
- d) The right to accompaniment/representation

A student will have the right to:

- i. be accompanied by a friend (provided that the friend is not a professionally contracted advocate);
- ii. be accompanied or represented by a Students' Union representative. (This right of accompaniment and representation is a general right and is not the right to accompaniment and/or representation by a specific individual.)

It is the student(s) responsibility to:

- a) Co-operate with the regulations concerning the alleged offence
- b) Attend the investigatory meeting/submit a written response to the allegation
- c) Demonstrate that the work is their own or that the alleged offence has not occurred.

Guidance about the format of the meetings and membership requirements for both processes are provided by the Academic Quality Enhancement Office.

The outcome of an admitted or found case can be found in the Schedule of Outcomes.

Major Offence

An Academic Misconduct Board will be established to investigate suspected major offence. This will normally be convened at School level.

Right to Accompaniment or Representation

A student will be given the following information in writing, at least 10 working days in advance of a meeting of the Board:

- a) The reason for their attendance being required
- b) A copy of any relevant report or other evidence
- c) The right to seek advice from the Students' Union
- d) The right to accompaniment/representation

A student will have the right to:

- a) be accompanied by a friend (provided that the friend is not a professionally contracted advocate);

- b) be accompanied or represented by a Students' Union representative. (This right of accompaniment and representation is a general right and is not the right to accompaniment and/or representation by a specific individual.)

Responsibilities of Student(s)

It is the student(s) responsibility to:

- a) Attend the meeting and/or submit a written response to the allegation
- b) Seek advice from the Students' Union if required

Membership of School Academic Misconduct Board

The School Academic Misconduct Board consists of:

- Chair (Dean of School or nominee)
- Two Academic Honesty Leads (from different Schools or Subject Areas to that of the student under consideration)

The following participants will also be in attendance:

- Internal Examiner (the person identifying the alleged offence)
- Student
- Student's friend or representative (if applicable)
- Secretary (a member of support staff from within the School)

Guidance about the format of the meetings and membership requirements for all processes is provided by the Academic Quality Enhancement Office.

The outcome of an admitted or found cases can be found in the Schedule of Outcomes for taught awards.

Viva Voce

A viva voce examination should be held where a student has a suspected case of contract cheating. The viva should not determine whether the allegation is substantiated, but should gather evidence to be considered by the Academic Misconduct Board, by allowing the student to defend their work.

Where a suspected case of contract cheating is identified, a viva voce examination should be arranged at the earliest opportunity. The viva voce examination can be held as a distinct

meeting prior to the Academic Misconduct Board or as an integral part of the Academic Misconduct Board meeting.

Viva Participants

Where the viva voce examination is held as an integral part of the Academic Misconduct Board meeting, the participants are as outlined for the School Academic Misconduct Board.

Where the viva voce examination is held as a distinct meeting, the viva participants are:

- Chair: an appropriately experienced and trained senior academic member of staff (who may be an Academic Honesty Lead) from outside of the School to that of the student under consideration
- Student
- Student's friend or representative (if applicable), but not a legal representative
- Academic subject expert (normally the person identifying the alleged offence)
- Secretary (a member of support staff from within the School)

Right to Accompaniment or Representation

A student will be given the following information in writing, at least 10 working days in advance of a viva voce examination:

- a) The reason for their attendance being required
- b) A copy of any relevant report or other evidence
- c) The right to seek advice from the Students' Union
- d) The right to accompaniment/representation

A student will have the right to:

- a) be accompanied by a friend (provided that the friend is not a professionally contracted advocate);
- b) be accompanied or represented by a Students' Union representative. This right of accompaniment and representation is a general right and is not the right to accompaniment and/or representation by a specific individual.

Responsibilities of Student(s)

It is the student(s) responsibility to:

- a) Attend the viva voce examination
- b) Seek advice from the Students' Union if required

Conduct of the Viva

The Chair must ensure that the viva is conducted in a collegiate manner and that the student is treated fairly.

The student should be allowed to present evidence, such as date-stamped draft copies of their work, to support their claim that they did complete the work themselves.

The subject expert will normally ask questions about the work to ascertain whether the student understands what they submitted and have met the relevant learning outcomes.

A record of the viva is added to the set of evidence that constitutes the case against the student.

Further guidance about the format of the Viva Voce Examination is provided by the Academic Quality Enhancement Office.

Schedule of Outcomes for Taught Awards

The category of the breach and the gravity and circumstances of the case will inform the penalty in accordance with the schedule of outcomes for taught awards. Where extenuating circumstances have been accepted they will be taken into consideration in determining the penalty. Full details can be found in the guidance that accompanies these regulations.

The following outcomes will be available following an admitted or found case:

Investigation Stage	Available Penalties
Minor Offence (Academic Honesty Lead)	A mark of zero will be attributed to the assessment and the case will be referred to the Module Board. Any eligibility for reassessment (for a capped mark of 40% for Levels 4-6 and 50% for Level 7) will be confirmed by the relevant Module Board/Progression and Award board and be available at the next scheduled reassessment period. A letter of warning will be sent to the student and they will be strongly recommended to engage with the opportunities for further education about academic honesty and good academic practice.
Major Offence	1) A mark of zero will be attributed to the assessment and the case will be referred to the Module Board.

Investigation Stage	Available Penalties
	Any eligibility for reassessment (for a capped mark of 40% for Levels 4-6 and 50% for Level 7) will be confirmed by the relevant Module Board/Progression and Award board and be available at the next scheduled reassessment period. A letter of warning will be sent to the student and they will be strongly recommended to engage with the opportunities for further education about academic honesty and good academic practice. 2) Module failed with no right of reassessment. A letter of final warning will be sent to the student and they will be strongly recommended to engage with the opportunities for further education about academic honesty and good academic practice. 3) Level failed and requirement to withdraw from the course/pathway of study. The Progression and Award Board will advise the student of their entitlement to a contained award or credit achieved, if applicable. A letter of withdrawal will be sent to the student.

Non-Attendance of Student at any stage of these procedures

In the event of non-attendance (in person, by telephone or internet) without good cause, of a student at any stage of these proceedings, the Academic Honesty Lead or Academic Misconduct Board is authorised to proceed in their absence.

Right to Request an Appeal Hearing

All students have a right to request an appeal hearing in respect of the decision of a Module Board, Progression and Award Board or Research Degrees Sub-committee in accordance with Section 9 of the Academic Regulations.

Fail Withdraw

All students have the right to request an early appeal hearing to reconsider a decision of Fail Withdraw at the time of formal publication of decisions by the Academic Misconduct Board or Research Degrees Sub-committee, (see section 9 of the Academic Regulations).

Schedule of Outcomes for Research Awards

The Research Degrees Sub-committee may determine to do one of the following depending on the circumstances and gravity of each individual case in accordance with Section 11 of the Academic Regulations.

Awards and Level	Available Penalties	
MRes – Level 7	Resubmit	Withdraw from the course/pathway of study
MPhil – Level 7	Resubmit	Withdraw from the course/pathway of study
PhD / Professional Doctorate / European PhD / PhD by Existing Published Work – Level 8	Resubmit	Withdraw from the course/pathway of study

Considerations upon awarding penalty – Research Awards

Students may submit extenuating circumstances pertaining to their suspected case for consideration by the Research Degrees Sub-Committee.



LEEDS
BECKETT
UNIVERSITY

Academic Regulations Research Awards

Section 11

leedsbeckett.ac.uk

Section 11

Research Awards

Originating Department:	Academic Quality Enhancement Office
Enquiries to:	ResearchStudentAdmin@leedsbeckett.ac.uk
Approving Body:	Academic Board
Last Approved:	3 July 2024
Next due for approval:	July 2026
Document Type	Regulation
Target Audience:	Relevant for all University staff and students and of particular relevance to: Academic and Support Staff responsible for the operation of regulatory processes for Research Awards.

Contents

11.1	Purpose	1
11.2	Research Awards	1
11.2.1	Research Awards of the University	1
11.2.2	Other Research Awards.....	1
11.2.3	Field of Study.....	2
11.3	Research Awards: Requirements	2
11.3.1	Conditions of Award.....	2
11.3.2	Masters by Research (MRes).....	2
11.3.3	Masters Titles	2
11.3.4	Masters: Certificate of Award	3
11.3.5	Masters: Use of Designatory Letters.....	3
11.3.6	Master of Philosophy (MPhil).....	3
11.3.7	Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)	3
11.3.8	Professional Doctorate.....	3
11.3.9	PhD by Existing Published Work.....	4
11.3.10	Higher Doctorates	4
11.4	Co-operation With Other Organisations.....	4
11.4.1	Co-operation with Other Organisations	4
11.4.2	Co-operating Organisations.....	5
11.4.3	Details of Agreement.....	5
11.4.4	Academic Independence	5
11.5	Admission	5
11.5.1	Admission & Entry Qualifications	5
11.5.2	Consideration and Determination of Application	7
11.6	Research Awards: Registration and fees	8
11.6.1	Registration of Candidates	8
11.6.2	Fees for Research Candidates	11
11.7	Supervision of Research	12

11.7.1	Supervision of Research	12
11.7.2	Appointment of Supervisory Team	12
11.7.3	Supervisory Team: staff development	12
11.7.4	Advisors	12
11.7.5	Staff eligible to act as Research Supervisors	13
11.7.6	Change in Supervisory Arrangements	13
11.8	Study and Engagement.....	13
11.8.1	Commencement of Study	13
11.8.2	Engagement with the Supervisory Team	13
11.8.3	Ethical Approval of Research Programme.....	13
11.8.4	Health and Safety: Risk Assessment	14
11.8.5	Data Protection Act 2018	14
11.8.6	Intellectual Property Provisions	14
11.8.7	Collaborating Institutions or Organisations.....	14
11.8.8	Consideration of Reasonable Adjustments.....	14
11.8.9	Research Training Programme	15
11.8.10	Exemption from the Research Training Programme.....	15
11.8.11	Research Misconduct and Unfair Practice	15
11.8.12	Extenuating Circumstances	15
11.9	Confirmation of Registration and Progression	17
11.9.1	Progression.....	17
11.9.2	Annual Progression	17
11.9.4	Annual Progression: Process	18
11.9.5	Annual Progression: Outcomes	18
11.9.6	Annual Progression: Review of Written Warnings.....	18
11.10	Eligibility and Submission for Examination	19
11.10.1	Eligibility for Examination.....	19
11.10.2	Submission for Examination	19
11.11	Confidentiality And Presentation Of Work	20
11.11.1	Confidentiality of Theses.....	20
11.11.2	Form of Presentation	21

11.11.3	Creative Work.....	21
11.11.4	Scholarly Editions	22
11.12	Examination Provisions.....	22
11.12.1	Examinations: General Provisions	22
11.12.2	Examiners	23
11.13	Examination for Award of MRes	25
11.13.1	Format of Examination.....	25
11.13.2	Meeting Between Examiners	25
11.13.3	Oral Examination	25
11.13.4	MRes Examination: Outcomes	25
11.14	Examination Procedures for the Awards of MPhil, PhD and Professional Doctorate	26
11.14.1	Format of Examination.....	26
11.14.2	Preliminary Assessment Report	26
11.14.3	Status of the Preliminary Assessment Report.....	26
11.14.4	MPhil, PhD, Professional Doctorate: Oral Examination	26
11.14.5	Oral Examination: Timing.....	27
11.14.6	Oral Examination: Supervisors and Advisors.....	27
11.14.7	Examination Decisions	27
11.14.8	Available Outcomes.....	27
11.14.9	Cases where the Examiners are not in Agreement	28
11.14.10	Course of Action Open to the University	28
11.14.11	Additional External Examiner	28
11.15	Re-examination of theses.....	29
11.15.1	General Provisions.....	29
11.15.2	Re-examination for the Awards of MPhil, PhD and Professional Doctorate	30
11.15.3	Re-examination for the Award of MRes.....	30
11.16	Recommendation for an Award of the University	30
11.16.1	Recommendation for a Research Award of the University	30
11.16.2	Confirmation of Completion of Minor Amendments	30
11.16.3	Documentation Presented to the Chair of the Research Degrees Sub-Committee.....	31
11.16.4	Formal Reporting of the Recommendation for an Award.....	31

11.16.5	Date of Conferment	31
11.17	Submission of Final Thesis.....	31
11.17.1	Post-Examination: Submission of Copies of Final Text to the University	31
11.17.2	Deposit in Library	32
11.17.3	Confidentiality: Restriction of Access.....	32
11.18	Doctor of Philosophy by Existing Published Work	32
11.18.1	General Requirements	32
11.18.2	Application Process	34
11.18.3	Requirements for Submission	36
11.18.4	The Examination Process	36
11.18.5	Final Submission	38
11.19	Higher Doctorates	38
11.19.1	Higher Doctorates: General Provisions	38
11.19.2	Applicants.....	38
11.19.3	Applications.....	39
11.19.4	Assessment of the Submission	40
11.19.5	Decision on an Award.....	41
11.20	Appeal Provisions	42
11.20.1	Regulations and Procedures for Appeal.....	42
11.20.2	Application	42
11.20.3	Academic Judgement.....	42

Section 11: Research Awards

11.1 Purpose

These Regulations cover all aspects of regulatory requirements for the research awards of the University. These include: Masters by Research (MRes), Master of Philosophy (MPhil), Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), Doctor of Philosophy by Existing Published Work (PhD) and named Professional Doctorates and Higher Doctorates. They provide clear, robust and effective regulatory guidance and set out conditions that apply to the research awards throughout the period of study. These Regulations should be read in conjunction with other regulations of the University and with the [Student Contract](#).

Research degrees are overseen by the Research Degrees Sub-Committee, or any succeeding body with powers delegated to it by Academic Board.

11.2 Research Awards

11.2.1 Research Awards of the University

The University makes the following awards to registered candidate who have successfully completed approved programmes of supervised research:

- Masters by Research (MRes)
- Master of Philosophy (MPhil)
- Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

Professional Doctorates, specifically:

- Doctor of Education (EdD)
- Doctor of Engineering (EngD)
- Doctor of Business Administration (DBA)
- Doctor of Professional Practice in Sport (DProfSport)
- Doctor of Professional Practice in Built Environment (DProfBuiltEnvironment)
- Doctor of Professional Practice in Construction Law (DProfConstructionLaw)
- Doctor of Professional Practice in Planning (DProfPlanning)

11.2.2 Other Research Awards

The University also makes the following awards, subject to the fulfilment of the specific requirements of the award:

- PhD by Existing Published work
- Higher Doctorates – LLD, DLitt, DSc, DTech

11.2.3 Field of Study

Programmes of research may be proposed in any field of study subject to the following requirements:

- That the proposed programme is capable of leading to scholarly research
- That it can be presented for assessment by appropriate examiners
- That a suitable supervisory team can be formed.

11.3 Research Awards: Requirements

11.3.1 Conditions of Award

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

a) Registration, Fees and Financial Liabilities

The candidate is a registered student for an award and payment of all the appropriate tuition and other relevant fees and outstanding financial liabilities has been made.

b) Completion of Programme

The candidate has completed an approved programme of research.

c) Recommendation for Award

The examination outcome has been agreed by the examiners, and the award confirmed by the Chair of the Research Degrees Sub-Committee.

11.3.2 Masters by Research (MRes)

A Masters is awarded to a candidate who has investigated a topic using appropriate research methodology and has presented a satisfactory thesis. An oral examination may be required at the discretion of the examiners.

Candidates who achieve the Masters by Research degree, and who wish to undertake doctoral study, cannot re-use unadapted material from the earlier programme of study. They can, however, use the learning from it to develop doctoral level study.

11.3.3 Masters Titles

The title Masters by Research (MRes) is used for all subject areas.

11.3.4 Masters: Certificate of Award

The specification of the award of Masters by Research is shown on the Certificate of Award.

11.3.5 Masters: Use of Designatory Letters

Award holders may use the designatory letters with or without the mode of attaining the award.

11.3.6 Master of Philosophy (MPhil)

The degree of Master of Philosophy (MPhil) is awarded to a candidate who has satisfactorily completed, or been exempted from, an approved programme of research training; has investigated and evaluated, or critically studied, an appropriate topic demonstrating an understanding of research methods appropriate to the chosen field; and has presented a satisfactory thesis. The candidate is required to defend the thesis by oral examination.

11.3.7 Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

The degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) is awarded to a candidate who has satisfactorily completed, or been exempted from, an approved programme of research training; has investigated or critically studied an appropriate topic resulting in a significant contribution to knowledge; and has presented a satisfactory thesis. The candidate is required to defend the thesis by oral examination.

11.3.8 Professional Doctorate

Professional Doctorates develop knowledge, skills and competences to advance research and professional development within a defined professional field. Professional Doctorates are equivalent in time, intellectual demands and academic outcomes to the PhD but differ in their orientation and emphasis on more applied contributions to professional knowledge and practice. Professional Doctorates are also characterised by having a structured course design, including taught elements to develop research skills and reflective practice.

A Professional Doctorate course comprises both a taught component (Stage 1) and a research component (Stage 2). A Professional Doctorate is awarded to a candidate who has satisfactorily completed Stage 1 (180 taught credits) as outlined in the named course specification, investigated or critically studied an approved topic or topics which make a significant contribution to practice and/or knowledge and presented a satisfactory thesis (Stage 2). The candidate is required to defend the thesis by oral examination.

Specific titles for professional doctorates as outlined in 11.2.1 are reserved for programmes of research and professional practice focused on those areas of study, and candidates will normally have appropriate professional experience working in these domains.

Students who fail to achieve their target award shall be recommended for the conferment of a contained award for which they have achieved the specified requirements. Candidates for a Professional Doctorate may be entitled to one of the following contained awards:

- a) Postgraduate Certificate or Postgraduate Diploma at level 7;
- b) Master's degree at level 7.

Eligibility requirements for these awards are set in section 4 of the Academic Regulations.

11.3.9 PhD by Existing Published Work

The degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) may be awarded on the basis of existing published work. This may include the candidate's own original creative work. The work presented must demonstrate a systematic approach evidencing independent, critical and original aspects, with a significant contribution to knowledge; and must include an exegesis. The exegesis and existing published work will form the thesis which is presented for examination. The candidate is required to defend the exegesis and published work (the thesis) by oral examination.

11.3.10 Higher Doctorates

The University awards Higher Doctorates to applicants who have undertaken work of high distinction, which has constituted an original and significant contribution to the advancement of knowledge, or its applications, or both.

Applications may be made for the following Higher Doctorates:

- Doctor of Laws (LLD)
- Doctor of Letters (DLitt)
- Doctor of Science (DSc)
- Doctor of Technology (DTech).

11.4 Co-operation With Other Organisations

11.4.1 Co-operation with Other Organisations

The University encourages programmes of research that involve co-operation with industrial, commercial, professional or research organisations leading to one of its awards.

Such co-operation is undertaken with the intention of:

- Encouraging outward looking and relevant research
- Extending a research candidate's experience and perspectives
- Providing a wider context for the development of the research topic to be undertaken
- Benefiting the research of the co-operating organisation.

11.4.2 Co-operating Organisations

Formal co-operation may be with one or more external bodies or institutions, each of which is referred to as a Co-operating Organisation.

11.4.3 Details of Agreement

The establishment of such a co-operation shall specify:

- The resources and facilities available for a candidate
- The arrangements (if appropriate) for joint or other supervision
- Their commitment to support the candidate to submission, or other relevant guarantee.

Any agreement with a co-operating organisation(s) will be subject to the procedures identified in 'Section 15: Collaborations and Partnerships' of the University Academic Regulations.

Where collaborations relate to individual research degree students, the Research Degrees Sub-Committee has the authority to approve appropriate arrangements.

11.4.4 Academic Independence

All proposed research programmes are considered for research award registration on their academic merits and without reference to the concerns or interests of any associated funding body.

11.5 Admission

11.5.1 Admission & Entry Qualifications

11.5.1.1 Admission

Admission of candidates for research awards will conform to the general Admission Regulations of the University, as appropriate, and to the specific provisions in respect of

application and qualification for registration for research awards.

11.5.1.2 Evidence of Qualifications

All applicants will be required to provide satisfactory evidence of the qualifications or experience claimed. Falsification of such evidence will lead to the termination of registration.

11.5.1.3 MRes, MPhil, PhD, PhD by Existing Published Work

The normal entry qualifications for registration on to the degrees of MRes, MPhil or PhD is an appropriate honours degree of a United Kingdom higher education institution; or one recognised by the University as equivalent.

11.5.1.4 Professional Doctorates

Candidates for Professional Doctorates should normally have an appropriate honours degree of a United Kingdom higher education institution; and have had a minimum of three years of professional experience. Professional experience will be understood as practical experience within the relevant field of enquiry.

11.5.1.5 Non-standard Entry Qualifications

An application made by someone other than those holding an appropriate entry qualification is considered on its merits. Evidence is required to demonstrate that the background knowledge is appropriate and that the candidate has the ability to carry out the research to the level required for that award.

Such an application is considered by the Chair of the Research Degrees Sub-Committee who will consider the recommendation in the context of consistency and fairness across the University and make a recommendation.

11.5.1.6 English Language Qualification

If a candidate's first language is not English, the University will require evidence that the candidate has the necessary language skills to fulfil the requirements of the award.

The requirements for research degrees will be set by the Research Degrees Sub-Committee and published on the University website.

11.5.1.7 Transfer of Registration from another Institution

An applicant wishing to transfer their registration from another institution in the United Kingdom must provide evidence:

- That the proposed programme of study has been accepted by that institution and when their registration commenced.
- The level at which it was accepted.
- Written explanation of why they wish to transfer.

Subject to the satisfactory provision of evidence, an applicant for transfer into the University will be presented to the Research Degrees Sub-Committee for approval. If successful, an applicant for transfer will normally be required to attend a progression meeting prior to registering for the target award of PhD, Professional Doctorate, MPhil or MRes.

Candidates whose programme of study was approved for the award of MPhil or MRes and who wish to register for a higher or alternative award with the University will be required to submit for Confirmation of Registration on to the higher / alternative award.

11.5.2 Consideration and Determination of Application

11.5.2.1 Reference to relevant external legislation and policies

The University requires all candidates to comply with all laws, legislation and policies appropriate to the research project and provide documentary evidence as appropriate.

Confirmation of compliance with the relevant legislation / policies must be provided before any decision on admission can be made.

This requirement applies equally where the requirement to comply with any law, external legislation / policies emerges after registration.

11.5.2.2 Group Projects

An applicant whose work forms part of a larger group project may apply to register for a research award subject to the following requirements:

- The project work to be undertaken by the applicant must be clearly defined, together with supervisory and technical assistance.
- The individual contributions must be clearly identified and be distinguishable at the examination.

11.5.2.3 Research Projects Substantially Undertaken Outside the University

Applications may be made from persons proposing to work substantially outside the University or outside the United Kingdom provided that:

- The facilities are available to carry out the programme of research
- Arrangements for supervision can be made to provide for adequate and appropriate contact between the candidate and the supervisor(s) based in the University.

11.5.2.4 Decision on an Application

The University will determine:

- Whether an offer of a place should be made to an applicant
- The level at which registration should take place (if relevant)
- Whether the applicant is exempt from the Research Training Programme.

The Admissions team will communicate the decision to the applicant.

11.6 Research Awards: Registration and fees

11.6.1 Registration of Candidates

11.6.1.1 Mode of Study

Subject to any award or course-related restrictions, a candidate may register on a full-time or part-time basis.

A candidate may seek approval from the Research Degrees Sub-Committee for a change in the mode of study at any point during the research programme, subject to any award or course-related restrictions. In considering an application to change mode of study, the Sub-Committee will take account of the suitability of the proposed mode of attendance for the candidate's research programme and visa status.

11.6.1.2 Off Shore Study Option (MRes, MPhil, PhD, and Professional Doctorates)

Opting for offshore study will allow a candidate to remain in their own country to study for their award whilst using agreed facilities within a specified and University-approved location (usually a place of education that the University has a pre-arranged agreement with).

A candidate opting for this mode of study will be expected to be in residence in Leeds for the Induction and for an agreed period throughout the programme of study. These periods will be

used to establish a good working relationship with the supervisory team, undertake appropriate training and prepare for the key milestones. The candidate must attend the Viva Voce Examination in person at Leeds Beckett University.

11.6.1.3 Location of Study

Candidates will be expected to undertake their research at Leeds Beckett University unless they have the approval of the Research Degrees Sub-Committee to undertake research off shore or at a partner organisation. Students are expected to be on campus regularly, or as specified in their off shore or partner organisation agreement.

11.6.1.4 Periods of Registration

Registration commences from the date the candidate registers and enrolls as a research candidate at the University. The periods of registration (from first registration to submission of thesis for examination), are provided in the table below:

Award	Expected	Maximum
Masters by Research (full time)	1 year	1 year
Masters by Research (part time)	2 years	2 years
Master of Philosophy (full time)	2 years	3 years
Master of Philosophy (part time)	4 years	5 years
Doctor of Philosophy (full time)	3 years	4 years
Doctor of Philosophy (part time)	6 years	7 years
Professional Doctorates (part time) as named in section 11.2.1	6 years	7 years
PhD by Existing Published Works	1 year	2 years

The expected period of registration can be reduced by up to 6 months for both full-time and part-time candidates (with fees adjusted accordingly), with the support of the candidate's supervisory team and the prior approval of the Research Degrees Sub- Committee.

11.6.1.5 Changes to a Candidate's Period of Registration

Where a candidate changes their mode of study or transfers from one research award to another, their period of registration will be calculated on a pro-rata basis.

11.6.1.6 Candidates Transferring from Another Institution – Periods of Registration

Where a candidate has commenced their period of registration with another institution, their period of registration will be calculated based on the date their registration commenced with the previous institution, unless the Research Degrees Sub-Committee specifies otherwise.

11.6.1.7 Duration of Study – Application to Exceed Expected Maximum Period of Registration

A candidate registered for a research award of the University may apply for permission to exceed the expected period of registration only in exceptional circumstances. The Research Degrees Sub-Committee is authorised to agree an extension to a candidate's registration up to a maximum of 12 months.

A candidate must submit a request to extend their registration at least 3 months prior to the expiry of their expected period of registration.

11.6.1.8 Externally-Funded Candidates – Duration of Study

Where a candidate accepted for a research award of the University is funded by an external body, and that external body prescribes time limits for the completion of the award in question, the time limit set by the external body shall be the duration of study for the candidate.

In accepting the funding from the external body to study within the University, the candidate agrees to be bound by the time limits set by the funding body for the submission of the award for which funding is given.

11.6.1.9 Suspension of Registration

In exceptional circumstances, the Research Degrees Sub-Committee may approve a request for suspension of registration for any research award where the candidate is prevented by ill- health or any other valid cause from making progress on their research.

The minimum period for a suspension is 2 months, and suspension will be granted in multiples of one month. Application for suspension is not normally permitted within the first 6 months of a programme of study nor during the writing-up period.

During any period of suspension, the candidate will be required to maintain regular contact with their Director of Studies, providing updated information (such as medical certificates) on their status and expected return date.

Any period of suspension will not count towards the candidate's overall period of registration.

11.6.1.10 Withdrawal of Registration

A candidate wishing to withdraw their registration from the University must inform the Graduate School of this intention in writing. The Graduate School should offer the candidate an exit interview in which the reasons for withdrawal will be discussed.

11.6.1.11 Candidates Transferring to another Institution

Where a candidate seeks to transfer to another institution, the University will support the transfer, in line with the [Student Transfer Plan](#).

11.6.1.12 Transfer of Registration

If, through the course of their research, the candidate feels their research project may be suitable for an alternative award than the one which they originally registered for (a candidate wishing to transfer from MRes to MPhil or MPhil to PhD for example), they may seek to transfer their registration. Candidates are advised to seek the opinion, and advice of, their supervisory team before making a request to transfer their registration to an alternative award.

An application to transfer to an alternative award will be considered by the Research Degrees Sub-Committee who may arrange for the candidate to undertake the Transfer of Registration process. Candidates applying to transfer to an alternative award must be able to complete the requirements for the new award within the maximum period of study for the proposed award.

11.6.2 Fees for Research Candidates

11.6.2.1 Fees

The payment of fees will be as prescribed by the appropriate University guidance and processes. Please see the [Fee Schedule and Liability Policy](#) for further information.

The candidate will be expected to re-enrol and pay fees on an annual basis, subject to the outcome of the annual progression process, and completion of the taught modules of the professional doctorates.

The candidate's registration and fee payment must be current at the time of examination.

11.6.2.2 Candidate Entitlement on Payment of Fees

Payment of the required full-time or part-time fees entitles the research candidate to access the University's facilities and services. The candidate is entitled to receive supervision only during the period in which they pay the full fee for the appropriate mode of study.

11.6.2.3 Writing-up Fee – MPhil, PhD and all Professional Doctorates only

A candidate permitted to register on to the writing-up fee by the Research Degrees Sub-Committee will not require, nor receive, any supervision during the period in which they are paying the writing-up fee; but will be able to access the library and other learning facilities of

the University.

The writing-up fee period will be a minimum of 2 months and a maximum period of 12 months which may not be extended.

11.6.2.4 Writing-up Fee and Periods of Registration

A flat rate fee will be charged for the writing-up period. The fee is non-refundable.

Any period of writing-up will count towards the candidate's overall period of registration.

11.7 Supervision of Research

11.7.1 Supervision of Research

A research degree candidate is normally supervised by a Director of Studies and at least one other supervisor. In exceptional circumstances, an additional supervisor may be added to the supervisory team.

11.7.2 Appointment of Supervisory Team

The supervisory team will be proposed by the relevant School with the relevant members of academic staff, normally during the process of consideration of the application.

The composition of the supervisory team is based on academic judgement and cannot be challenged by the candidate.

11.7.3 Supervisory Team: staff development

All supervisors will be required by the University to engage in development of various kinds to equip them to supervise candidates. New supervisors will participate in specified development activities arranged by the University to assure their competence in the role.

11.7.4 Advisors

An advisor or advisors may be proposed in addition to the Director of Studies and supervisor. The advisor would normally provide one or more of the following:

- A specialised knowledge of value to the research project
- Additional extensive experience of research award supervision
- An appropriate link with an external organisation that will assist with the programme of research.

11.7.5 Staff eligible to act as Research Supervisors

The criteria for eligibility to act as a Research Supervisor will be determined and kept under review by the Research Degrees Sub-Committee.

To avoid potential conflicts of interest, real or perceived, a member of staff registered for a research degree, either internal or external to the University, should not act as a supervisor to another research degree candidate.

In exceptional circumstances the Research Degrees Sub-Committee has discretion to approve variance to these provisions.

11.7.6 Change in Supervisory Arrangements

Changes in supervisory arrangements are approved by the Research Degrees Sub-Committee.

11.8 Study and Engagement

11.8.1 Commencement of Study

During the first stage of the research project on MRes, MPhil and PhD awards, the research candidate will work with the supervisory team; refine the proposed project; and comply with any other relevant University procedures required for confirmation of registration.

The supervisory team will work with the candidate; assure themselves of the candidate's suitability to undertake the research and the feasibility of the proposed project; and ensure compliance with any other relevant procedures. Candidates for professional doctorates will complete 180 credits of taught modules as outlined in the course specification.

11.8.2 Engagement with the Supervisory Team

Research candidates must engage regularly with their supervisory team. Formal supervisory meetings should take place at least monthly for full-time candidates, and at least every two months for part-time candidates. Individuals' engagement will be monitored in line with the [Academic Engagement Policy](#), and lack of satisfactory engagement can ultimately lead to the candidate being withdrawn from the research degree programme.

11.8.3 Ethical Approval of Research Programme

The supervisors will determine the type and level of approval or authorisation the candidate's project is likely to require and whether the proposed project requires reference to the School

Research Ethics Committee; or requires any other external approval.

A report on the ethical approval status of the research project must be included with the documentation for confirmation as defined by the confirmation of registration regulations for that award. Normally, University ethical approval should be in place prior to confirmation of registration, noting that external approval, if required, may take longer.

11.8.4 Health and Safety: Risk Assessment

The supervisors, with the advice of the University Health and Safety Officers if appropriate, will determine whether the proposed project requires a risk assessment.

Where required, such a risk assessment must be carried out prior to confirmation of registration; and the record of the risk assessment and its outcomes included with the documentation for confirmation of registration.

11.8.5 Data Protection Act 2018

Research candidates must make themselves aware of the provision of the Data Protection Act 2018, and how this impacts on their programme of study.

11.8.6 Intellectual Property Provisions

Research candidates must ensure they are aware of the University Regulations with regards to intellectual property; by enrolling on to the University programme, candidates will confirm their compliance with these provisions.

11.8.7 Collaborating Institutions or Organisations

The supervisors will ensure that, where required, a formal letter of support from a collaborating institution or organisation, setting out the terms of the collaboration, is obtained by the candidate. This letter will be included with the documentation for confirmation of registration.

11.8.8 Consideration of Reasonable Adjustments

In the interests of ensuring compliance with relevant equality and diversity legislation, where a candidate is prevented through disability, or any other valid cause, from undertaking the processes relating to their research award in the standard way, the Research Degrees Sub-Committee will consider and approve any variation to the processes relating to that award. In doing so, the standards of the award must be maintained.

11.8.9 Research Training Programme

It is compulsory for a candidate registered for a research award to have successfully completed an approved research training programme before they are eligible to be examined for the research award, unless exemption has been agreed. For professional doctorate candidates, the completion of stage 1 and its 180 credits of taught modules is required.

MRes candidates will be exempt from this requirement due to the nature of their award.

On account of the basis on which the submission will be made, a candidate for PhD by Existing Published Work is exempt from the requirement to participate in the University's Research Training Programme.

11.8.10 Exemption from the Research Training Programme

The Research Degrees Sub-Committee may, following an application from the supervisory team, exempt an applicant from the Research Training Programme.

In cases where a candidate has been exempted from the approved training this should be stated clearly on the offer letter to the applicant prior to them registering on their award.

11.8.11 Research Misconduct and Unfair Practice

The circumstances of a claim of Research Misconduct will be investigated in line with the provisions of the University's Policy and Procedures for Investigating Allegations of Misconduct in Research.

A candidate or member of staff studying towards a research award who is suspected of plagiarism, collusion or other forms of unfair practice may be investigated under the provision of Section 10 of the University Academic Regulations.

11.8.12 Extenuating Circumstances

11.8.12.1 Fit to Sit/Submit Principle

The Research Awards regulation in respect of Extenuating Circumstances is based on the principle of fit to sit/submit. The principle asserts that candidates who undertake an assessment or confirmation of registration process declare themselves fit to take that assessment or process; any claim for extenuating circumstances in relation to that assessment or process will not, normally, be considered.

11.8.12.2 Progression

Extenuating circumstances which may have affected a candidate's progress should be drawn to the attention of the Research Degrees Sub-Committee in respect of decisions which may be made on any aspect of a candidate's progress including confirmation of registration and examination.

11.8.12.3 Early Notification

Candidates should draw the attention of their supervisory team (or independent contact) to any circumstances which may have affected or be affecting the progress of their studies at the earliest opportunity. This will enable the supervisory team to take this into account in respect of the annual progression review.

11.8.12.4 Extenuating Circumstances

Where the extenuating circumstances relate to the timing of the *viva voce* examination and / or any further examination (as relevant), the candidate must inform the Graduate School of these circumstances at the earliest possible opportunity so that arrangements can be made to postpone / re-schedule the viva-voce examination and/or any further examination.

Normally, no research award of the University may be conferred without the candidate successfully undertaking the relevant examination process for that award.

Candidates undertaking Professional Doctorates will follow Section 8 of the University's regulation for consideration of extenuating circumstances and mitigations during the taught phase of their programme.

Any other extenuating circumstances will be considered as follows:

- The Mitigation Co-ordinator may approve an extension up to 10 days.
- The Chair of the Research Degrees Sub-Committee or nominee may approve an extension up to 1 month.
- Request for extensions over 1 month must be present to the Research Degrees Sub-Committee to consider suspension of study.

The Research Degrees Sub-Committee may approve a change from the fixed weeks, in exceptional circumstances only. Any application for a change from the fixed weeks must be made at the earliest possible opportunity when the reasons for making such a request emerge.

11.9 Confirmation of Registration and Progression

The following provisions apply to MPhil, PhD, and Professional Doctorate candidates during the research phase.

11.9.1 Progression

A formal progression meeting can be called at any point where the Director of Studies has significant concerns about the academic progress of a research degree student. The format and outcomes for any *ad hoc* progression meetings will be as described below for Annual Progression.

11.9.2 Annual Progression

The progress of MPhil and PhD candidates will be reviewed annually through the Annual Progression process. The first Annual Progression Panel, which also serves as Confirmation of Registration, will meet within 12 months of the candidate's enrolment date with the University and prior to re-enrolment. The candidate's progress will be reviewed at least annually thereafter.

Candidates for Professional Doctorates will undertake annual progression reviews following the completion of the taught components (stage 1). The first review will normally take place within 12 months of the commencement of the research stage.

In the absence of such progress, the Progression Panel will take appropriate action which may include the requirement for the candidate to withdraw from their programme of study.

11.9.3 Confirmation of Registration

The purpose of Confirmation of Registration (the first Annual Progression Panel) is to confirm:

- That the completion of the research project as described will realistically enable the candidate to achieve a research award of the University at the designated level
- The suitability of the candidate to pursue the research project at that level
- For Professional Doctorates only: That the candidate has successfully completed the taught components (stage 1) required for the award as outlined in the course specification. In exceptional circumstances, for example due to professional body requirements, candidates may be permitted to commence the thesis module alongside completion of stage 1 modules.

11.9.4 Annual Progression: Process

The Annual Progression Process will take the following format:

- Annual Progression Panel is formed
- The candidate submits the Annual Progression Form with any relevant supporting information (Director of Studies also completes the relevant section of this form)
- The candidate presents an overview of their work to date and outlines the progress made in a presentation to the Annual Progression Panel
- The Annual Progression Panel confirms the outcome to the candidate
- Outcomes of the Annual Progression Process are reported to Research Degrees Sub-Committee.

11.9.5 Annual Progression: Outcomes

The Confirmation of Registration (first Annual Progression Panel) will result in one of the following outcomes:

- Confirmation of registration for the award
- Confirmation of registration for a lesser award
- Termination of programme.

The following outcomes are available for subsequent Annual Progression Panels:

- Continue - The candidate is permitted to continue their studies
- Continue with Written Warning - The candidate is permitted to continue with their studies with a written warning regarding their lack of satisfactory progress which will be reviewed at an earlier additional progression point, as defined by the Panel
- Alternative Award - The candidate is not permitted to continue their studies on their current award but may be considered for registration on an alternative (MPhil to MRes) or lesser award (PhD to MPhil or MRes)
- Withdraw - The candidate is not permitted to continue their studies and is required to withdraw from their research programme. Eligibility for any relevant contained award will be considered where a candidate is withdrawn.

11.9.6 Annual Progression: Review of Written Warnings

Where the outcome of the Annual Progression Panel is to permit the candidate to continue with their studies with a written warning regarding the lack of satisfactory progress, this will be reviewed at an additional progression point as decided by the Panel. The date by which the review will take place will be clearly specified to the candidate. Where the candidate fails, by the review, to demonstrate satisfactory progress, the review Panel may withdraw the

candidate or change their registration to an alternative or lower award.

11.10 Eligibility and Submission for Examination

11.10.1 Eligibility for Examination

11.10.1.1 Research Training Programme – Research Awards

Unless specifically exempted, a candidate registered for a Research Award of the University is required to follow an approved Research Training Programme before they are eligible to be examined for the research award.

11.10.1.2 Stage 1 180 credits taught modules – Professional Doctorates

A candidate for the award of Professional Doctorate is not eligible to be examined until the approved programme of 180 credits of taught modules (Stage 1) specific to that award has been successfully completed.

11.10.1.3 Confirmation of Completion of Research Training Programme

Before examination for the registered award, the candidate must obtain written confirmation that the relevant research training programme and/or contextual study has been satisfactorily completed.

11.10.2 Submission for Examination

11.10.2.1 Submission at the Discretion of the Candidate

Submission of the thesis for examination is at the sole discretion of the candidate. Although a candidate would be unwise to submit the thesis against the advice of the supervisors, it is their right to do so.

Candidates should not assume that a supervisor's agreement to the submission of the thesis guarantees the award of the degree.

11.10.2.2 Mock Viva

Any candidate registered on a research award of the University must be offered a mock viva. The outcome or advice received by the candidate as a result of this process does not guarantee the award of the degree.

11.10.2.3 Compliance with University Requirements

Is it the responsibility of the candidate to ensure prior to the examination that the requirements of the relevant University Academic Regulations have been met, including the payment of fees, and that their registration is still current.

11.10.2.4 Candidate's Declaration

The candidate is required to confirm in writing that:

- The thesis has not been submitted for a comparable academic award
- The thesis is the candidate's own work.

Where work which has already been submitted for a degree or comparable award is included in the thesis, this should be declared.

The candidate's declaration must include a signature from their Director of Studies confirming that, so far as they are aware, the work was undertaken by the candidate. If the Director of Studies is unable to confirm this, any concerns will be outlined. Where appropriate, the Candidate's Declaration form will be presented to the Research Degrees Sub-Committee and any concerns raised by the Director of Studies may be investigated prior to the examination taking place.

Candidates should not assume that the Director of Studies signature guarantees the award of the degree.

11.10.2.5 Format of the Thesis and Language of Submission

The candidate is responsible for ensuring that the thesis is submitted in the appropriate format. All theses must be submitted in English.

11.10.2.6 University Property

The copies of the thesis submitted for examination remain the property of the University.

11.11 Confidentiality And Presentation Of Work

11.11.1 Confidentiality of Theses

Where a candidate or the University wishes the thesis to remain confidential for a period of time after completion of the work, application for approval is normally made to the University at the time of registration or as soon as the need for confidentiality emerges. Application must be

made to the Graduate School on the appropriate form.

The Research Degrees Sub-Committee normally only approves an application for confidentiality in order to enable a patent application to be lodged or to protect commercially sensitive material. The maximum period of confidentiality is normally two years, although in exceptional circumstances the Research Degrees Sub-Committee may approve a longer period.

11.11.2 Form of Presentation

The form of presentation may be by:

- A written thesis; or
- A thesis that comprises other material accompanied by a written critical evaluation and contextualising overview of the process and product of the intellectual enquiry.

11.11.3 Creative Work

Candidates may propose a programme of work in which the candidate's own creative work forms a significant part of the intellectual enquiry where it is an integral part of the process and product. In such cases, the following are required:

a) Research programme

Such creative work shall be undertaken within and as part of an identified research programme.

b) Context

Such creative work must be clearly presented in relation to a written thesis or equivalent document which offers a critical evaluation or contextual overview of the process and product of the intellectual enquiry. This written component should not normally be less than 15,000 or more than 25,000 words as appropriate to the particular research programme.

c) Form of Submission, Methods of Assessment and Permanent Record

The form of the proposed submission and the proposed methods of assessment must be set out in the application for registration and be such that they meet the regulatory requirements for the award. Creative work submitted for examination must be documented through appropriate textual and photographic, video, CD-rom or DVD evidence including any artefacts or documentation integral to the creation of the work. Such documentation will provide a permanent archival record of the full submission. Where a web-based submission is made, a permanent archival record of the website on disk must be provided. Submissions in such a format may if appropriate integrate the written component (see 11.11.3 (b) above).

11.11.4 Scholarly Editions

Applicants may propose a programme of research of which the principal focus is the preparation of a scholarly edition of a text or texts, musical or choreographic work, or other original artefact. In such cases the following are required:

a) Form of Submission

The application must show how the final work shall be submitted.

b) Commentary and Context

The resultant work to be examined shall include a substantial introduction and a critical commentary setting the text(s) in the relevant historical, theoretical and critical context.

c) Other Requirements

The thesis shall conform to the usual scholarly requirements and be of an appropriate length.

11.12 Examination Provisions

11.12.1 Examinations: General Provisions

11.12.1.1 Proper Conduct of Examinations

The Research Degrees Sub-Committee has responsibility for ensuring that all examinations are conducted in accordance with University Regulations; and that all recommendations for awards are made in accordance with the University Academic Regulations.

Examinations and other forms of assessment that form part of the taught stage of the Professional Doctorates will be conducted in accordance with, the University Academic Regulations, specifically section 3 Education and Assessment; section 4 Progression and Award; section 5 Examinations and section 6 Progression and Award Boards and Module Boards.

11.12.1.2 Action on Irregularities

In any instance where the Research Degrees Sub-Committee is made aware of a failure to comply with all the procedures of the examination process or of any circumstances which may have adversely affected the examination process of a candidate, it may declare the examination null and void, and appoint new examiners.

11.12.1.3 Research Degrees Sub-Committee

The Research Degrees Sub-Committee is responsible for approving examination arrangements for all research degrees. Non-UK based examiners will not normally be considered unless an exceptional rationale is made for their appointment.

11.12.1.4 Authority to Approve an Award Decision

The examiners will make a decision on the outcome of an examination which may include a recommendation for award.

Where a recommendation for an award of the University is made, whether following the successful completion of minor amendments, re-submission or any other circumstances, the Chair of the Research Degrees Sub-Committee will, on behalf of the Sub-Committee, consider and approve the recommendation for award prior to conferral.

In doing so, the Chair may inspect any relevant paperwork or information.

11.12.1.5 Aegrotat and Posthumous Awards

An aegrotat award may be conferred in exceptional circumstances, such as in cases where a student's ability to complete their studies is permanently compromised by severe illness. A recommendation for the award must be reached by an Examination Panel with due regard for evidence of an appropriate threshold standard of performance. Before a recommendation of an aegrotat award is made, the student (or their designate) must have signified a willingness to accept the award and an understanding that the acceptance of the award waives the right to future examination.

Research Awards may be awarded posthumously on the basis of Examiners' assessment of the research completed and written up.

11.12.2 Examiners

11.12.2.1 Number of Examiners

A candidate is examined by at least two and normally not more than three examiners. One examiner shall be an internal examiner. Examiners should be experienced in research in the general area of the candidate's thesis and, where practicable, have experience as a specialist in the topic(s) to be examined.

The supervisory team will propose suitable examiners for approval by the Research Degrees Sub-Committee.

11.12.2.2 External Examiners

At least one of the examiners shall be external to the University. External examiners are required to have substantial experience of examining research candidates to the level of the award being examined. This is normally regarded as having undertaken at least three previous examinations in the field and at the level in question.

11.12.2.3 External Examiners: Independence

The external examiner is required to be independent both of the University and of the collaborating body (if any); and shall not have acted as the candidate's adviser or supervisor.

The Research Degrees Sub-Committee must also ensure that an external examiner is not approved so frequently that their familiarity with the University might prejudice objective judgement.

Former members of the University are not normally approved as external examiners until five years after the termination of their employment with the University.

11.12.2.4 Requirement for Second External Examiner

Where the candidate and the internal examiner are members of staff of the University at the time of submission of the thesis for examination, a second external examiner shall be appointed. This provision does not apply in respect of a candidate who is on a time-limited employment contract for example a research assistant or part time hourly paid lecturing staff.

Where other circumstances arise outside of those above, the chair of the Research Degrees Sub-Committee will make a final decision regarding whether the circumstances of the individual case dictate that a second external examiner is required.

11.12.2.5 Internal Examiners

An internal examiner may be:

- A member of staff of the University
- A former member of staff, employed during the period of registration
- A member of staff of any co-operating establishment concerned with the project.

11.12.2.6 Ineligibility to act as Examiner

No member of the candidate's supervisory team should be appointed as internal examiner for

that candidate.

No candidate registered for a research award may act as an examiner.

11.12.2.7 Independent Chairs

The Research Degrees Sub-Committee will appoint a non-examining Independent Chair for all viva-voce examinations for research awards of the University.

The Independent Chair will be appointed from a different school to the supervisory team.

11.12.2.8 Contact with Examiners: Prior to Examination

A candidate shall have no formal contact with the examination team in relation to the thesis or examination process between the appointment of the examiner(s) and the conclusion of the examination process (including any reassessment). Any queries from the candidate will be directed to the Independent Chair.

11.13 Examination for Award of MRes

11.13.1 Format of Examination

Examination for Masters by Research awards is normally through consideration of the written thesis only.

11.13.2 Meeting Between Examiners

If, having completed the preliminary assessment reports, the examiners consider that the assessment process requires a meeting between the examiners, the Graduate School will arrange such a meeting.

11.13.3 Oral Examination

The examiners may request an oral examination in addition to assessing the thesis. This may be particularly useful in determining the outcome of borderline cases. If the examiners require an oral examination, the examination process is not complete until the oral examination has taken place.

11.13.4 MRes Examination: Outcomes

The examiners may make one of the following recommendations:

- The candidate receives the award
- The candidate receives the award subject to minor amendments being made to the thesis within a 3 month period
- The candidate is permitted to re-submit for the award (within a 6 month period)

11.14 Examination Procedures for the Awards of MPhil, PhD and Professional Doctorate

11.14.1 Format of Examination

The final examination for these research awards normally proceeds in two stages:

- The submission and preliminary assessment of a thesis
- An oral examination (viva voce) where the candidate is required to defend the thesis.

11.14.2 Preliminary Assessment Report

Each examiner is required to read and examine the thesis and produce an independent preliminary assessment report on it. The Graduate School will make arrangements for the exchange of preliminary assessment reports between examiners.

11.14.3 Status of the Preliminary Assessment Report

The preliminary assessment report is a preliminary assessment of the academic standard of the work only. The contents of the preliminary report are confidential to the examiners and do not carry the status of a final decision.

The Graduate School will retain this documentation for the purpose of assuring due process only; and the contents of the preliminary view will not be disclosed to any other person under normal circumstances.

11.14.4 MPhil, PhD, Professional Doctorate: Oral Examination

A candidate is normally examined orally on the programme of work and on the field of study in which the programme lies. The oral examination is normally held in the United Kingdom and the candidate is expected to attend in person.

In exceptional circumstances, the Research Degrees Sub-Committee may approve an alternative form of examination.

11.14.5 Oral Examination: Timing

The oral examination is normally arranged to take place within three months of the submission of the thesis.

11.14.6 Oral Examination: Supervisors and Advisors

Members of the supervisory team or an advisor may, with the consent of the candidate, attend the oral examination. They may be permitted to speak at the discretion of the examiners but they are required to withdraw prior to the deliberations of the examiners on the outcome of the examination.

11.14.7 Examination Decisions

Following the oral examination (and, if relevant, further examination), where the examiners are in agreement they complete the relevant joint decision paperwork.

The Research Degrees Sub-Committee will routinely review the paperwork produced following examinations to satisfy itself that due process has been followed and the decisions reached are sound.

In cases where the examiner's recommendation is to confer the award, the Chair of the Research Degrees Sub-Committee must sign to confirm this on behalf of the Committee.

11.14.8 Available Outcomes

The examiners may make one of the following recommendations:

- The candidate receives the award
- The candidate receives the award subject to minor amendments being made to the thesis within a 3 month period
- The candidate receives the award subject to substantive amendments being made to thesis within a 6 month period. The examiners will be required to indicate the date by which the amendments are to be completed
- The candidate be permitted to re-submit for the award, and be re-examined on the thesis with an oral examination (and/or further examination (as applicable) within a 12 month period)
- The candidate be permitted to re-submit for the award, and be re-examined on the thesis only (within a 12 month period)
- (For PhD and Professional Doctorate) That the candidate has not achieved the standard of the award, but has satisfied the criteria for award of an MPhil. In this case the candidate may, after possible changes to format of the thesis to satisfy the terms of the

regulations for the degree, be awarded the degree of MPhil (within a 6 month period)

- (For MPhil examinations) That the candidate has not achieved the standard of the award of MPhil, and should be awarded the alternative award of MRes subject to confirmation that the thesis meets the requirements of the award (within a 3 month period)
- (For all examinations) That the candidate has not achieved the standard of the award, but should be offered the opportunity to re-submit to be assessed for the award of MPhil (PhD, or Professional Doctorate registrations) or MRes (MPhil registrations). In exceptional circumstances, a candidate who has not achieved the standard of the doctoral award may be offered the opportunity to re-submit to be assessed for the award of MRes.

11.14.9 Cases where the Examiners are not in Agreement

Where the examiners are not unanimous in respect of their final decision, each examiner must complete and forward their individual recommendation to the Research Degrees Sub-Committee, in the required format. The individual recommendations must provide sufficiently detailed comments to enable the Committee to satisfy itself that due process has been followed.

11.14.10 Course of Action Open to the University

On receipt of the individual recommendations, the Research Degrees Sub-Committee may take one of the following courses of action:

- Accept a majority recommendation, providing that the majority recommendation includes at least one external examiner
- Accept the recommendation of the external examiner
- Appoint an additional external examiner.

11.14.11 Additional External Examiner

Where an additional external examiner is appointed, they are not informed of the recommendations of the other examiners.

The additional external examiner is required to provide an independent report on the thesis making any recommendation open to an examiner. For clarification, where an additional examiner is appointed following the requirement for the candidate to re-submit their thesis and/or be re-examined by oral examination, only the recommendations available to examiners at the reassessment stage will be available.

The additional external examiner may also conduct an oral examination. This may be in

addition to any previous oral examination which may have taken place. In such cases, the Independent Chair of any previous examination will also be present.

11.15 Re-examination of theses

11.15.1 General Provisions

11.15.1.1 One Re-examination

Where the examiners decide that the candidate should be re-examined, they will be permitted to be re-examined once only.

11.15.1.2 Information to Candidates

The examiners are required to provide the candidate with written guidance on any deficiencies of the first submission, which will be forwarded to the candidate with the result of the first examination. Receipt of this guidance does not of itself guarantee successful re-examination.

11.15.1.3 Timescale for Re-examination

Timescales in respect of re-examination commence from the date of the written notification from the Graduate School of the candidate's entitlement to re-submit.

All candidates will be re-examined at the earliest opportunity following the original examination and re-examination must take place within 12 months of the receipt of the written notification.

11.15.1.4 Extension of the Timescale for Re-examination

The Research Degrees Sub-Committee may approve an extension of this period in exceptional circumstances only.

11.15.1.5 Responsibility of the Candidate

It is the candidate's responsibility to re-submit the work in the appropriate format and within the required timescale.

11.15.1.6 Re-examination Process

The process for examination and determination of outcomes is the same as that for the initial examination, however the list of available decisions differs as outlined below.

11.15.2 Re-examination for the Awards of MPhil, PhD and Professional Doctorate

The examiners may make one of the following recommendations:

- The candidate receives the award
- The candidate receives the awards subject to minor amendments being made to the thesis within a 3 month period
- (For PhD, Professional Doctorate) That the candidate has not achieved the standard of the award, and should be awarded the degree of MPhil, subject to the conditions for that award being met (within a 6 month period)
- (For MPhil examinations) That the candidate has not achieved the standard of the award of MPhil, and should be awarded the degree of MRes subject to the conditions for that award being met (within a 3 month periods)
- (for Professional Doctorate) That the candidate has not achieved the standard of the award and should be awarded the contained award for which they have already met the requirements.
- (for MPhil and PhD) That the candidate has not achieved the standard of the award or that of a lesser or alternative award; and shall not receive an award.

11.15.3 Re-examination for the Award of MRes

The examiners may make one of the following recommendations:

- The candidate receives the award
- The candidate receives the award subject to minor amendments being made to the thesis within a 1 month period
- The candidate shall not receive the award.

11.16 Recommendation for an Award of the University

11.16.1 Recommendation for a Research Award of the University

The Research Degrees Sub-Committee is the body empowered to approve the conferment of a research award of the University. The Chair of the Research Degrees Sub-Committee or their nominee has delegated authority to approve the conferment of a research award.

11.16.2 Confirmation of Completion of Minor Amendments

Where the examiners have recommended that the candidate receives the award subject to minor amendments being made to the thesis, the examiners (internal and/or external) shall

confirm to the Chair of the Research Degrees Sub-Committee that this has been completed satisfactorily.

11.16.3 Documentation Presented to the Chair of the Research Degrees Sub-Committee

The Chair of the Research Degrees Sub-Committee may in exceptional circumstances inspect any relevant documentation. This would normally include the following:

- The paperwork relating to the formal decision of the examiners
- The candidate declaration in respect of the work
- (For PhD awards only) A loose copy of the abstract, table of contents and title page
- a copy of the thesis
- (If appropriate) Written confirmation that required minor amendments have been satisfactorily completed.

11.16.4 Formal Reporting of the Recommendation for an Award

The Chair's approval will be presented to the next meeting of the Research Degrees Sub-Committee for formal recording of the conferment of the award to the candidate.

11.16.5 Date of Conferment

The date of conferment of an award will be the date when the Chair of the Research Degrees Sub-Committee or their nominee confirms the examiners' recommendation to award the degree.

The certificate of award will be available to the candidate at the time of the next award ceremony following conferment of the award and the final thesis having been formally deposited with the University.

A candidate may elect to receive their award in absentia.

11.17 Submission of Final Thesis

11.17.1 Post-Examination: Submission of Copies of Final Text to the University

Following a recommendation of the award, the candidate shall submit to the Graduate School such copies of the final text of the thesis as may be required under the Academic Regulations. This will be the text endorsed for the conferment of the award by the Chair of the Research Degrees Sub-Committee.

11.17.2 Deposit in Library

Following the award of the degree the Graduate School shall require the candidate to submit one electronic copy of their thesis in the University Repository in line with the University's E-Thesis policy, and one copy in the repository or library of any collaborating establishment.

In the case of research by creative work, the permanent archival record of the full submission (see Regulation 11.11.3 (c)) shall be submitted to the University Repository and a copy in the library or repository of any collaborating establishment.

11.17.3 Confidentiality: Restriction of Access

Where the Research Degrees Sub-Committee has agreed to confidentiality, this precludes the thesis being made freely available in:

- Any Library or repository of the University
- The library or repository of any Collaborating Establishment
- The British Library (PhD theses only).

In such cases the thesis shall, immediately on completion of the programme of work:

- Be retained by the University on restricted access
- For a defined period of time, shall only be made available to those who were directly involved in the project.

11.18 Doctor of Philosophy by Existing Published Work

11.18.1 General Requirements

11.18.1.1 General Provisions

A candidate for the award of PhD by Existing Published Work will be covered by the standard University Academic Regulations and procedures for research awards with the following exceptions / additions.

A candidate may submit for the degree of PhD by Existing Published Work in any field of study. Published Work includes creative work where this is an integral part of the process and product.

11.18.1.2 General Requirements

Published Work may be submitted for the award of PhD by Existing Published Work providing

that:

- The submitted works constitute a sufficient, coherent programme of published peer-reviewed research, as opposed to a series of unconnected works
- The creative work has been placed in the public domain and underpins a coherent programme of research
- The University is able to provide appropriate advisor in the field of study.

11.18.1.3 Eligibility

The award of PhD by Existing Published Work is open to:

- All members of staff contracted to the University who have completed the probation period, graduates of the University, former academic staff and honorary academics.
- All candidates are normally expected to have at least five years relevant experience and to have conducted research at postgraduate level prior to application.
- The body of submitted published work must be available in the public domain, normally within the five year period prior to application, and:
- constitute a sufficient, coherent programme of published peer-reviewed research, as opposed to a series of unconnected works
- for professional practice and creative work, underpins a coherent programme of research should be comparable to a PhD thesis in terms of quantity, quality and level of research - equivalent to that of a traditional PhD candidate who has reached the beginning of the write-up stage.

11.18.1.4 Research Standing

The PhD by Existing Published Work is primarily intended as an alternative route to the award of PhD in which recognition is given to the contribution of established researchers who have a substantial research and publication record and have made a contribution to the field of study commensurate with that of a PhD thesis. It is normally expected that the submission will demonstrate original work which has extended the forefront of the discipline in question.

Creative work is expected to be a substantive corpus of original creative work which extends the forefront of the discipline, and in which intellectual enquiry is shown to be an integral part of the process and product.

It is normally expected that the works submitted by a candidate form part of a substantial record of publication.

11.18.1.5 Indicative Scope of Submission

As an indication of what would be sufficient, candidates would be expected to submit at least six distinct, substantial refereed journal articles or equivalent (for example chapters in edited collections or selected chapters from wholly authored publications) from an extensive portfolio of publications. These articles and the accompanying exegesis (see below) are expected to approximately equate to the written work expected of more conventional doctoral dissertations in similar subject areas. This number should be increased appropriately where articles of multiple authorship are submitted, and authors will be expected to state the nature and quantity of their contribution to any shared publication. It is expected that some of the articles submitted will be single authored.

As an indication of what would be expected for submissions relying on creative work, candidates would normally be expected to submit a significant corpus of work which represents an equivalent depth and breadth of enquiry to that of a PhD. This may include original words, or, where necessary, their representation through other means.

11.18.1.6 Candidate's Declaration

Normally, a candidate must not have submitted any of the publications listed in this application for any other award. A declaration to this effect must be submitted by the candidate, both at the time of application for registration and with the final submission.

Any exception to this provision must be agreed by the Research Degrees Sub-Committee as part of the admission process.

11.18.1.7 Language of Submission

The published works and exegesis should be presented in English.

11.18.1.8 Requirements in Relation to Publications

A work is normally regarded as published only if it is traceable through ordinary catalogues, abstracts or citation indices and is available to the general public. This will normally require that the works are registered with an ISSN/ISBN numbers and therefore in the public domain.

11.18.2 Application Process

11.18.2.1 Application Process

The process followed is that set out in the Academic Regulations Section 11.5, with the following additions.

11.18.2.2 Information Required on Application

Each applicant should provide the following information with their application:

- A statement of not more than 1,500 words which identifies in outline how the proposed submission shows work at the forefront of the discipline; and outlines the rationale for the cohesion of the proposed works
- A full citation and short abstract of 50 words for each submission/output. Where there are joint publications the applicant must state the nature and quantity of their contribution
- A copy of the published works which the candidate proposes to submit
- A Curriculum Vitae
- Details of two academic referees.

11.18.2.3 Assessment of applications

Applications for this award will be considered initially by a Review Panel on behalf of the University Research Degrees Sub- Committee.

11.18.2.4 Purpose

The purpose of these provisions is to ensure that the completion of the research project as described will realistically enable the candidate to achieve the award of PhD by Existing Published Work.

The candidate should provide the Review Panel with sufficient material for the Panel to be able to consider:

- The coherence of the submission
- The extent to which the proposed submission for the award demonstrates work which is original and has extended the forefront of the discipline in question
- The extent to which the proposed submission for the award is commensurate with that of a PhD.

11.18.2.5 Interview Stage

A formal and rigorous interview of the Candidate by a Review Panel comprising selected members of the Research Degrees Sub-Committee will be held. The candidate must attend in person. The Panel must satisfy itself that the published work is significant and the level of the individual's contribution justifies the registration for the award of the degree.

11.18.2.6 Format of the Exegesis

The candidate is responsible for ensuring that the format of the submission is in accordance with the University Academic Regulations.

11.18.3 Requirements for Submission

11.18.3.1 Contents of Submission

A candidate is required to submit copies of the published works accompanied by an exegesis which demonstrates how these works taken together constitutes a coherent piece of research which makes a significant contribution to knowledge.

11.18.3.2 Requirements in Relation to Publications

A work is normally regarded as published only if it is traceable through ordinary catalogues, abstracts or citation indices and is available to the general public. This will normally require that the works are registered with ISSN/ISBN numbers and therefore in the public domain.

11.18.3.3 Collaborative Research

Where any work submitted for the award has been carried out in collaboration with others, a candidate must include within the Candidate's Submission a statement clearly setting out the relative input of the contributing/collaborating parties. This statement will also have to be included with the final submission for the award. The University reserves the right to consult with any of the co-authors or collaborators in respect of this statement.

11.18.4 The Examination Process

11.18.4.1 The Examination Process: Overview

The examination for the degree of PhD by Existing Published Work is in two stages:

- The submission and preliminary assessment of the published work and accompanying exegesis
- Defence of the submission by oral examination

11.18.4.2 Assessment of the Submission

In examining the candidate, the examiners must determine whether:

- The submission demonstrates that the candidate has produced work which is

commensurate with the requirements for the PhD thesis in the chosen field.

- The submission demonstrates original research and independent critical thinking which has extended the forefront of knowledge in the discipline in question.
- The submission demonstrates that the candidate has made a systematic and coherent study within a single or closely related field(s) and has made a distinctive contribution to knowledge.
- The candidate has demonstrated an appropriate level of critical analysis and reflection on the research undertaken.

11.18.4.3 Available Decisions

Following consideration of the written submission and the oral examination, the examiners may make one of the following decisions:

- The candidate receives the award.
- The candidate receives the award subject to minor amendments being made to the exegesis within a 3 month period.
- The candidate receives the award subject to substantive amendments being made to thesis within a 6 month period. The examiners will be required to indicate the date by which the amendments are to be completed.
- The candidate be permitted to re-submit for the award, and be re-examined on the exegesis only without the need for an oral examination.
- The candidate be permitted to re-submit for the award and be re-examined by oral examination only without the need to re-submit the exegesis.
- The candidate be permitted to re-submit for the award, and be re-examined on the exegesis with an oral examination. This recommendation may include advice to the candidate to include further published work in the portfolio.

11.18.4.4 Additional Material in Portfolio

Where the examiners consider that the overall submission would not meet the requirements for a PhD on account of the volume or weight of the published works themselves, the examiners may recommend that re-submission should include a further paper or chapter, which may already be published, or about to be published.

11.18.4.5 Re-examination Outcomes

The examiners may make one of the following decisions:

- The candidate receives the award.
- The candidate receives the award subject to minor amendments being made to the exegesis within a 3 month period.

- That the candidate has not achieved the standard of the award

11.18.5 Final Submission

The final submission is the finished submission after any amendments have been undertaken and the award has been conferred.

One copy must be permanently bound in its final form according to the format detailed in the University Academic Regulations for Research Awards. A further copy of the abstract, title and contents page is also required for the British Library records.

The final form must be such as to provide for a permanent record of any creative work considered for the award. This should be bound, where practicable, with the written component.

11.19 Higher Doctorates

11.19.1 Higher Doctorates: General Provisions

11.19.1.1 Award of Higher Doctorates

The University awards Higher Doctorates to those who have contributed works of high distinction.

11.19.1.2 Consideration of Applications

The University Research and Enterprise Committee considers all applications for Higher Doctorates.

11.19.2 Applicants

11.19.2.1 Applicants

Applications for a Higher Doctorate may normally be considered from persons fulfilling the requirements below.

11.19.2.2 First Degree

Holders of at least seven years standing, of a first degree awarded by an institution of Higher Education in the United Kingdom or a qualification of equivalent standing.

11.19.2.3 Higher Degree

Holders of at least four years standing, of a research degree by an institution of Higher Education in the United Kingdom or of a qualification of equivalent standing.

11.19.3 Applications

11.19.3.1 Eligibility

The award is open to all members of staff contracted to our University, graduates of our University, former academic staff and honorary academics.

11.19.3.2 Criteria for Consideration

Applicants are required to demonstrate that they have undertaken work of a high distinction, which has constituted an original and significant contribution to the advancement of knowledge, or its application, or both.

The application should demonstrate that the applicant is a leading authority in their field or area of study.

11.19.3.3 Submission to the University

The applicant should submit three copies of the work on which the application is based to the Graduate School.

11.19.3.4 Form of Submission

The submission may take the form of:

- books
- contributions to journals
- patent specifications
- reports
- conference proceedings
- specification and design studies

The submission may also include other relevant evidence of original work.

11.19.3.5 Presentation of Submission

The submission, other than books, may be in one, or more, hardback folders, or be bound.

11.19.3.6 Title Page

Each book or folder shall contain a title page, which includes:

- the name of the applicant with designatory letters
- the subject/area of the bulk of the work
- the list of contents
- the name of the degree for which application is being made

11.19.3.7 Submission for any other Academic Award

The applicant is required to state which part of the submission, if any, has been submitted for another academic award.

11.19.3.8 Applicant's Statement

The applicant is required to provide three copies of the following:

- a) Nature and significance of the work
A statement of not more than 2,000 words, setting out the applicant's view as to the nature and significance of the work submitted and highlighting the progression of the work and of any inter-relationships.
- b) Personal contribution
A full statement of the extent of the applicant's contribution to the work(s) submitted and detailing joint authorship or other types of collaboration.

11.19.3.9 English Language

The contents of the submission will be English.

11.19.3.10 Fees

The applicant is responsible for the payment of fees for each stage of the assessment.

11.19.4 Assessment of the Submission

11.19.4.1 Process of Assessment

The assessment of the submission consists of two stages which are set out below.

11.19.4.2 Assessment Panel within the University

Preliminary consideration of the submission is undertaken by an Assessment Panel established by the University Research and Enterprise Committee. The Assessment Panel is required to ascertain whether a prima facie case exists for proceeding to a formal examination of the submission.

The panel will comprise of four members, one of whom will be the Chair of the University Research and Enterprise Committee. The Chair of the University Research and Enterprise Committee will act as the Chair of the Assessment Panel.

All members of the Assessment panel will have extensive research experience.

11.19.4.3 External Examination

If the Assessment Panel determines that the submission be formally examined, consideration of the submission will be undertaken by two external examiners, wholly independent of the University and the applicant.

The examiners will be appointed by the University Research and Enterprise Committee of Academic Board.

Each examiner is required to make an independent report to the University Research and Enterprise Committee.

11.19.4.4 Action in Case of Disagreement

In the case of disagreement between the examiners the University Research and Enterprise Committee may appoint a third examiner and will accept a majority decision.

11.19.5 Decision on an Award

11.19.5.1 University Research and Enterprise Committee

The University Research and Enterprise Committee will make a decision on the report and recommendation(s) of the examiners in respect of the candidate.

11.19.5.2 Confirmation of the Degree

The power to confirm the degree rests with the Academic Board of the University.

11.20 Appeal Provisions

11.20.1 Regulations and Procedures for Appeal

The regulations and procedures governing the submission of an appeal are as found in Section 9 of the University Academic Regulations.

11.20.2 Application

These regulations apply to any candidate appeal in respect of the following:

- Transfer of Registration
- Registration for an alternate award
- The outcomes of the Annual Progression Panel, including the Confirmation of Registration
- The examiners' decision in respect of a research award of the University.

11.20.3 Academic Judgement

Appeals on the grounds of academic judgement are not permitted grounds of appeal under these regulations.

Academic Regulations

Building Academic Communities - Student Engagement and Partnerships

Section 12

Section 12

Building Academic Communities – Student Engagement and Partnerships

Originating Department:	Academic Quality Enhancement Office
Enquiries to:	quality@leedsbeckett.ac.uk
Approving Body:	Academic Board
Last Approved:	2 July 2025
Next due for approval:	July 2026
Document Type:	Regulation
Target Audience:	Relevant for all University staff and students and of particular relevance to: Deans of School, Course Directors, Module Leaders, Students, Student Representatives, academic and professional support staff and our Collaborative Partners.

Contents

12.1	Purpose	1
12.2	Principles	1
12.3	Engagement of Students	1
12.4	Participation by Students	2
12.5	Student Representation	2
12.6	Appointment of Course Representatives	2
12.7	Continuous Curriculum Enhancement	3
12.8	Action for Enhancement	3
12.9	Training and Support	3
12.10	Oversight, Monitoring and Review of Student Engagement	3
12.11	Consultation on Modifications to the Course	4
12.12	Consultation on other changes	4

Section 12: Engagement and Partnership with Students

12.1 Purpose

This section of the Academic Regulations defines the University's framework within which student engagement, partnership and academic communities contribute to the provision of an excellent education for all our students.

It sits alongside our Student Charter in setting out the University's approach to partnership working and defines students' involvement and engagement in quality enhancement systems and processes.

The University and our Students' Union are committed to working in partnership with our students to provide an inclusive, safe and engaging environment for learning and working.

12.2 Principles

The following principles underpin the involvement and engagement of students in quality systems and processes:

- a) The involvement of our students in quality systems has a positive influence on the delivery and development of all aspects of the student experience.
- b) All students are provided with opportunities for involvement in quality enhancement via individual and/ or collective engagement and feedback which take account of the diversity of the student body.
- c) Partnership working with students is based on a spirit of mutual trust, transparency, openness, respect and building academic communities.
- d) Feedback provided by our students is used to inform improvements to the academic communities and educational experience of our students.

12.3 Engagement of Students

Our University takes deliberate steps to engage all students, individually and collectively, as partners in the development, assurance and enhancement of the quality of their educational

experience (see also section 13). The contribution of students and their representatives is central to our University's quality enhancement systems and processes and the systematic enhancement of our students' educational experience.

Students' feedback and involvement is sought and their contribution is recognised through our quality processes.

12.4 Participation by Students

We seek active participation by all our students in the enhancement of student learning opportunities. Students are invited to participate in a range of quality assurance and enhancement processes and as members of School Assemblies, focus groups, forums, meetings and committees.

Students' involvement and feedback will be sought via a range of mechanisms including student surveys, module evaluation, continuous curriculum enhancement processes, and the processes for the design, validation and review of courses. Feedback received from students via these mechanisms will be used to inform action plans and course enhancement.

12.5 Student Representation

Students are invited to volunteer to undertake the role of Course Representatives. The University works in partnership with the Students' Union to promote this activity and to ensure that Course Representatives are developed and supported appropriately.

Course Representatives are student volunteers who represent the views of students on their course. They work in partnership with academic and professional services staff and the Students' Union to support the delivery of an excellent educational experience for our students through the provision of feedback and through their involvement in quality systems and processes.

Information on student representation and course representatives will be provided to students upon commencing their course.

12.6 Appointment of Course Representatives

Course Representatives are appointed from amongst the student body and will be sought for taught courses and research awards.

Students will have the opportunity to be volunteer as a Course Representative and to contribute in this capacity in addition to their involvement as an individual student. Flexibility is permitted dependent on the nature of the course, size of the cohort and mode of study.

12.7 Continuous Curriculum Enhancement

The process of continuous curriculum enhancement at course level enables collective student engagement and the involvement and contribution by students and their Course Representatives to the enhancement of the educational experience.

Students are provided with an opportunity to be involved in quality enhancement and assurance processes via individual or collective feedback and it is the responsibility of the Course Director to ensure these opportunities are made available and that students are kept informed of the actions taken in response to feedback they have provided.

Students will be provided with opportunities to provide feedback on their educational experience to staff, informing action plans for enhancement.

Student representation through membership of School and University governance structures provides further opportunities for feedback and contribution to enhancement action planning.

12.8 Action for Enhancement

Feedback from students will inform subject evaluation reporting and our University's annual quality reports and action plans.

Responses to student feedback will be provided via the agreed mechanisms.

12.9 Training and Support

Course Representatives and University staff have access to training and support to equip them to undertake their roles in enhancement and quality assurance. The University and Students' Union will work in partnership to provide support and training for all Course Representatives.

12.10 Oversight, Monitoring and Review of Student Engagement

The effectiveness of student engagement processes are reviewed through our annual review and enhancement process. Oversight of student representation is maintained via Academic Quality and Standards Committee.

12.11 Consultation on Modifications to the Course

Students likely to be affected by proposals for modifications to their course will be consulted, in accordance with Academic Regulations Section 13: Approval, Validation and Continuous Curriculum Enhancement and that consultation will inform the decision-making process.

All approved modifications will lead to updated published course information in accordance with University regulations and sector legislation.

12.12 Consultation on other changes

The University will seek feedback from students on other changes that may affect them, guided by the Student Protection Plan (where applicable).

Academic Regulations

Approval, Validation and Continuous Curriculum Enhancement

Section 13

Section 13

Approval, Validation and Continuous Curriculum Enhancement

Originating Department:	Academic Quality Enhancement Office
Enquiries to:	quality@leedsbeckett.ac.uk
Approving Body:	Academic Board
Last Approved:	3 July 2024
Next due for approval:	July 2026
Document Type:	Regulation
Target Audience:	Relevant for all University staff and students and of particular relevance to: Staff and external representatives associated with approval, validation and continuous curriculum enhancement activities including Deans of School, Heads of Subject, Course Directors and their teams and officers to events; and to Collaborative Partners.

Contents

13.1	Purpose	1
13.2	General Principles of Approval, Validation, Cyclical Monitoring and Review	2
13.3	Validation Definition and Scope	3
13.4	Approval, Validation and Continuous Curriculum Enhancement Arrangements.....	4
13.5	General Principles of Continuous Curriculum Enhancement	12
13.6	Process of Continuous Curriculum Enhancement	13
13.7	University Responsibility	14
13.8	Course Changes and Modification: General	15
13.9	Modification Approval	15
13.10	Consent from Applicants and/or Students/Apprentices	15
13.11	Consultation	16
13.12	Reporting Modifications	17
13.13	Awards Withdrawn from the University Portfolio.....	18

Section 13: Approval, Validation and Continuous Curriculum Enhancement

13.1 Purpose

This section of the Academic Regulations defines the University's approach to the approval, validation of taught courses and modules, the monitoring of course performance through the application of both School and institutionally managed continuous improvement and annual review activities and the cyclical course review process that provides assurance of validation status good standing on an annual basis, thereby confirming a course's ongoing validated status.

These academic regulations and processes ensure that appropriate academic standards are set and maintained and make available learning opportunities which enable the intended learning outcomes to be achieved. These processes aim to enhance the quality of learning opportunities and to continuously improve the performance and satisfaction of our students.

The requirements establish distinct, inter-related, co-dependent processes of approval, validation and continuous curriculum enhancement and enable a distinction between activities which focus on the course as the unit of review, the subject and the location of delivery.

The systematic approach requires approval, validation and continuous curriculum enhancement activities. These are set within a formalised cycle of course approval, validation and continuous curriculum enhancement, and a strategic portfolio planning and review process based on the relevant portfolio and a defined process of partnerships and collaborations approval or validation to enable courses to be taught in other locations.

Validation and continuous curriculum enhancement processes are proportionate to the provision under consideration and are applied flexibly with due regard for risk. They are underpinned at each stage by externality and student views and where relevant, they are conducted with an awareness and appreciation of Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) requirements and apprenticeship governing bodies where applicable (ESFA, IFATE, Ofsted).

The focus of these activities is the course, since that is the unit of delivery with which our students identify. However, enhancement strategies are delivered at a range of aggregations, including modules and continuous improvement action benefit more than one course may benefit from these.

This enables a proportionate approach to validation and maintenance of validation status, course monitoring and review which supports flexibility applicable to the provision and focus e.g. course as the unit of review, the subject or the location of delivery.

The following regulations further explain the University's approach to:

- Approval of Course Proposals and new Partner proposals
- Validation and Maintenance of Validated Course Status
- Approval of collaborative delivery
- Course Monitoring and Continuous Curriculum Enhancement
- Enhanced Monitoring
- Modification
- Strategic Portfolio Planning and Review

13.2 General Principles of Approval, Validation, Cyclical Monitoring and Review

- 13.2.1** New taught course proposals require institutional approval before they can be included within the University's portfolio and advertised.
- 13.2.2** All courses leading to an award of the University must undergo a formal process of validation appropriate to the breadth and complexity of the proposal to be considered.
- 13.2.3** Course titles must conform to the usual expectations of higher education bodies, relevant professional bodies, students and employers about the level of knowledge and skills to be expected from a person holding such a qualification.
- 13.2.4** Course titles and awards which appear on certificates must be approved by the University, and may not be changed without the approval of Academic Board.
- 13.2.5** Courses must be designed and operated in accordance with the University's Regulations, and meet relevant national qualifications framework and external requirements.
- 13.2.6** Feedback from internal and external stakeholders will be used, as appropriate, in the design, development and validation of courses.
- 13.2.7** A system of peer review including experts external to the University will be applied to the validation of all taught provision.

13.2.8 Taught courses will be subject to monitoring and review in accordance with our regulations.

13.3 Validation Definition and Scope

13.3.1 Course validation is an institutional peer approval process which provides assurance of the quality and standards of newly developed courses prior to their delivery to students. It confirms:

- that the academic standards of taught courses and qualifications meet the requirements of relevant national qualifications frameworks, including the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications and associated classification descriptors, and other relevant sector qualification standards, frameworks, qualifications characteristics and benchmarks.
- that the assessment strategies and associated learning outcomes provide a mechanism to differentiate clearly between performance at the threshold level and at higher levels of achievement.
- that the course design, content, structure, assessment student support and learning outcomes are well designed and appropriate for the provision of a high-quality academic learning experience for all students, which enable a student's achievement to be reliably assessed.
- the appropriateness of student support mechanisms to enable students to succeed in and benefit from higher education.
- that the course will provide students with the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonable comparable with those achieved in other UK sector providers.
- that the standards of University awards delivered in partnership or collaboration with others are credible and secure.
- For apprenticeships the relevant knowledge, skills and behaviours as required by the Institute for Apprenticeships and Technical Education.

13.3.2 Once validated and in delivery, all courses are required to maintain ongoing validation status and continue to meet the requirements of relevant national frameworks at the point of qualification and over time in line with sector recognised standards.

13.3.3 All taught courses are subject to a formal institutional review of the validation status, normally conducted on a cyclical basis annually or within a defined period. This process provides institutional oversight and assurance of ongoing validation good

standing, that the value of the University's qualifications over time is in line with sector recognised standards and confirmation of validation status.

13.3.4 Taught academic provision delivered in collaboration with others is required to be validated prior to the approval of collaborative delivery.

13.3.5 Approval of academic delivery in collaborative contexts is normally for a maximum of six years, or sooner if an earlier review is stipulated or required by the University. This may arise as a result of modifications to the home validated course, where academic standards or quality of course is imperiled or of concern to the institution, due to student protection, partner approval status or other reason.

13.3.6 Normally, collaborative provision for delivery as University accredited awards by a collaborative partner are subject to a separate validation and are required to undergo re-validation every six years or sooner, if a validation panel stipulates an earlier review.

13.3.7 These requirements enable institutional oversight and assurance of the effectiveness of arrangements for validation to ensure the academic standards of University awards are credible and secure and that the academic experience is of high quality, irrespective of where or how courses are delivered and who delivers them.

13.4 Approval, Validation and Continuous Curriculum Enhancement Arrangements

13.4.1 Institutional Approval of Course Proposals

a) Documentation for Institutional Approval must, as a minimum, include the following information:

- the target award
- the proposed title of the target award
- the proposed structure of the award (e.g. course, short course)
- the proposed mode(s) of delivery (e.g. full time, part time, sandwich)
- the proposed start date for the first cohort
- its congruence with the strategic direction of academic provision within the University
- the market rationale
- broad feasibility and costing projections, including requirements for academic and support staffing and the minimum number of anticipated students
- partnership information, where relevant.

b) Institutional approval will confirm:

- the proposed title of the award
- the proposed structure of the award
- the planned start date of the first cohort
- the proposed provision may proceed to validation.

c) Formal admission of students is authorised only if the following apply:

- the course has received institutional approval
- the course is validated
- the course is offered for delivery in the current academic year
- in the case of collaborations and apprenticeships, the financial and contractual agreement is current and compliant with associated external requirements.

d) When a new course proposal has been approved but is awaiting validation (or approval of delivery in a recognised institution) this should be made clear in any advertising.

13.4.2 Course Validation

a) All validated courses leading to a target award will contain a series of contained awards at different levels unless specific provision is made to exclude these awards in the course specification. For courses leading to a final award of a degree with honours the contained awards are:

- Ordinary Degree
- Diploma of Higher Education
and
- Certificate of Higher Education
- Certificate in Lifelong Learning

For courses leading to a final award of a Masters degree the contained awards are:

- Postgraduate Diploma
- Postgraduate Certificate
- Advanced Certificate in Lifelong Learning

For courses leading to a final award of an Integrated Masters degree the contained awards are:

- Postgraduate Diploma (Level 7)
- Postgraduate Certificate (Level 7)
- Honours Degree (Level 6)
- Ordinary Degree (Level 6)
- Diploma of Higher Education (Level 5)
and
- Certificate of Higher Education (Level 4)
- Certificate of Lifelong Learning (level 4)

For Professional Doctorate courses the following contained awards apply to the taught element of the course (the first 180 credits):

- Masters Degree (Level 7)
- Postgraduate Diploma (Level 7)
- Postgraduate Certificate (Level 7)

All contained awards are required to have discrete academic coherence and the title shall be the same as the title of the target award unless specified otherwise in the Course Specification.

b) Course Development

Course development will normally be led by a Course Director who will ensure that the course is designed and developed with due consideration for:

- The University's Education Strategy
- Inclusive assessment, learning and teaching approaches
- Academic Regulations and guidance on validation
- Relevant University policies
- External Reference points and relevant national qualifications requirements (e.g. Framework for Higher Education Qualifications, the H.E. Credit Framework for England, Subject Benchmark Statements, Apprenticeship Standards)
- Professional Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (where relevant), including Ofsted and Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) and resource implications (responsibility for resourcing lies with the Dean of School)

The Course Director is responsible for:

- Development of the proposal

- Preparation of validation documentation
- Compliance with the Academic Regulations
- Liaison with appropriate stakeholders including students, apprentices and employers
- Consideration of resource implications

In addition to the above, at re-validation, the Course Director is responsible for:

- Critically appraising the course; and
 - Incorporating any enhancements, as appropriate
- c) The Dean of School is responsible for sign off of the validation documentation submitted to the Academic Quality Enhancement Office in accordance with the agreed deadlines.
- d) The course validation panel will be appropriate to the quality assurance requirements of the course under consideration and will involve peer review scrutiny by an institutionally agreed, proportionate and appropriately constituted panel.
- e) New course validation will normally be undertaken by a validation panel which includes:
- Chair (External to the School in which the course(s) resides)
 - External Panel Members (at least one Academic from the subject area under consideration and external to our university and one external employer representative)
 - Academic Panel Member (external to the School)
 - Internal Panel Member (from the School)

It is informed by feedback from students.

For apprenticeship validations, the Academic Quality Enhancement Office will ensure the panel contains suitable expertise in the area of apprenticeships and require internal panel members to complete the necessary training in advance of the event.

Other panel members may be assigned as appropriate to the course(s) under consideration.

- f) A University Validation Panel, institutionally constituted and chaired by the Deputy-Vice Chancellor Academic (or nominee), informed by internal and external expertise and student feedback in the design and development of the course, may be adopted

where proportionate to the provision. This may include validation of pathways and proposals for substantial modification.

g) The Validation documentation will be appropriate to the course(s) under consideration and will include, as a minimum:

- A Course Information Form
- A Briefing Statement
- (An Apprenticeship) Course Specification and Material Information Summary
- Module Specifications
- Staff CVs (for new course proposals)
- Professional Statutory or Regulatory Body requirements (as applicable)
- Mapping exercise to Apprenticeship Standard (as applicable)
- Evidence of engagement with employers/ industry that informed the design and development of the Leeds Beckett apprenticeship (as applicable)

h) The Validation Panel may make the following decisions:

- to validate the course
- validate the course subject to conditions and/or recommendations
- not to validate the course

Where the panel agree not to validate a course the Dean of School will be consulted to determine whether and when the provision may be re-presented for validation or is required to be suspended from recruitment or withdrawn from the university portfolio by a specified date.

i) The Validation Panel will establish that each course:

- is of a standard appropriate to the award offered in accordance with 13.3.1
 - will be delivered to a standard appropriate to the award offered
- and
- has sufficient resources to support student learning

The Academic Quality Enhancement Office will provide advice to the panel on areas of the proposal which require further consideration and/or approval.

j) The Academic Quality Enhancement Office will provide an oversight report on the outcomes of validation to Academic Quality and Standards Committee.

13.4.3 The Maintenance of Course Validation Status

- a) All courses will be subject to maintaining ongoing validation status and are required to undergo a formal institutional review of the validation status. This process will determine validation status and any requirements for further peer review or validation scrutiny necessary for assuring the ongoing confirmation of academic standards and quality requirements set out in section 13.3.
- b) Expectations Concerning Good Standing

In order to remain validated for delivery, courses are required to maintain good standing in respect of academic standards and quality expectations defined by the University and aligned with external requirements. These expectations will be consistent, transparent and equitable and will include consideration of a range of indicators:

- Threshold course performance relating to student progression, achievement and employability indicators;
- Threshold course performance relating to student satisfaction indicators;
- External Examiner feedback on Academic Standards
- External feedback
- Action planning already in train at Course, Subject and/ or School level that relates to any of the above

- c) Institutional Process for the Maintenance of Validated Course Status

A University Validation Panel will be convened annually in accordance with the specified institutional process to provide oversight of the maintenance of validated status of award bearing courses and will make recommendations concerning the outcomes of that process for consideration by Academic Quality and Standards Committee overseen by Academic Board.

The University Validation Panel will include:

- Chair (Deputy Vice Chancellor Academic – or nominee) – ex officio
- Director of Academic Quality Enhancement (or nominee) – ex officio
- Academic panel members drawn from University Schools [2]
- Students' Union Representation. The panel will receive feedback from student representatives to inform its decision making.

The University Validation Panel will determine the necessity for the engagement of and feedback from additional attendees, feedback or expertise at the panel's discretion, including:

- Internal representatives
- external subject experts relevant to the academic subject area
- students
- employers
- professional, statutory and regulatory bodies where applicable.

Courses subject to professional, statutory and regulatory body accreditation or recognition may be required to undergo a Course Validation within a defined period and may require a joint or separate accreditation process.

The Validation documentation considered by the panel will be appropriate to the courses under consideration and will include, as a minimum, a subject evaluation report and action plan considering matters relating to good standing (*provided by the Academic Quality Enhancement Office*).

Additionally, as part of the maintenance of ongoing validation status and formal institutional review Schools may be required to:

- provide a critical appraisal of the evidence informed by the annual review and evaluation of the course(s)
- provide examples of best practice, as applicable
- make an evaluation of modifications to the course
- consider external examiner reports and review external reference points and requirements e.g. Subject benchmark statements and Framework for Higher Education Qualifications
- consider student and other external stakeholder feedback
- consider management information and course performance indicators
- consider research within the subject area in relation to course content

d) Outcomes of the Process for the Maintenance of Validated Status

The University Validation Panel may make the following recommendations to the Academic Quality and Standards Committee overseen by Academic Board in respect of each course under consideration:

- to continue to validate the course
- to continue to validate the course subject to conditions and/or recommendations to

be satisfied within a specified period

- not to continue to validate the course
- not to validate the course and require conditions to be satisfied by a specified date
- not to validate and recommend suspension of recruitment or withdrawal of the course by a specified date

Conditions relating to the maintenance of validated status may include:

- remedial actions for improvement
- referral of the course for Enhanced Monitoring (see Regulation 13.7.2)
- referral of the course for redevelopment with a full validation panel required at the culmination of that process
- referral of the course for further scrutiny and feedback from external expertise or students)
- referral of the course for redevelopment with full validation via a separate validation panel required at the culmination of that process.

Changes to course content, structure and assessment generated by the outcomes of this process will be approved by the University Validation Panel and will be subject to the regulatory provisions concerning 'Course Modification' (see regulation 13.8)

Continuous Curriculum Enhancement

The process of Maintenance of Course Validation Status and assurance of validation good standing by the University Validation Panel will assure the continuous review of taught courses.

The University Validation Panel will maintain oversight of the course following initial validation and where appropriate will require a Course Validation periodically to provide additional assurance that the academic standards and quality of the course over time is in line with sector recognised standards and quality. In the case of validated collaborative provision, validation will be for a maximum period of six years.

Alongside the process for institutional assurance of courses' good standing, the monitoring and review activity at Course, Subject and School level will lead to proposals for modifications to courses. In some cases, these may trigger a more holistic view of course structure and content that requires a course to be redeveloped and re-validated discretely.

These activities may require an institutional Course validation event as defined in section 13.4.2 and should be planned between Schools and the Academic Quality Enhancement

Office with due regard for material change deadlines, any associated professional body expectations and the sustainable deployment of appropriate staff and resources.

In addition, there are some changes which are outside the purview of the modifications regulations and will require a proportionate institutional validation process. These are summarised in section 13.11.4: Limits on modifications and substantial changes to courses.

The Academic Quality Enhancement Office will advise on the appropriate validation process to be deployed with due regard for risk and responsiveness.

A modification request will be required for changes which trigger validation.

13.5 General Principles of Continuous Curriculum Enhancement

Continuous curriculum enhancement processes provide assurance of the ongoing academic quality and standards of validated courses and enables systematic enhancements to the quality of learning opportunities to be identified and delivered.

They support the continuous improvement of student performance and satisfaction through targeted action planning and require the progress and effectiveness of these actions to be monitored.

Continuous curriculum enhancement activities are informed by and relevant to the enhancement strategies defined at course, subject, School or institutional level.

The continuous curriculum enhancement framework provides a flexible framework within which information, course outcomes and data that relates to the academic standards of awards and the quality of learning opportunities are considered and evaluated in order to:

- a) maintain threshold standards
- b) provide the opportunity for students awarded qualifications to achieve beyond the threshold level and to be reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers
- c) maintain the ongoing value of qualifications awarded, in line with the relevant national qualifications framework and sector recognised standards
- d) ensure standards of University awards delivered in partnership with others are credible and secure irrespective of where or how courses are delivered or who delivers them
- e) evaluate course performance and outcomes to provide assurance regarding the academic standards and quality of the course and any action required to deliver enhancements to the learning opportunities

- f) provide evidence for cyclical monitoring and review of academic provision
- g) provide assurance to Academic Board and its committees that the implementation of the University's academic regulations and processes are being conducted consistently and effectively.

13.6 Process of Continuous Curriculum Enhancement

Continuous curriculum enhancement is the process by which the continued health of each course is monitored, reviewed and enhanced on a continuous basis, taking account of core course information.

13.6.1 Elements of the process

The elements of the process comprise of:

- a) Opportunities for student engagement including meetings, individual and collective feedback
- b) Opportunities for Course Team reflection and action planning
- c) The production of a subject evaluation report and action plan
- d) The use and analysis of management information to inform decision making

13.6.2 School responsibility

It is the responsibility of each Dean of School to ensure the process of continuous curriculum enhancement is conducted effectively, including the production of summary reports and action plans.

Deans are further responsible for the provision of timely assurance reports and action plans to Academic Quality and Standards Committee arising from the conclusion of complete and effective continuous curriculum enhancement. This will support University academic assurances to our Board of Governors.

13.6.3 Use of data and other quality indicators

The University will provide data and management information for use in continuous curriculum enhancement. The information provided will be from a variety of sources including:

- a) Course performance data relating to student continuation/progression/completion, attainment and employment or further study;
- b) Course performance data relating to student satisfaction indicators;

- c) Graduate Employment or further study outcomes;
- d) Cohort profile data;
- e) External Examiner Reports;
- f) Reports from Module Boards and Progression and Award Boards.
- g) Data relating to compliance with external apprenticeship bodies, including ESFA and Ofsted (as applicable)

13.6.4 Other Information

Other relevant information will be derived from within the School, and will include outcomes from student engagement activities, module evaluations and other external feedback (for example from Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies).

13.7 University Responsibility

13.7.1 University Quality Action Plan

The Academic Quality Enhancement Office is responsible for maintaining an Action Plan overseen by the Academic Quality and Standards Committee drawing on the outputs of University monitoring and review prior to the Plan being received and ratified by Academic Board.

13.7.2 Enhanced Monitoring

- a) Enhanced monitoring is an opportunity to reflect on course progress and consider matters of academic standards, quality and course performance which have emerged since validation/re-validation, informed by KPIs and other relevant information.
- b) The Course Director and members of the course team will meet with the Head of subject to review course outcomes and planned enhancement, following this the head of subject will complete a subject area report and submit to Academic Quality Enhancement Office for review at the University Validation Panel.
- c) University Validation Panel outcomes will confirm how any recommendations or conditions for continuous improvement will be addressed by the Course Team.

13.8 Course Changes and Modification: General

13.8.1 Definition

Modification is a process, which enables a course or module to respond to internal or external stimuli and adapt itself to meet the needs of its students, or external stakeholders by making changes or modifications to a validated or published course or module.

Substantial modification of a course may lead to re-validation.

13.8.2 Course Modification

All proposals for modification require University oversight. No modifications may be made, implemented, delivered or published for applicants or students/apprentices without one of the following assurances, dependent on the scope/scale of the modification:

- School Academic Committee approval
- University Validation Panel approval
- Course validation panel approval

Substantial modification of a course or module may lead to re-validation.

13.9 Modification Approval

Changes to validated courses and modules may be proposed by Schools or appropriate University senior manager in accordance with our Academic Regulations.

Proposals for modifications are determined by Schools or appropriate University senior manager prior to these proposed modifications being submitted for consideration.

University approval is needed prior to implementation of change. Depending on the timing of the modification there may need to be a process of consultation with applicants and/or existing students/apprentices.

13.10 Consent from Applicants and/or Students/Apprentices

Depending on the timing of the modification there may need to be a process of consultation with applicants and/or existing students/apprentices. This may require the explicit consent from the identified group(s) in advance of implementation.

Should a proposal for change arise in relation to, or which constitutes, a potential risk under the University's Student Protection Plan, the Director of Academic Quality Enhancement shall be informed in accordance with the Plan.

The decision on whether a consultation process is required will be determined by the Director of Academic Quality Enhancement. This will consider and confirm the relevant consultation process with applicants and/or students/apprentices (as applicable), with external examiners (where applicable), any requirement for validation due to the nature or extent of change and the timescale for implementation of change.

The consent for change decision if and when confirmed will be made following completion of the necessary steps and requirements of the University's regulations and process.

13.11 Consultation

The Academic Quality Enhancement Office will provide guidance confirming the consultation process proportionate to the proposed modification. Normally, consultation with external examiners, students/apprentices or applicants will be required where the proposals are likely to affect current students/apprentices, future students/apprentices or applicants. In the case of apprenticeships, consultation with employers must also be undertaken.

13.11.1 Students/Apprentices and External Examiners

Students/apprentices likely to be affected by proposals for modification or change, must be consulted in relation to any such proposal.

The Student Consultation Framework will be used as guidance. Normally, consultation with students/apprentices in accordance with the University's required process will be conducted by the relevant School.

External Examiners will be consulted, where appropriate.

Consultation must be concluded before the modification can be implemented.

13.11.2 Applicants

Consultation with applicants will be conducted by Admissions, in accordance with the University's process for consultation with applicants, upon the notification by the Academic Quality Enhancement Office.

Consultation must be concluded before the modification is implemented. Applicants who do not consent to the proposed change will have the opportunity to be released from the University's offer of admission.

13.11.3 Implementing modifications and changes

Following approval of modifications the University will, in accordance with our associated University procedures, before implementation:

- updated published information
- updated course information, course specifications and student and curriculum/portfolio system data and
- communicate with relevant students/apprentices, applicants, staff

13.11.4 Limits on modifications and substantial changes to courses

The following changes will lead to a re-validation activity:

- a) title of the course and/or the award to which it leads
- b) overall aims and learning outcomes of the course
- c) Addition of or changes to pathways
- d) mode(s) of study or duration of a course
- e) awarding body
- f) the addition or deletion of module(s) where the course learning outcomes are changed or where this constitutes a material change to the course
- g) changes to the overall methods of assessment and strategy for the course
- h) changes to a material component of a course or pathway

A modification request will be required for changes which trigger re-validation.

13.12 Reporting Modifications

A report of approved modifications will be submitted to Academic Quality and Standards Committee periodically including assurances that definitive documentation have been updated.

13.13 Awards Withdrawn from the University Portfolio

Decisions to withdraw validated courses are taken from time to time as the University portfolio is reviewed. The School will take appropriate action to ensure that:

- Academic Standards are maintained for any students remaining on the course
- Students' continuation of study is protected in accordance with the Student Protection Plan;
or
- Students are consulted with a view to transferring to a suitable alternative course. Requirements for student consultation will be in accordance with the Academic Regulations.

All withdrawals must have institutional approval.

Academic Board shall withdraw validation of a course offered by the university or associated institution if there is evidence that the course is no longer meeting minimum acceptable standards.

Academic Regulations

External Examiners and Advisers

Section 14

Section 14

Appointment and Role of External Examiners and Advisers

Originating Department:	Academic Quality Enhancement Office
Enquiries to:	quality@leedsbeckett.ac.uk
Approving Body:	Academic Board
Last Approved:	3 July 2024
Next due for approval:	July 2026
Document Type	Regulation
Target Audience:	Relevant for all external examiners, University staff and students, Collaborative Partners and members of our Board of Governors.

Contents

14.1	Purpose	1
14.2	General Principles	1
14.2.1	Equity and Fairness	1
14.2.2	Appointment of External Examiners.....	2
14.2.3	Impartiality.....	2
14.2.4	Selection of External Examiners	2
14.2.5	Induction of External Examiners	2
14.2.6	Cessation of Appointment	2
14.2.7	External Examiners' Reports	2
14.3	Code of Practice on Appointment and Role of External Examiners and Advisers.....	3
14.3.1	External Examiner/Adviser Appointment.....	3
14.3.2	Period of Tenure	4
14.3.3	Extension of Tenure	4
14.3.4	End of External Examiners' period of tenure.....	4
14.3.5	Changes to External Examiners' responsibilities	5
14.3.6	Duties of External Examiners	5

Section 14: Appointment and Role of External Examiners and Advisers

14.1 Purpose

This section of the Academic Regulations sets out our principles on External Examining, our processes for appointing external examiners, the duties expected of them and their annual reporting obligation to us.

External Examining is a key component of our University's quality assurance framework. It provides assurance that the academic threshold standards of our taught awards are appropriate in light of UK reference points, that the achievement of our students is comparable to that on similar courses elsewhere, and that students are treated equitably in assessment.

External examiners must be appointed for all validated courses leading to an award of the University.

14.2 General Principles

14.2.1 Equity and Fairness

The role of the external examiner(s) approved by the University for courses is to ensure that academic threshold standards are appropriately set and maintained in light of relevant UK expectations, that student achievement is comparable to that on similar courses elsewhere, and that the processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards are rigorous and fairly conducted.

External examiners may also be involved in the approval of courses of study for individual students where such frameworks are validated.

External examiners will also be consulted on and participate in decisions related to and/or approval of:

- a) new modules
- b) modifications to the existing modules of a course
- c) any proposed changes to the approved assessment regulations which will directly affect students studying on the course.

No recommendation for the conferment of an award of the University at, or above, Level 4 of the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications may be made without the written consent of the approved external examiner(s).

14.2.2 Appointment of External Examiners

University appointment criteria, guidelines and processes will ensure that all external examiners have the appropriate standing, expertise and breadth of experience to carry out their duties as recommended by external reference points.

14.2.3 Impartiality

University appointment guidelines will be such as to ensure that external examiners are impartial in judgement.

14.2.4 Selection of External Examiners

External examiners will be drawn from a wide variety of institutional and/or professional contexts in order to ensure that University taught awards benefit from wide-ranging external scrutiny.

14.2.5 Induction of External Examiners

The University will ensure that external examiners are given adequate induction and briefing in order for them to fulfil their responsibilities.

14.2.6 Cessation of Appointment

The appointment of external examiners will cease at the end of their contracted tenure, or as otherwise provided for in the current University guidelines.

14.2.7 External Examiners' Reports

External examiners are required to report annually in writing to the Academic Board about the ways in which assessment has been conducted and on other issues as determined by the Academic Board.

14.3 Code of Practice on Appointment and Role of External Examiners and Advisers

The code of practice outlined below applies only to taught awards. Regulations for external examiners for research awards are documented separately.

14.3.1 External Examiner/Adviser Appointment

Final University approval of external examiners/advisers rests with Academic Quality and Standards Committee, acting on behalf of Academic Board. All nominations of external examiners and advisers are required to be authorised by the Dean of School.

External advisers with particular subject expertise may also be appointed to assist the external examiners, for example in language awards. The duties of external advisers will be fewer than those of external examiners and do not necessarily include participation in meetings of Progression and Award Boards. Normally, a schedule of duties will be drawn up and agreed with the Course Team and progressed in accordance with the current University Regulations. An adviser is required to submit an annual report to the external examiner and also to the Academic Quality Enhancement Office.

All arrangements for and duties of external examiners for courses leading to Pearson awards will be in accordance with the associated licence agreement and appropriate University guidance issued by the Academic Quality Enhancement Office.

The number of external examiners to be appointed will vary from course to course, appointments may be made to whole courses or groups of modules and the designation of Chief External Examiner to assure standards and provide rigour of process underpinning Progression and Award. There may also be particular requirements laid down by Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Bodies in relation to the number of practitioner and academic external examiners required. (See guidance provided by the Academic Quality Enhancement Office.)

An external examiner should, normally, hold no more than two external examiner appointments.

Where an external examiner has no previous external examining experience, but meets all other appointment criteria, a mentor will be appointed. This is normally the previous external examiner but can be an experienced external examiner from another course.

14.3.2 Period of Tenure

The period of tenure for an external examiner will normally be four consecutive years running from the 1st November to the 31st October. The tenure will normally allow an external examiner to assess four successive cohorts of full-time students. A new external examiner will normally take up appointment on or before the retirement of his/her predecessor. External examiners must remain available after the last assessments with which they are to be associated to deal with any subsequent reviews of decisions.

14.3.3 Extension of Tenure

In certain exceptional circumstances, for example in the case of a new award, to ensure continuity within an examining team, or where a course is running out and has only a further year to run, the period of appointment of an external examiner may be extended by a period of one year only. The external examiner must be consulted and should consent to the extension of tenure. In order to extend the term of office of an external examiner, the appropriate University process must be followed.

14.3.4 End of External Examiners' period of tenure

The appointment of an external examiner will normally cease at the end of their appointed tenure. In certain circumstances it may be necessary for the appointment to cease before the completion of the approved period of tenure. Examples of reasons for the early cessation of an appointment may include:

- a) resignation
- b) changes in course structure
- c) non-fulfilment of duties
- d) failure to provide an annual report within the required timescale
- e) unprofessional conduct
- f) breakdown in relationship with staff teams or
- g) other cause which may disadvantage students

If such early cessation is thought to be necessary, the appropriate University process will be followed.

Examiners may request to temporarily cease their appointment, for example due to illness or maternity leave, and another suitable University Examiner should be asked to temporarily increase their duties to cover the period of absence. If this increase of duties by another examiner is not possible the examiner must resign and a new examiner be appointed.

One month's notice of resignation of external examiners should be made in writing, addressed to the appropriate Dean of School. The resignation must be notified to the Academic Quality Enhancement Office and the appropriate School staff.

In the case of resignations late in the assessment cycle, the University may request the external examiner to perform some or all of their duties.

14.3.5 Changes to External Examiners' responsibilities

External examiners' responsibilities may be changed within the period of tenure. This may be due to the award to which the examiner was first appointed ceasing to run or where it is decided by a School to change the responsibilities allocated within a large team of examiners. This may also occur when there is illness or where an external examiner ceases their tenure early due to resignation or the University has sought the early cessation of duties of an examiner. To change an external examiner's responsibilities:

- a) the external examiner must be consulted and agree the proposed change
- b) appropriate University process must be followed.

14.3.6 Duties of External Examiners

On appointment, external examiners are assigned specific duties including:

a) Confirming Standards for Awards

External examiners confirm that the threshold standards set for the awards are appropriate by referencing relevant national subject benchmark statements, the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications, the national qualifications framework, University validation documentation and any appropriate Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body requirements.

b) Comparing Achievement of Students

External examiners draw on their professional experience to compare the achievement of students with that of their peers on comparable courses of higher education elsewhere.

c) Confirmation of Assessment

External examiners confirm the appropriateness of the form and content of proposed examination papers, coursework and other assessments which count towards an award above the level of Certificate of Higher Education, except where the Certificate of Higher Education is the target award. In confirming the appropriateness of assessments, external

examiners are asked to ensure that the assessments are capable of measuring achievement of the intended learning outcomes, in such a way that internal and external examiners will be able to judge whether students have fulfilled the objectives of the course and reached the required threshold standard.

d) Commenting on Proposed Changes to Assessment Regulations

External examiners should be consulted about any proposed changes to the approved assessment regulations which will directly affect students currently on the course.

e) Modifications

External examiners participate in decisions and/or approval of new modules and modifications to existing modules of a course.

f) Accessing Assessed Work

To ensure that each student is fairly assessed in relation to the rest of their cohort, external examiners are expected to see the work of a representative sample of students proposed for the highest available category of the award and for failure; to see samples of the work of students proposed for each category of award; to have appropriate access to all assessed work where practicable.

g) Moderation

External examiners have the right to moderate the marks awarded by internal examiners. The marks may relate to modules of a course or groups of modules, appropriate to their subject or professional expertise.

The modules may also contribute to an award for which the external examiner is not responsible.

h) Alteration to Sets of Marks

Exceptionally, the external examiner(s) may propose to the Progression and Award Board or Module Board the adjustment up or down of marks for a particular cohort of students on a particular module to maintain academic threshold standards. The adjustment must apply to the whole cohort marks and cannot be used to adjust the marks of individual students in isolation.

In such a case, discussion will be held with internal examiners in accordance with the provisions for the conduct of Progression and Award Boards.

i) Attendance at Progression and Award Boards

External examiners are required to:

- attend Module Board in accordance with the University Regulations
- attend the meeting of the Progression and Award Board at which decisions on student progression and recommendations for awards are made.
- ensure that those recommendations have been reached by means according with the University's requirements and normal practice in higher education.

No recommendation for the conferment of an award of the University above the level of Certificate of Higher Education may be made without the written consent of the approved external examiner(s). Normally, this is through the signing of the spreadsheet of marks at the conclusion of the Progression and Award Board and/or Module Board but may also be by oral agreement followed by written confirmation.

Signing the spreadsheet of marks is also confirmation that:

- the external examiner is satisfied that the conduct of the Progression and Award Board and/or Module Board has been in accordance with the regulations of the University and
- any further consideration of the decisions made at the Progression and Award Board and/or Module Board is limited to the University regulations for the review of a decision of a Progression and Award Board or Module Board and an appeal against the outcome of that review.

j) Matters of Principle

On any matter which the external examiner(s) have declared a matter of principle, the decision of the external examiner(s) shall either:

- be accepted as final by the Progression and Award Board
or
- be referred to the Academic Board.

Any unresolved disagreement between external examiners shall be referred to the Academic Board. If the disagreement concerns only one or more individual students, the recommendations for all other students should be signed.

Any unresolved disagreement between external examiner(s) and a Progression and Award Board shall be referred to the Academic Board.

k) Participation in Reviews of Decisions

External examiners may be asked to participate as required in any reviews of decisions about individual students' awards taken during the examiner's period of office.

l) Submission of an Annual Report

External examiners are required to report annually in writing to the University and within four weeks of the date of the Progression and Award Board and/or Module Board for the award they examine. The reports are intended to provide assurance to the University that:

- academic threshold standards set are appropriate in light of relevant external reference points;
- student achievement is comparable to similar provision elsewhere;
- the processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards are rigorous and fairly conducted.

Reports must be made using the template issued by the Academic Quality Enhancement Office and submitted electronically to the designated e-mail address.

The purpose of the report is to assure the University that the academic threshold standards of its awards are appropriate, and to enable the University to judge whether the course is meeting its stated objectives and to make any necessary improvements, either immediately or at the next review as appropriate.

The University requires that:

- external examiners submit their reports to the University within four weeks of the date of the Progression and Award Board and/or Module Board with which they are associated
- external examiners' reports are considered at course level and the outcomes of such consideration are formally recorded
- reports do not reference individuals by name
- reports are made publicly available
- the final report of an examiner's tenure will be shared with the incoming external examiner for the purposes of continuity.

External examiners will be provided with a written response to their comments and recommendations by relevant School staff.

External examiners have authority to submit a confidential report direct to the Chair of the Academic Board if they have serious concerns that they do not believe are appropriate to raise elsewhere.

m) **Other Reports**

External examiners will provide other reports as required by the University.

n) **Matters of Serious Concern**

External examiners have the right to report to the University through the Chair of the Academic Board on any matters of serious concern arising from the assessments which put at risk the threshold standard of the University's awards, or jeopardise the fair treatment of students.

Academic Regulations Collaborations and Partnerships

Section 15

Section 15

Collaborations and Partnerships

Originating Department:	Academic Quality Enhancement Office
Enquiries to:	quality@leedsbeckett.ac.uk
Approving Body:	Academic Board
Last Approved:	3 July 2024
Next due for approval:	July 2026
Document Type:	Regulation
Target Audience:	Relevant to academic and professional support staff who support collaborative provision and of particular relevance to Collaborative Partners and their students and our Board of Governors.

Contents

15.1	Purpose	1
15.2	General Principles of Collaborations and Partnerships	1
15.3	General Provisions	2
15.4	Partner approval and review	4
15.5	Approval and review of collaborative delivery	5
15.6	Continuous Curriculum Enhancement and Modification of Courses Approved for Collaborative Delivery	7
15.7	Written agreements.....	8
15.8	Accreditation of Provision Designed and Delivered by Other Organisations	9
15.9	Dual awards with other degree-awarding institutions.....	10

Section 15: Collaborations and Partnerships

15.1 Purpose

The delivery of learning opportunities with others can bring many benefits. Nevertheless, there are inherent risks to both academic standards and quality whenever learning opportunities are not directly delivered and supported by the degree-awarding body making the award.

The fundamental principle underpinning all arrangements for delivering learning opportunities with others is that the degree-awarding body retains responsibility for the academic standards of their awards and for the quality of the student experience, regardless of where these opportunities are delivered and who provides them.

This section of the Academic Regulations sets out the general provisions on the approval, monitoring and review of Collaborations and Partnerships and the duties, roles and responsibilities of the University and Collaborations and Partnerships.

15.2 General Principles of Collaborations and Partnerships

- a) The University will only approve Collaboration and Partnership activities that fall within its own subject expertise and which are consistent with the University's strategy for UK and global engagement.
- b) The University is responsible for the academic standards of all credit and awards granted in its name, ensuring that the threshold standards for its qualifications are consistent with the relevant national qualification frameworks and are reasonably comparable with those achieved by other UK providers.
- c) The quality of learning opportunities must be appropriate to the achievement of the learning outcomes for the award and consistently met.
- d) The University shall make publicly available an up-to-date and authoritative record of its collaborations and partnerships.
- e) The University will not permit serial arrangements, whereby a collaborating body uses a collaborative arrangement with the University as a basis for establishing collaborative provision of its own with other parties, but offering the University's awards, whereby the other party delivers the course.
- f) The University may enter into partnerships with other bodies in the United Kingdom or overseas. Partnerships do not involve delivery of University awards.
- g) Collaborative provision is educational provision leading to an award, or to specific credit toward an award, of the University delivered and/or supported and/or assessed through an agreement with a collaborating body. The University may

- collaborate with other bodies in the United Kingdom or overseas to offer courses or part of a course leading to an award of the University.
- h) In order for a collaborative partner to deliver academic provision of the University it must first be approved by the University as an organisation fit for this purpose. It is a requirement that all collaborating bodies recognised by the University undergo an approval.
 - i) At an early stage a new course proposal for collaborative provision must be approved in accordance with University procedures where applicable.
 - j) All courses are subject to validation and subsequent continuous curriculum enhancement activities, as set out in Section 13.
 - k) The University requires that all provision delivered by an approved partner is subject to the approval of delivery and subsequent re-approval.
 - l) The University shall make appropriate public information available to students on collaborative provision.
 - m) The University requires that all collaborative provision leading to an award of the University must satisfy the University's normal requirements for the conferment of an award.
 - n) There must be a written and legally binding written agreement or contract setting out the rights and obligations of the parties and signed by the authorised representatives of the University and the partner in respect of delivery, continuous curriculum enhancement and modification of the provision.
 - o) In the event of withdrawal from a collaborative agreement, the University has a duty of care to all students registered on collaborative provision to reasonably enable them to complete a course of study.
 - p) The University will maintain a register of Collaborations and Partnerships illustrating all arrangements (by type and category) for delivering learning opportunities with others that are subject to a formal agreement.

15.3 General Provisions

15.3.1 Guidance documentation - The University shall set out the requirements and processes in respect of collaborations and partnerships through a series of guidance documents available through the Academic Quality Enhancement Office.

15.3.2 Due diligence - Prior to entering into a collaboration or partnership with a collaborating body in the United Kingdom or overseas, the risks of each arrangement must be assessed at the outset and reviewed on a periodic basis. Requirements for due diligence shall be proportionate to the type of activity sought.

15.3.3 Location of delivery by a collaborating body - The University may in some circumstances allow a collaborating body to deliver an element of a validated course

of study at a location other than the collaborating body's own premises. The process for this shall be detailed within University guidance.

- 15.3.4 New Partner Proposal - All proposals for partnerships and collaborative provision are subject to approval by the University Executive Team. The processes to be undertaken to achieve this are as set out in University guidance.
- 15.3.5 Expertise of staff - The University's procedures shall ensure that its own and partner staff engaged in delivering and supporting University awards (or credit contributing to award) under Collaborative Provision arrangements, are aware of their responsibilities and appropriately qualified for their role, and that both the University and the collaborating body have effective measures in place to guide, monitor, assure and seek to enhance the expertise of such staff.
- 15.3.6 Access to appropriate resources - The University shall ensure that students studying on courses delivered under collaborative and partnership arrangements shall have access to the appropriate resources to enable them to complete their studies.
- 15.3.7 Assessment - The University requires that all collaborative provision leading to an award or credit of the University is subject to arrangements for assessment in accordance with University regulations.
- 15.3.8 External examiners and advisers - The arrangements in respect of external examiners and advisers for collaborative provision shall comply with the University's requirements as set out in Section 14 of the Regulations. The University shall retain responsibility for the appointment and functions of external examiners and advisers for all collaborative provision. The University shall offer the same level of support and developmental opportunities to external examiners and advisers on collaborative provision as for awards offered within the University.
- 15.3.9 Professional or statutory regulatory bodies - The University shall as required notify any professional or statutory regulatory body, which has accredited, approved or recognised a course that will also be offered as collaborative provision. Prospective students shall also be notified of the status of the Course in relation to the professional or statutory regulatory body.
- 15.3.10 Certificates of award - The University has sole authority to produce certificates of award and associated transcripts for courses of study delivered through collaborative provision. The certificate of award or accompanying documentation will make reference to the name of the collaborating body and location of delivery and will take

account of external factors including Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs) or in-country government requirements.

15.3.11 Contractual and financial arrangements - Contractual and financial arrangements pertaining to collaborative provision shall be discussed at School level, the content of which shall be determined and agreed in line with current University guidance. These shall form part of the written agreement.

15.4 Partner approval and review

15.4.1 Partner approval process - The approval process is proportionate to the type of collaboration or partnership and is in accordance with University guidance. The University's Executive Team is responsible for the conduct of the partner approval and review process.

15.4.2 Requirements for approved partner status for the delivery of collaborative provision - To approve a new partner proposal intended for collaborative provision, the University will need to be assured of the following, utilising the enhanced due diligence process:

- a) Legal impediment - That there is or continues to be no legal impediment to the institution delivering University courses.
- b) Financial viability - That the collaborating body has or has maintained good standing and is financially stable.
- c) Institutional mission - That the philosophy, mission and aims of the collaborating body are or remain acceptable to and compatible with those of the University.
- d) Legal requirements - That the collaborating body meets or continues to meet its legal requirements, specifically in relation to matters affecting students such as health and safety, data protection, equal opportunities and non-discrimination.
- e) Learning and teaching resources - That the collaborating body has or continues to have an infrastructure and learning resources adequate to ensure that the academic standards of the University's provision and the quality of learning opportunities are maintained and enhanced.
- f) Written agreement - That appropriate written agreements will be in place which specify clearly the mutual arrangements and obligations upon each other.

The requirements will be in accordance with the proposal under consideration and University guidance.

15.4.3 Duration of period of approval - The period of approval will normally be aligned to the University's academic cycle (i.e. 1 August – 31 July). An approved partner will be

subject to review within a maximum period of six years of commencement of that period.

15.4.4 Purpose of partner review - The purpose of reviewing the approved partner status is to assure the University that this status remains fit for purpose. In addition, this may be used as an opportunity to review the balance of responsibilities between the University and the Partner.

15.4.5 Revocation of period of approval - The University may at its own discretion revoke or shorten the agreed period of approval in the event of the following:

- a) The philosophy, aims and objectives of the University and Partner are deemed to no longer align.
- b) The terms of the agreement are not being achieved.
- c) The approved partner ceases to deliver collaborative provision before the end of the agreed period of approval.
- d) The written agreement under which collaborative provision is delivered is terminated before the end of the agreed period of approval.
- e) The status of approved partner will automatically be revoked if the period as defined in regulation see 15.4.3 runs out and re-approval has not taken place.

In all such cases the Vice Chancellor or nominee, shall inform the collaborating body of the revocation of this status.

15.5 Approval and review of collaborative delivery

15.5.1 Approval of collaborative delivery: definition – Approval of delivery is the process by which the University is assured that the quality of delivery of University courses offered in whole or in part by an approved partner is equivalent to that of comparable courses delivered solely by the University. A course approved for delivery may be designed and/or delivered by an approved partner alone or jointly with the University or solely by the University.

15.5.2 Approval - Any proposal for delivery of courses by an approved partner institution is subject to:

- a) Due diligence
- b) new course proposal as appropriate
- c) validation and revalidation
- d) approval and review of collaborative delivery

15.5.3 Process - The approval and review of collaborative delivery processes is as set out in University guidance. The University is responsible for the conduct of the approval and review of collaborative delivery.

15.5.4 Pre-requisites for approval of collaborative delivery - To approve or review delivery of a course by a partner, the University will need to be assured of the following:

- a) That the academic standards and quality of the course have been assured previously through the process of validation (or revalidation). Where any variance to the course is proposed, this must be in accordance with University regulations and guidance (validation, revalidation or modifications).
- b) That scrutiny of resources both physical and human of the proposed location of delivery has been undertaken as set out in University guidance.

15.5.5 Requirements for approval of collaborative delivery - To approve or review collaborative delivery of a course, the University will need to be assured of the following:

- a) Quality of learning opportunities - That the collaborating body is able to and continues to provide learning opportunities equivalent to that of comparable courses delivered by the University. This will where appropriate include consideration as to whether the staffing body is appropriately qualified and able to deliver the course to the standard of the award.
- b) Quality assurance – That appropriate arrangements are in place for the collaborating body to fulfil the quality assurance, monitoring, review and enhancement requirements.
- c) Student support - That the staffing body is appropriately qualified and able to deliver the required level of support to students and that the level of support required is appropriate to the achievement of the learning outcomes for the award.
- d) Written agreement - That appropriate written agreements will be in place which specify clearly the mutual arrangements and obligations upon each party.
- e) Provisions for the admission of students - That the arrangements for the admission of students onto collaborative provision are subject to the provisions of Section 2 of the regulations.

15.5.6 Duration of period of approval of collaborative delivery - The period of approval of collaborative delivery will normally be aligned to the University's academic cycle (i.e. 1 August – 31 July). A course approved for collaborative delivery will be subject to review within a maximum period of six years of commencement of that period.

15.5.7 Purpose of re-approval of collaborative delivery - The purpose of the re-approval of collaborative delivery is to assure the University that the quality of the course offered at an approved partner remains equivalent to those of comparable courses delivered at the University and that the collaborating body has met and continues to meet its obligations as set out in the written agreement.

15.5.8 Revocation of period of validation and/or approval of collaborative delivery - The University may at its own discretion revoke or shorten the agreed period of validation and/or approval of collaborative delivery in the event of the following:

- a) The status of the approved partner is revoked in accordance with item 15.4.5.
- b) The approved partner ceases to offer collaborative provision before the end of the period of approval.
- c) The written agreement under which collaborative provision is delivered is terminated before the end of the period of approval.
- d) The approval will automatically be revoked should the period of approval run out without a re-approval taking place.

In all such cases the Vice Chancellor or nominee, shall inform the collaborating body of the revocation of this status.

15.6 Continuous Curriculum Enhancement and Modification of Courses Approved for Collaborative Delivery

This will be undertaken in accordance in Section 13, Approval, Validation and Continuous Curriculum Enhancement.

Mutual review

Purpose of Mutual Review - To provide Academic Board with the assurance that arrangements for delivering learning opportunities with others are implemented securely and managed effectively.

Form of Mutual Review - Mutual Review; specific to collaborative delivery with or by a collaborating body is conducted in the first year of a partner's operation. Our University reserves the right to invoke Mutual Review in subsequent years of operation, in accordance with the following criteria:

- a) Substantial or potential changes and/ or additions to a partner's portfolio or the model of delivery;

- b) Significant concerns raised by one or more stakeholders e.g. University; External Examiner, Student, School, Partner
- c) Concerns related to one or more of the following:
 - non-compliance with quality management process;
 - non-compliance with regulatory or contractual requirements;
 - operational delivery;
 - recommendation of a collaborative approval panel.

Participation - Mutual Review requires engagement by the collaborating body.

Reporting - The outcomes of mutual review and associated plans for continuous improvement will be presented to Academic Quality and Standards Committee.

15.7 Written agreements

15.7.1 Legal agreement - The mutual arrangements specific to collaborative provision as described in these regulations as agreed between the University and the partner or collaborating body will be specified clearly in a legally binding written agreement. Agreement templates shall be available as set out in item 15.3.11.

15.7.2 Content - The written agreement must, as a minimum, cover the following:

- a) aspects of the collaborations and partnerships concerned with the relationship between the University and the collaborating body including roles and responsibilities assigned to each party;
- b) aspects of the partnership or collaborative provision concerned with the course(s), where applicable;
- c) arrangements to ensure that the University retains overall responsibility for approving the criteria for admission and clearly specifies the roles and responsibilities in relation to admission decisions;
- d) arrangements to ensure that the academic standards of any course(s) are equivalent to those of comparable courses delivered at the University;
- e) arrangements to ensure that the quality of learning opportunities offered at the approved partner is equivalent to those offered by the University for comparable courses, where applicable;
- f) arrangements to ensure that the monitoring and continuous curriculum enhancement activity is conducted in accordance with University regulations;
- g) arrangements in the event of early termination or arbitration;
- h) provisions to enable the University to suspend or withdraw from the agreement if the other party fails to fulfil its obligations;

- i) residual obligations to students, where applicable;
- j) the responsibilities of each party in respect of quality assurance and academic standards, with reference to any applicable external reference point;
- k) a defined commencement and termination date which clearly set out the duration of the agreement;
- l) arrangement in respect of payments between the parties, where applicable;
- m) the law under which the agreement is governed, in addition to the judiciary system which will hear and determine any suit, action or proceedings, and to settle any disputes, which may arise out of or in connection with that agreement;
- n) arrangements for flow of information and deliberative and executive reporting structures, where applicable;
- o) arrangements to ensure the accuracy of public information relating to the course(s) offered as part of the collaborative provision, where applicable;
- p) arrangements for review and possible renewal of the agreement.

15.8 Accreditation of Provision Designed and Delivered by Other Organisations

Accreditation of learning delivered by other organisations - The University may wish to accredit provision delivered at other organisations.

Mapping of curriculum - The University shall be satisfied that any provision to be accredited maps appropriately to the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications, other National Qualifications Frameworks and where appropriate any antecedent, concurrent or subsequent University course that leads to credit of or an award of the University and is quantifiable in terms of academic level outcomes and volume of credit. In the case of credit imported for study abroad, credits may be awarded in accordance with the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS), or other national credit systems where appropriate.

15.8.1 Any proposal for accreditation is subject to:

- a) Partner Approval
- b) Mapping of the curriculum
- c) New course proposal
- d) Accreditation by Academic Planning and Collaborations Group

15.8.2 Process - The process for accreditation will be informed by University guidance and appropriate external oversight.

15.8.3 Accreditation Process – The Accreditation process will ascertain the following:

- a) Quality of learning opportunities - The School will ensure through scrutiny of resources that the proposed location for delivery and access to the facilities and resources required for successful completion of the course or credit are appropriate in relation to the quality of learning opportunities.
- b) Quality assurance - That appropriate arrangements are in place for the collaborating body to fulfil the quality assurance, monitoring, review and enhancement requirements.
- c) Mapping of the curriculum - That the curriculum-mapping process has been carried out appropriately.
- d) Assessment - That appropriate arrangements are in place for assessment, achievement of credit and award to be undertaken in accordance with the University regulations.
- e) Written agreement - That appropriate written agreements will be in place which specify clearly the mutual arrangements agreed in respect of the use of the facilities and resources of the collaborating body.

15.8.4 Duration of accreditation - The period of accreditation will normally be aligned to the University's academic cycle (i.e. 1 August – 31 July). Accredited provision will be subject to review of that approval within a maximum period of six years of commencement of that period.

15.9 Dual awards with other degree-awarding institutions

15.9.1 Definition and key characteristics: Dual awards are a collaborative arrangement whereby two or more awarding bodies collaborate in the delivery of a single jointly delivered course (or courses) leading to separate awards (and separate certification) being granted by both, or all, of them. Key characteristics are as follows:

- a) Both the University and each collaborating body are responsible for the content, delivery, quality and standards of its own provision and makes its own award;
- b) Students must be registered at each participating institution either concurrently or sequentially for the duration of the jointly delivered programme;
- c) Awards that are based on a single course and the same assessed student work are mindful of the University regulations for admission and registration;
- d) Students participating in an award through a credit based structure are offered non-transferable credit for assessment undertaken at the collaborating body(s) towards their University course of study to ensure that credit for a module successfully completed is not multiplied.

The development of dual awards is complex in nature and consideration of a range of regulatory requirements must be addressed in the initial stages of course approval. The Academic Quality Enhancement Office must be consulted in order to ensure that the University retains responsibility for the academic standards of each course.

- 15.9.2 Assurance of standards - Both the University and the collaborating body deliver, assess and support provision and each awarding body makes its own award, under its own degree awarding powers. There may be one award title agreed between the University and the other awarding body/s. The University and the collaborating body are responsible for ensuring that its own academic standards are maintained irrespective of the requirements of the collaborating body.

The University will ensure that the standards and quality of our University's awards are not jeopardised by the arrangements entered into with partners. Responsibility for each separate award, and its academic standard, remains with the body awarding it.

In the case of dual awards, partners determine which of them is responsible for the management of the admissions process (or how responsibilities are shared) and the obligations of respective parties are recorded in the written agreements.

The University retains oversight of assessment and standards irrespective or not as to whether the student has attended the awarding body. This will be recorded in the written agreement (see 15.7.2).

The University will ensure, utilising existing quality assurance processes, that the standards and quality of all dual awards will not be compromised by the arrangements entered into with partners including any elements delivered at a collaborating body institution.

The University retains full responsibility for every element of the programme, since every part of a student's contributed programme of study may contribute to the University's award.

Normally, a minimum of one third of the credit contributing to the University award must be taught and assessed by the University. Any variation to this principle must be approved by the University's Academic Board.

Academic Regulations

Academic Audit

Section 16

Section 16

Academic Audit

Originating Department:	Academic Quality Enhancement Office
Enquiries to:	quality@leedsbeckett.ac.uk
Approving Body:	Academic Board
Last Approved:	3 July 2024
Next due for approval:	July 2026
Document Type:	Regulation
Target Audience:	Relevant to: Academic staff involved in course delivery, and to academic and professional support staff whose work contributes to standards maintenance and the assurance and enhancement of course quality.

Contents

16.1	Purpose of Academic Audit.....	1
16.2	Principles of Academic Audit	1
16.3	Form and Process of Academic Audit	1

Section 16: Academic Audit

16.1 Purpose of Academic Audit

Our University is responsible for the setting and maintaining of academic standards and the assurance and enhancement of the quality of learning opportunities for our students.

The purpose of academic audit is to provide institutional oversight of the implementation of our university regulations, policies and processes relating to academic standards and quality.

This provides assurance for our University (via Academic Board and our Board of Governors) that the delegated responsibilities for academic standards, quality assurance and enhancement of academic provision are being properly discharged and that we promote continuous improvement and systematic quality enhancement by the identification and dissemination of good practice.

16.2 Principles of Academic Audit

The principles of academic audit are that:

- a) Academic Audit will be undertaken systematically through annual continuous audit and the targeted use of enhancement audit.
- b) Academic Audit will promote the continuous and effective use of our University's regulations and associated processes.
- c) Academic Audit will promote systematic enhancement and sharing of good practice and the development of inclusive practice through peer review and engagement.

16.3 Form and Process of Academic Audit

A schedule of academic audit is agreed annually by Academic Quality and Standards Committee and may include:

- a) Continuous Audit: ongoing activity which involves the collection, monitoring and evaluation of routinely produced evidence and observation of a range of activities.

- b) Enhancement Audit: specific issues or themes which arise from consideration of the outcomes of continuous audit and/or any other form of internal or external review.

The Academic Quality and Standards Committee maintains oversight and has overall responsibility for Academic Audit. The Academic Audit outcomes will be reported to Academic Board and its committees.

Academic Regulations

Awards of the University and their Standards

Section 17

Section 17

Awards of the University and their Standards

Originating Department:	Academic Quality Enhancement Office
Enquiries to:	quality@leedsbeckett.ac.uk
Approving Body:	Academic Board
Last Approved:	2 July 2025
Next due for approval:	July 2026
Document Type:	Regulation
Target Audience:	Relevant for all University staff and students and of particular relevance to: Staff developing and validating courses leading to University awards, the Honorary Awards Committee and for Collaborative Partners.

Contents

17.1	Purpose	1
17.2	Title of Awards	1
17.3	Standard	1
17.4	Designated Letters for Awards	1
17.5	Awards of the University.....	1
17.5.1	Pre-Degree Level.....	1
17.5.2	First Degree Level.....	2
17.5.3	Post-Experience	2
17.5.4	Postgraduate.....	2
17.5.5	Integrated Masters	3
17.5.6	Taught Masters Awards	3
17.5.7	Research Awards.....	3
17.5.8	Professional Research Doctorates	3
17.5.9	Higher Doctorates	4
17.6	Date of Conferment	4
17.7	Specific Provisions in respect of University Awards	4
17.7.1	Distinction and Merit	4
17.7.2	Classification of Honours Degrees and Integrated Masters	4
17.7.3	Pass or Unclassified Degree	5
17.7.4	Aegrotat Awards	5
17.7.5	Posthumous Awards	5
17.8	Awards of Other Bodies	5
17.9	Honorary Awards	5
17.9.1	Conferment of Honorary Awards	6
17.9.2	Categories of Honorary Awards.....	6
17.9.3	Criteria for Conferment	6
17.9.4	Selection for Conferment of Honorary Awards	6
17.9.5	Recipients: Honorary Masters Degrees and Doctorates	6
17.9.6	Recipients: Honorary Fellowships.....	7
17.9.7	Role of Recipients	7

17.9.8	Award of Honorary Masters Degree	7
17.9.9	Award of Honorary Doctorate	7
17.9.10	Degree of Distinction	7
17.9.11	Personal Acceptance	7
17.9.12	Use of Designatory Letters	8
17.10	Academic Dress	8

Section 17: Awards of the University and their Standards

17.1 Purpose

This section defines the awards of the University and their standard.

17.2 Title of Awards

The Academic Board is responsible for approving the title of any award of the University granted under these Regulations.

17.3 Standard

The Academic Board, on behalf of the University, ensures that all awards and distinctions are consistent and comparable with awards granted and conferred throughout higher education.

17.4 Designated Letters for Awards

Designated letters are established to enable holders of awards and distinctions of the University to use them in accordance with academic convention.

17.5 Awards of the University

The awards of the University are as below.

17.5.1 Pre-Degree Level

- Certificate in Lifelong Learning (CertLL)
- Foundation Certificate (FCert)
- Certificate (Cert)
- Letter of Achievement
- Certificate of Higher Education (CertHE)
- Certificate in Education (CertEd)
- Diploma (Dip)
- Diploma of Higher Education (DipHE)
- Advanced Diploma (ADip)
- Vocational Certificate (VCert)

Professional Diploma (PDip)

17.5.2 First Degree Level

Foundation Degree Arts (FdA)

Foundation Degree Engineering (FdEng)

Foundation Degree Science (FdSc)

Bachelor of Arts (BA)

Bachelor of Arts with Honours (BAHons)

Bachelor of Education (BEd)

Bachelor of Education with Honours (BEdHons)

Bachelor of Engineering (BEng)

Bachelor of Engineering with Honours (BEngHons)

Bachelor of Laws (LLB)

Bachelor of Laws with Honours (LLBHons)

Bachelor of Medical Science (BMedSci)

Bachelor of Science (BSc)

Bachelor of Science with Honours (BScHons)

Bachelor of Technology (BTech)

Bachelor of Technology with Honours (BTechHons)

Professional Graduate Certificate in Education (PGCE)

17.5.3 Post-Experience

Certificate in Professional Studies

Diploma in Professional Studies

17.5.4 Postgraduate

Advanced Certificate in Lifelong Learning (ACertLL)

Advanced Professional Diploma (APDip)

Postgraduate Certificate (PGCert)

Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE)

Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education (PGCHE)

Certificate in Management (CM)

Postgraduate Diploma (PGDip)

Diploma in Management Studies (DMS)

Graduate Certificate (GCert)

Graduate Diploma (GDip)

17.5.5 Integrated Masters

Integrated Masters

Master of Architecture (MArch)

Master of Biomedical Sciences (MBioms)

Master of Engineering (MEng)

Master of Planning (MPlan)

Master of Law (MLaw)

17.5.6 Taught Masters Awards

Executive Master

Executive Master of Business Administration (EMBA)

Master of Arts (MA)

Master of Business Administration (MBA)

Master of Education (MEd)

Master of Fine Art (MFA)

Master of Laws (LLM)

Master of Science (MSc)

Master of Public Administration (MPA)

Master of Architecture (MArch)

Master of Engineering (MEng)

Masters in Teaching and Learning (MTL)

Master of Landscape Architecture (MLA)

17.5.7 Research Awards

Masters by Research (MRes)

Master of Philosophy (MPhil)

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

Doctor of Philosophy by Existing Published Work (PhD)

17.5.8 Professional Research Doctorates

Doctor of Education (EdD)

Doctor of Engineering (DEng)

Doctor of Business Administration (DBA)

Doctor of Professional Practice in Sport (DProfSport)

Doctor of Professional Practice in Built Environment (DProfBuiltEnvironment)

Doctor of Professional Practice in Construction Law (DProfConstructionLaw)

Doctor of Professional Practice in Planning (DProfPlanning)

17.5.9 Higher Doctorates

Doctor of Laws (LLD)
Doctor of Letters (DLitt)
Doctor of Science (DSc)
Doctor of Technology (DTech)

17.6 Date of Conferment

The date of conferment of an award will normally be the date of the award ceremony. A student may elect to receive their award in absentia.

Where, through the working of the Appeal process, the classification of a Bachelor Degree with Honours is determined subsequent to the relevant award ceremony for the student's cohort, the date of the conferment of the degree will be deemed to be the date of that award ceremony.

Where through the working of the Appeal process, the entitlement to an award of the University is determined, the date of the conferment of that award will be deemed to be the date of the award ceremony for the student's cohort; and the student shall be entitled to attend a subsequent award ceremony if the student so wishes.

17.7 Specific Provisions in respect of University Awards

17.7.1 Distinction and Merit

Provision for the recommendation of a Distinction or Merit may be made in the regulations for all taught awards except for the classification for the degree with honours and Integrated Masters courses and for the Lifelong Learning contained awards.

17.7.2 Classification of Honours Degrees and Integrated Masters

Bachelor Degrees with Honours are available in the following classifications:

- First Class
- Upper Second Class
- Lower Second Class
- Third Class

Integrated Masters are available in the following classifications:

- First Class
- Upper Second Class
- Lower Second Class

17.7.3 Pass or Unclassified Degree

Bachelor Degrees with Honours and Integrated Masters may be awarded as pass or unclassified degrees.

Where they are a pass or unclassified, these awards do not appear on the degree certificate but may be on any transcript.

17.7.4 Aegrotat Awards

An aegrotat award may be recommended when a Progression and Award Board does not have enough evidence of the student's performance to be able to recommend the award for which the student was a candidate, but is satisfied that but for illness or other valid cause the student would have reached the standard required. A candidate who has been offered an aegrotat award, but who elects instead to be reassessed may not claim the aegrotat award in the event of failure.

Aegrotat awards do not carry any classification or distinction.

17.7.5 Posthumous Awards

An award may be conferred posthumously and be accepted by another person on behalf of the late student; and as deemed appropriate by the University.

17.8 Awards of Other Bodies

The University may confer awards of other institutions, validating and accrediting bodies either singly or jointly with University awards, where the University has an agreement with the other institution or body.

17.9 Honorary Awards

17.9.1 Conferment of Honorary Awards

The Academic Board, on behalf of the University, may confer honorary awards on individuals or organisations. The Academic Board delegates authority to the Honorary Awards Committee to seek nominations; select candidates against criteria and make invitations to candidates for the conferment of award.

17.9.2 Categories of Honorary Awards

The University may confer honorary masters' degrees, honorary doctorates and honorary fellowships.

17.9.3 Criteria for Conferment

Honorary awards of the University may be conferred on individuals or organisations whose work and achievement reflect the mission and values of the University and/or whose conduct or reputation has brought distinction in one or more of the following fields:

- research and scholarship
- education
- the arts and sport
- science and technology
- the professions
- industry and commerce
- public life
- public and voluntary service
- service to the University
- service to the City of Leeds and/or the region
- service to the national or international community.

17.9.4 Selection for Conferment of Honorary Awards

In conferring honorary awards, the University will have regard to distinguished alumni of the institution and will also seek to ensure a broadly balanced list. Nominations for the conferment of honorary awards will be sought on a regular basis from all members of the University community, against the criteria for conferment.

17.9.5 Recipients: Honorary Masters Degrees and Doctorates

Honorary masters' degrees and honorary doctorates may be conferred on individuals.

17.9.6 Recipients: Honorary Fellowships

Honorary fellowships may be conferred on either individuals or organisations.

17.9.7 Role of Recipients

Individuals and/or organisations invited to receive an award will also be invited to continue their involvement with the University after conferment for the benefit of students and staff.

17.9.8 Award of Honorary Masters Degree

The general policy for the award of an honorary master's degree will be the honorary award of one of the taught or research master's degrees of the University or the honorary degree of Hon M Univ.

17.9.9 Award of Honorary Doctorate

The general policy for the award of an honorary doctorate will be the award of one of the following:

- Hon D Arts
- Hon D Business Administration
- Hon D Ed
- Hon D Eng
- Hon D Laws
- Hon D Litt
- Hon D Music
- Hon D Science
- Hon D Sport Science
- Hon D Technology
- Hon D Univ

17.9.10 Degree of Distinction

The conferment of honorary masters' and doctorate awards will be differentiated by the degree of distinction to be recognised.

17.9.11 Personal Acceptance

Honorary awards of the University will not be conferred in absentia.

17.9.12 Use of Designatory Letters

Recipients of honorary awards may use approved designatory letters but may not use the doctorate title unless they are entitled by virtue of their other qualifications.

17.10 Academic Dress

Styles and colours for academic dress will conform to the regulations approved by the University.

Academic Regulations

Definitions of University Awards

Section 18

Section 18

Definitions of University Awards

Originating Department:	Academic Quality Enhancement Office
Enquiries to:	quality@leedsbeckett.ac.uk
Approving Body:	Academic Board
Last Approved:	2 July 2025
Next due for approval:	July 2026
Document Type:	Regulation
Target Audience:	Relevant for all University staff and students

Contents

18.1	Purpose	1
18.2	Definition of Award.....	1
18.3	Benchmark Definition	1
18.4	Mode and Duration of Study	2
18.4.1	Modes of Study	2
18.4.2	Minimum and Maximum Periods of Study	2
18.4.3	Normal Duration of Periods of Study.....	2
18.4.4	Assessment beyond the Maximum Period of Registration	4
18.4.5	Sandwich Mode	4
18.4.6	Sandwich Mode: Completion of Supervised Work Experience	4
18.4.7	Sandwich Mode: Certification.....	5
18.4.8	Apprenticeships	5
18.5	Benchmark Standards	5
18.6	Successful Completion of a Course of Study	5
18.7	Definition of Awards at Pre-Degree Level	6
18.7.1	Certificate in Lifelong Learning	6
18.7.2	Foundation Certificate.....	6
18.7.3	Letter of Achievement	6
18.7.4	Vocational Certificate	6
18.7.5	Certificate.....	6
18.7.6	Certificate of Higher Education.....	6
18.7.7	Certificate in Education (CertEd)	7
18.7.8	Vocational Diploma.....	7
18.7.9	Diploma	7
18.7.10	Diploma of Higher Education	7
18.7.11	Advanced Diploma	7
18.7.12	Professional Diploma	7
18.8	Definitions of First Degrees.....	7
18.8.1	Foundation Degree	7
18.8.2	Bachelor Degree.....	8
18.8.3	Bachelor Degree with Honours.....	8

18.8.4	First Degree Courses	8
18.8.5	Title of First Degrees	8
18.8.6	Combined Subject Awards	8
18.8.7	Bachelor of Education (BEd)	9
18.8.8	In-service Bachelor of Education	9
18.8.9	Bachelor of Engineering (BEng)	9
18.8.10	Bachelor of Technology (BTech)	10
18.8.11	Bachelor of Laws (LLB)	10
18.9	Definition of Post-Experience Awards	10
18.9.1	Post-Experience Awards	10
18.9.2	Certificate in Professional Studies	10
18.9.3	Diploma in Professional Studies	10
18.9.4	Professional Graduate Certificate in Education (PGCE).....	10
18.10	Definition of Postgraduate Awards.....	10
18.10.1	Advanced Certificate of Lifelong Learning	10
18.10.2	Advanced Professional Diploma	11
18.10.3	Postgraduate Certificate (PGCert)	11
18.10.4	Certificate in Management (CM)	11
18.10.5	Postgraduate Diploma (PGDip)	11
18.10.6	Diploma in Management Studies (DMS)	11
18.10.7	Graduate Certificate.....	12
18.10.8	Graduate Diploma.....	12
18.10.9	Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE)	12
18.11	Definition of Integrated Masters Awards	12
18.11.1	Integrated Masters Awards	12
18.12	Definition of Taught Masters Awards.....	12
18.12.1	Taught Masters Awards	12
18.12.2	Titles of Taught Masters Degrees (MA or MSc)	12
18.12.2	Executive Master	13
18.12.3	Executive Master of Business Administration (EMBA)	13
18.12.4	Master of Business Administration (MBA)	13
18.12.5	Titles of MBA Degrees.....	13

18.12.6	Master of Education (MEd)	13
18.12.7	Master of Fine Art (MFA)	13
18.12.8	Master of Laws (LLM).....	14
18.12.9	Master of Engineering (MEng)	14
18.12.10	Master of Architecture (MArch)	14
18.12.10	Master of Landscape Architecture (MLA).....	14
18.13	Definition of Research Awards	14
18.13.1	Masters by Research.....	14
18.13.2	Title of Masters by Research Awards.....	15
18.13.3	Application of Titles of Masters by Research Awards	15
18.13.4	Masters by Research: Certificate of Award	15
18.13.5	Masters by Research: Use of Designatory Letters	15
18.13.6	Master of Philosophy (MPhil)	15
18.13.7	Doctor of Philosophy (PhD).....	15
18.13.8	European Doctorate (PhD).....	16
18.13.9	Doctor of Philosophy (PhD): Published Works	16
18.13.10	Professional Research Doctorate	16
18.13.11	Doctor of Education (EdD)	16
18.13.12	Doctor of Engineering (DEng)	16
18.13.13	Doctor of Business Administration (DBA).....	16
18.13.14	Doctor of Creative Arts (DCA)	17
18.13.15	Professional Doctorate (DProf).....	17
18.13.16	Doctor of Professional Practice in Sport (DProf. Sport).....	17
18.13.17	Higher Doctorates	17
18.14	Table of Credit requirements and minimum credit outcomes	18
18.15	Certificate of Award and University Transcript	20
18.15.1	Certificate of Award	20
18.15.2	Signatories of the Certificate of Award.....	21
18.15.3	University Transcript.....	21
18.15.4	Contents of University Transcript	21
18.15.5	Signatory of the University Transcript	21

Section 18: Definition of University Awards

18.1 Purpose

The purpose of defining university awards is to state the credit requirements and any essential dependencies which must be satisfied before an award of the university may be conferred.

The minimum standard shall be comparable with any other institution of higher education in the United Kingdom.

18.2 Definition of Award

An award is that qualification, which is achieved by and conferred upon a student upon completion of a course. An award may be either a target or contained award, dependent on successful achievement of the course requirements and number of credits by a student. A student may undertake a course and successfully achieve credit but not be eligible for an award. The awards of the University are defined in this section.

Proposals for new awards are considered through procedures agreed by the Academic Board. New proposals will be considered in the context of the range of the University's awards and their relationship to each other and to the awards of other bodies.

18.3 Benchmark Definition

For each award, the University has established a benchmark definition against which the proposal for a course of study is to be judged as follows:

- a) the possession of the necessary knowledge and skills needed for admission to a course may be demonstrated by means other than the possession of qualifications;
- b) the award may be attained by a variety of modes of study other than full-time;
- c) the period of study may be shorter or longer depending upon the student's prior knowledge and skills and upon the mode of study.

Courses approved by the University must conform in terms of standard and objectives to the requirements of the University's definitions of awards (see Academic Regulations: Section 1).

18.4 Mode and Duration of Study

18.4.1 Modes of Study

For any mode of study, the following should be specified and be designed to satisfy the duration requirements of the award:

- a) the level of knowledge and skills required at the entry point
- b) the curriculum
- c) teaching arrangements
- d) time available for students' private study
- e) the length and nature of any supervised work experience
- f) assessment arrangements

18.4.2 Minimum and Maximum Periods of Study

The minimum and maximum periods within which a student must normally complete the programme shall be specified. Exceptionally decisions taken to support reasonable adjustments for disabled students in line with Academic Regulations: Section 7 Disabled Students may exceed the standard maximum period for completion of the award.

18.4.3 Normal Duration of Periods of Study

The normal duration of periods of study is as set out below:

a) Certificate of Higher Education

The planned duration of the Certificate of Higher Education is 1 year full-time and 2 years part-time; and normally the maximum period of registration is 2 years full-time and 3 years part-time.

b) Diploma of Higher Education

The planned duration of the Diploma of Higher Education is 2 years full-time and 4 years part-time; and normally the maximum period of registration is 5 years full-time and 7 years part-time.

c) Foundation Degree

The planned duration of the Foundation Degree is 2 years full-time and 3 years part-time; and normally the maximum period of registration is 5 years full-time and 7 years part-time.

d) Bachelor Degree

The planned duration of the Bachelor Degree is 3 years full-time and 5 years part-time; and normally the maximum period of registration is 6 years full-time and 8 years part-time.

e) Bachelor Degree with Honours

The planned duration of the Bachelor Degree with Honours is 3 years full-time and 6 years part-time; and normally the maximum period of registration is 6 years full-time and 9 years part-time.

f) Top-up Degree

The planned duration of the Top-up Degree is 1 year full-time and 2 years part-time; and normally the maximum period of registration is 2 years full-time and 3 years part-time.

g) Postgraduate Certificate

The planned duration of the Postgraduate Certificate is up to 15 weeks full-time and 1 year part-time; and normally the maximum period of registration is 2 years full-time and 3 years part-time.

h) Postgraduate Diploma

The planned duration of the Postgraduate Diploma is up to 1 year full-time and 2 years part-time; and normally the maximum period of registration is 2 years full-time and 3 years part-time.

i) Integrated Masters

The planned duration of an Integrated Masters degree is 4 years full time and 8 years part time; and normally the maximum period of registration is 8 years full-time and 10 years part-time.

j) Masters Degree

The planned duration of the Masters Degree is up to 2 years full-time and 4 years part-time; and normally the maximum period of registration is 5 years full-time and 7 years part-time.

k) Executive Master

The planned duration of the Executive Master is up to 2 years part time; and normally the maximum period of registration is 7 years part time.

l) Vocational Certificate, Vocational Diploma, Professional Diploma and Advanced Professional Diploma

The planned duration of the awards of Vocational Certificate, Vocational Diploma, Professional Diploma and Advanced Professional Diploma will be for delivery within one academic year; and normally the maximum period of registration is 2 years.

18.4.4 Assessment beyond the Maximum Period of Registration

The Progression and Award Board, having regard for the standard of the award, and the course objectives and regulations, may, at its discretion, allow a student to be assessed beyond the maximum period of registration.

18.4.5 Sandwich Mode

A programme of study leading to the Degree or Honours Degree in the sandwich mode shall include a placement of not less than 30 weeks of supervised work experience, in addition to the period for any related full-time award. The placement period will not exceed one calendar year's duration.

Any arrangement other than this specified period will be agreed at approval of the award and reviewed at revalidation.

18.4.6 Sandwich Mode: Completion of Supervised Work Experience

For all sandwich mode awards, students are required to perform satisfactorily and complete the period of work experience before the award can be made.

18.4.7 Sandwich Mode: Certification

If the course is designed in the sandwich mode, then this is specified on the Diploma Supplement.

18.4.8 Apprenticeships

An apprenticeship is a programme of study and training aligned to an approved Institute for Apprenticeship and Technical Education (IfATE) Apprenticeship Standard and associated Assessment Plan. Degree Apprenticeships require completion of an EPA which may take place following completion of the degree element. Standard registration periods are therefore extended to ensure sufficient time, and access to university resources, for apprentices to complete the EPA in accordance with the expectations of the Apprenticeship Standard and Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) Funding Rules.

18.5 Benchmark Standards

For courses of study, benchmark standards may be defined in terms of credit points and levels.

a) Pre-Higher Education Level

The University may offer awards at a pre-higher education level.

b) Undergraduate Honours Course

Normally 120 credit points each at HE Level 4, HE Level 5, or HE Level 6 equate with the first three years of a full-time undergraduate honours course.

c) Postgraduate Level

At postgraduate level, 180 credit points (of which a minimum of 160 are at level 7, with the remaining 20 credits at level 6 or above) equate to one calendar year of full-time study.

18.6 Successful Completion of a Course of Study

Successful completion of a course of study requires the achievement of the objectives and learning outcomes of the course.

The definitions therefore specify that the course must be suitable for the fulfilment of the University's general educational aims, and require the standard of achievement required for the award to be demonstrated by the fulfilment of the objectives.

18.7 Definition of Awards at Pre-Degree Level

18.7.1 Certificate in Lifelong Learning

The Certificate in Lifelong Learning is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 30 credit points at HE levels 4-6.

18.7.2 Foundation Certificate

The Foundation Certificate is awarded for a Foundation year or equivalent period of study at HE Level 0. These are normally specific courses as pre-entry to a named higher HE award and are not offered as discrete awards, except where they are supporting the development of English language skills.

18.7.3 Letter of Achievement

The Letter of Achievement is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 10 credit points at HE Level 4.

18.7.4 Vocational Certificate

The Vocational Certificate is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 40 credit points at HE Level 4 or above studied on an award which provides the opportunity for continuous professional development.

18.7.5 Certificate

The Certificate is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 60 credit points at HE Level 4.

18.7.6 Certificate of Higher Education

The Certificate of Higher Education is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 120 credit points at HE Level 4.

18.7.7 Certificate in Education (CertEd)

The title of Certificate in Education (CertEd) is reserved for courses of study of teacher education. The CertEd is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 120 credit points at HE Level 4 and includes appropriate periods of teaching practice.

18.7.8 Vocational Diploma

The Vocational Diploma is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 40 credit points at HE Level 5 or above studied on an award which provides the opportunity for continuous professional development.

18.7.9 Diploma

The Diploma is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 120 credit points at HE Level 4 and 60 credit points at HE Level 5.

18.7.10 Diploma of Higher Education

The Diploma of Higher Education is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 120 credit points at HE Level 4 and 120 credit points at HE Level 5.

18.7.11 Advanced Diploma

The Advanced Diploma is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 60 credit points at HE Level 6.

18.7.12 Professional Diploma

The Professional Diploma is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 40 credit points at HE Level 6 or above studied on an award which provides the opportunity for continuous professional development.

18.8 Definitions of First Degrees

18.8.1 Foundation Degree

The Foundation Degree is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 120 credit points at HE Level 4 and 120 credit points at HE Level 5.

Candidates must have demonstrated the achievement of work related learning and core skills.

18.8.2 Bachelor Degree

The Bachelor Degree is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 120 credit points at HE Level 4, 120 credit points at HE Level 5 and 60 credit points at HE Level 6.

18.8.3 Bachelor Degree with Honours

The Bachelor Degree with Honours is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 120 credit points at HE Level 4, 120 credit points at HE Level 5 and 120 credit points at HE Level 6.

Candidates must have demonstrated the capacity for sustained independent and high quality work.

18.8.4 First Degree Courses

First degree courses lead to either:

- the title of Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science;
or
- a more closely defined award restricted to certain subjects and types of course.

18.8.5 Title of First Degrees

Courses of study for first degrees have a title which demonstrates more clearly the subject or field studied. Such titles are incorporated into degree certificates and may be used in designated letters by those who receive such awards.

18.8.6 Combined Subject Awards

Combined Subject Awards may be made.

Titles of Combined Subject Awards

The titles of Combined Subject Awards will normally be guided by the following conventions:

- a) Use of “and” in the title

Where two curriculum areas are combined in the title of the degree, the two areas shall be linked by the word “and” where:

candidates have attained at least 50% of the total credit points required for the completion of both HE Level 5 and HE Level 6 in each of the two curriculum areas identified in the title of the award.

b) Use of “with” in the title

In cases where the approved course of study does not meet the above requirements, the title of the award will specify the first curriculum area “with” the second as subsidiary curriculum area where:

- candidates have attained at least 25% of the total credit points for the completion of both HE Level 5 and HE Level 6 in a subsidiary curriculum area.

18.8.7 Bachelor of Education (BEd)

The title of Bachelor of Education (BEd) is reserved for courses of teacher education. The BEd may be at honours level or unclassified.

Initial or pre-service courses include appropriate periods of teaching practice.

18.8.8 In-service Bachelor of Education

The in-service Bachelor of Education degree is for qualified teachers holding a Certificate in Education or equivalent qualification.

The degree is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 120 credit points at HE Level 5 and 60 credit points at HE Level 6.

The degree with honours is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 180 credit points at HE Levels 5 and 6, of which at least 120 should be at HE Level 6.

18.8.9 Bachelor of Engineering (BEng)

The title of Bachelor of Engineering (BEng) is reserved for Bachelor courses of study which provide a technologically broad education with an emphasis on engineering applications.

18.8.10 Bachelor of Technology (BTech)

The title of Bachelor of Technology (BTech) is reserved for Bachelor courses of study specialised in Civil Engineering.

18.8.11 Bachelor of Laws (LLB)

The title of Bachelor of Laws (LLB) is reserved for Bachelor courses of study specialised in Law.

If Law is combined with another subject then the title shall be Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science as appropriate.

18.9 Definition of Post-Experience Awards

18.9.1 Post-Experience Awards

Post-experience awards are reserved for courses of study related to specific professional areas and designed to build upon professional qualifications and professional experience.

18.9.2 Certificate in Professional Studies

The Certificate in Professional Studies is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 40 credit points at HE Level 5 or HE Level 6.

18.9.3 Diploma in Professional Studies

The Diploma in Professional Studies is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 120 credit points at HE Level 5 or HE Level 6.

18.9.4 Professional Graduate Certificate in Education (PGCE)

The Professional Graduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) is an award for a graduate who has successfully completed the study of the theory and practice of teaching at HE Level 6.

18.10 Definition of Postgraduate Awards

18.10.1 Advanced Certificate of Lifelong Learning

The Advanced Certificate in Lifelong Learning is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 30 credit points at HE Level 7

18.10.2 Advanced Professional Diploma

The Advanced Professional Diploma is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 40 credit points at HE Level 7 or above studied on an award which provides the opportunity for continuous professional development.

18.10.3 Postgraduate Certificate (PGCert)

The Postgraduate Certificate (PGCert) is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 60 credit points at Level 7.

The course can be designed to re-orientate students from one area of a subject discipline to another related area and will use the skills and competencies attained in the first degree studied.

18.10.4 Certificate in Management (CM)

The Certificate in Management (CM) is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 60 credit points at Level 7. It is a post-experience, postgraduate certificate and the standard is that expected of a person who has demonstrated competence in the appropriate aspects of management.

18.10.5 Postgraduate Diploma (PGDip)

The Postgraduate Diploma (PGDip) is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 120 credit points at Level 7.

18.10.6 Diploma in Management Studies (DMS)

The Diploma in Management Studies (DMS) is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 120 credit points at Level 7.

This is a post-experience, postgraduate diploma award designed to meet the needs of those who have at least two years' management experience and wish to achieve a range of general management knowledge, skills and competencies.

18.10.7 Graduate Certificate

The Graduate Certificate is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 60 credit points, 40 of which at HE Level 6 and 20 at HE Level 4 or 5 or above.

18.10.8 Graduate Diploma

The Graduate Diploma is awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 120 credit points, 80 of which at HE Level 6 and 40 at HE Level 4 or 5 or above.

18.10.9 Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE)

The Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) is an award for a graduate who has successfully completed the study of the theory and practice of teaching at HE Level 7

18.11 Definition of Integrated Masters Awards

18.11.1 Integrated Masters Awards

An Integrated Masters is awarded for the attainment of 480 credit points; 120 credits at level 4, 120 credits at level 5, 120 credits at level 6 and 120 credits at level 7.

Integrated Master of Architecture is awarded for the attainment of 540 credit points; 120 credits at level 4, 120 credits at level 5, 120 credits at level 6 and 180 credits at level 7.

18.12 Definition of Taught Masters Awards

18.12.1 Taught Masters Awards

Taught Masters degrees are awarded for the attainment of a minimum of 180 credit points, of which a minimum of 160 credit points are at Level 7.

They are at a level which demands more advanced and intensive study than a first degree, and include a compulsory element of advanced independent work.

18.12.2 Titles of Taught Masters Degrees (MA or MSc)

Courses leading to awards of MA or MSc shall be given a title which indicates clearly the subject(s) studied.

18.12.2 Executive Master

The Executive Master is reserved for courses of study which focus on the necessary leadership development skills alongside the very latest thinking in core specialisms present in modern-day sporting organisations. The award is comprised of 180 credits at Level 7 and is for students with appropriate industry experience.

18.12.3 Executive Master of Business Administration (EMBA)

The title of Executive Master of Business Administration (EMBA) is reserved for courses of study which focus on the general principles and function of management and the development of management skills

Students entering MBA courses shall have appropriate practical experience

18.12.4 Master of Business Administration (MBA)

The title of Master of Business Administration (MBA) is reserved for courses of study which focus on the general principles and function of management and the development of management skills.

Students entering MBA courses may have appropriate practical experience.

18.12.5 Titles of MBA Degrees

Courses leading to the MBA may be given a title which indicates clearly the management context studied.

18.12.6 Master of Education (MEd)

The title of Master of Education (MEd) is reserved for courses of study focused on education and professional practice in teaching.

All students must have appropriate professional experience.

18.12.7 Master of Fine Art (MFA)

The title of Master of Fine Art is comprised of 300 credit points, of which a minimum of 240 credit points are at level 7.

18.12.8 Master of Laws (LLM)

The title of Master of Laws (LLM) is reserved for courses of study in which the focus is on the principles and/or application of Law.

18.12.9 Master of Engineering (MEng)

The title of Master of Engineering (MEng) is reserved for courses of study in Engineering or its application.

The standard of the award is that expected of a student with a Bachelor Degree with Honours in Engineering or equivalent who has followed an additional course, normally of one year's full-time study or equivalent, which is at a level more demanding than that required for the award of BEng (Honours). This does not apply to the Integrated Master of Architecture (see 18.11.1).

18.12.10 Master of Architecture (MArch)

The title of Master of Architecture (MArch) is reserved for courses of study in Architecture incorporating Part 2 of the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) professional qualification as prescribed by the Architects Registration Board (ARB). The award is comprised of 240 credit points at level 7.

18.12.10 Master of Landscape Architecture (MLA)

The title of Master of Landscape Architecture is comprised of 300 credit points, all of which are at level 7.

18.13 Definition of Research Awards

18.13.1 Masters by Research

The standard of a Masters by Research is that expected of an honours graduate who has satisfactorily completed an approved period of research training, has investigated a topic using appropriate research methodology, and has presented a satisfactory thesis.

Where the course involves Level 7 credit, any award will conform to the standard requirements for a Taught Masters award.

18.13.2 Title of Masters by Research Awards

The title Masters by Research (MRes) is used for all subject areas.

18.13.3 Application of Titles of Masters by Research Awards

a) Master of Arts

The title Master of Arts (MA) is used in art, design, the arts and humanities and areas of social and business studies.

b) Master of Science (MSc)

The title Master of Science (MSc) is used where studies are substantially based on science or mathematics, or their applications.

18.13.4 Masters by Research: Certificate of Award

The specification of the award of Masters by Research is shown on the Certificate of Award.

18.13.5 Masters by Research: Use of Designatory Letters

Award holders may use the designatory letters with or without the mode of attaining the award.

18.13.6 Master of Philosophy (MPhil)

The standard of the Master of Philosophy (MPhil) is that expected of a good honours graduate who has satisfactorily completed an approved period of research training and has investigated and evaluated, or critically studied, an appropriate topic, demonstrating an understanding of research methods appropriate to the chosen field, and has presented a satisfactory thesis.

18.13.7 Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

The standard of a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) is that expected of a good honours graduate who has satisfactorily completed an approved course of research training. The student shall have investigated or critically studied an approved and appropriate topic resulting in a significant contribution to knowledge, and presented a satisfactory thesis.

18.13.8 European Doctorate (PhD)

Part of the thesis results from work undertaken in another European country.

18.13.9 Doctor of Philosophy (PhD): Published Works

The award of a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) may also be made on the basis of published works. The work presented, supported by a synoptic review, is required to demonstrate a systematic approach showing independent, critical and original powers with a distinct contribution to knowledge.

18.13.10 Professional Research Doctorate (EdD, DEng, DBA, DCA, DProf. Sport, DProf)

The standard of a Professional Research Doctorate is that expected of a good honours graduate who has satisfactorily completed an approved course of research training and contextual study.

The candidate will have investigated or critically studied an approved topic or topics which result in a significant contribution to practice and has presented a satisfactory portfolio of research including two or more substantial research outputs.

18.13.11 Doctor of Education (EdD)

The title of Doctor of Education (EdD) is reserved for courses of research focused on education and professional practice in education.

Normally all candidates must have appropriate professional experience.

18.13.12 Doctor of Engineering (DEng)

The title of Doctor of Engineering (DEng) is reserved for courses of research focused on engineering and related subjects and professional practice in engineering.

Normally all candidates must have appropriate professional experience.

18.13.13 Doctor of Business Administration (DBA)

The title of Doctor of Business Administration (DBA) is reserved for courses of research focused on Business Administration and related subjects and professional practice

Normally all students must have appropriate and subject relevant professional experience.

18.13.14 Doctor of Creative Arts (DCA)

The title of Doctor of Creative Arts (DCA) is reserved for programmes of research focussed on research in creative arts.

Normally, all candidates must have appropriate creative arts experience.

18.13.15 Professional Doctorate (DProf)

The title of Professional Doctorate is reserved for those areas not covered by a named award.

Normally, all candidates must have appropriate professional experience.

18.13.16 Doctor of Professional Practice in Sport (DProf. Sport)

The title of Doctor of Professional Practice in Sport (DProf. Sport) is reserved for programmes of research focused on professional practice in sport-related subjects including Sport Coaching, Sport and Exercise Science, Sport and Exercise Physiology, Sport and Exercise Biomechanics, Sport and Exercise Nutrition, Sport and Exercise Psychology, Sport Development, Sport Business, Sport Marketing, Physical Education, and Physical Activity & Health.

Candidates will normally have appropriate professional experience working in these domains.

18.13.17 Higher Doctorates

The standard of the award of Higher Doctorates is that expected of an applicant who is a holder of at least seven years' standing of a first degree, or a holder of at least four years' standing of a higher degree, who is a leading authority in the field of study concerned and has made an original and significant contribution to the advancement or application of knowledge in that field.

18.14 Table of Credit requirements and minimum credit outcomes

	Title of Certificate or Award	Overall Credits	Minimum required at Highest Level	Other credit and level requirements	QAA FHEQ level
1	Letter of Achievement		10 at L4		4
2	Certificate of Lifelong Learning	30	30 at L4/5/6		4/5/6
3	Vocational Certificate	40	40 at L4	Award must provide opportunity for continuous professional development	4
4	Certificate (Cert)	60	60 at L4		4
5	Certificate of Higher Education (Cert HE)	120	120 at L4		4
6	Certificate in Education (CertEd)	120	120 at L4	Appropriate periods of teaching practice	4
7	Vocational Diploma	40	40 at L5	Award must provide opportunity for continuous professional development	5
8	Diploma (Dip)	180	60 at L5	Remaining 120 at L4 or higher	5
9	Diploma of Higher Education (DipHE)	240	120 at L5	Remaining 120 at L4 or higher	5
10	Professional Diploma	40	40 at L6	Award must provide opportunity for continuous professional development	6
11	Advanced Diploma	60	60 at L6	Award must provide opportunity for continuous professional development	6
12	Foundation Degree (FdA or FdSc)	240	120 at L5	Remaining 120 at L4 or higher Candidates must demonstrated achievement of work related learning and core skills.	5

	Title of Certificate or Award	Overall Credits	Minimum required at Highest Level	Other credit and level requirements	QAA FHEQ level
13	Bachelor Degree (Ordinary Degree BA or BSc)	300	60 at L6	Minimum of 120 at L5 and remaining 120 at L4 or higher	6
14	Bachelor Degree with Honours (BA (Hons) or BSc (Hons))	360	120 at L6	Minimum of 120 at L5 and remaining 120 at L4 or higher	6
15	Professional Graduate Certificate in Education (PGCE)	120	60 at L6	Remaining 60 at L5 or higher and meets requirements for Qualified Teacher Status (QTS)	6
16	Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE)	120	60 at L7	Remaining 60 at L6 or higher and meets requirements for Qualified Teacher Status (QTS)	7
17	Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) Schools Direct	60	60 at L7	Meets requirements for Qualified Teacher Status	7
18	Certificate in Professional Studies	40	40 at L5 or L6		5 or 6
19	Diploma in Professional Studies	120	120 at L5 or L6		5 or 6
20	Advanced Certificate in Lifelong Learning	30	30 at L7		7
21	Advanced Professional Diploma	40	40 at L7	Award must provide opportunity for continuous professional development	7
22	Postgraduate Certificate (PGCert)	60	60 at L7		7
23	Certificate in Management (CM)	60	60 at L7		7
24	Postgraduate Diploma (PGDip)	120	120 at L7		7

	Title of Certificate or Award	Overall Credits	Minimum required at Highest Level	Other credit and level requirements	QAA FHEQ level
25	Diploma in Management Studies (DMS)	120	120 at L7		7
26	Graduate Certificate	60	40 at L6	Remaining 20 at L 4 or L5 or above	6
27	Graduate Diploma	120	80 at L6	Remaining 40 at L4 or L5 or above	6
28	Integrated Masters (first degree e.g. MEng, MOst)	480	120 at L7	Remaining 360 meets requirements of an honours degree	7
29	Integrated Master of Architecture	540	180 at L7	N/A	7
30	Masters Degree (MA, MSc, MBA, EMBA)	180	160 at L7	Remaining 20 credits at L6 or above. Award must include a compulsory element of advanced independent work.	7
31	Executive Master	180	150 at L7	Remaining 30 credits at L6 or above.	7
32	Master of Architecture (MArch)	240	200 at L7	Remaining 40 credits at L6. Award is reserved for study in architecture incorporating part 2 of the RIBA professional qualification in accordance with the Architects Registration Board (ARB).	7
33	Master of Fine Art	300	240 at L7	Remaining 60 at L6	7
34	Master of Landscape Architecture	300	300 at L7	N/A	7

18.15 Certificate of Award and University Transcript

18.15.1 Certificate of Award

The Certificate of Award conferred by the University records:

- the name of the University, together with, if appropriate, the name of any other institution sharing responsibility for the student's programme of study
- the student's full name as given on the final recommendations of the award
- the award and date of conferment
- the title of the course of study, if any, as approved by the University for the purposes of the Certificate of Award

18.15.2 Signatories of the Certificate of Award

The certificate shall bear the signature of the Vice Chancellor of the University and/or the Chair of the Board of Governors.

18.15.3 University Transcript

A University Transcript may be issued on request to a student who has successfully completed any modules approved by the University as suitable to form part of an approved programme of study leading to an award.

18.15.4 Contents of University Transcript

The University Transcript, or Certificate of Credit, records:

- the full name of the student
- the dates of the student's enrolment with the University
- the modules successfully completed, with details of their level and credit rating, grade achieved (where appropriate) and date of completion
- details of any periods of supervised work experience or placement, with grades where appropriate and dates.
- the name of the University, together with, if appropriate, the name of any other institution sharing responsibility for the student's programme of study

18.15.5 Signatory of the University Transcript

The transcript shall bear the signature of the Vice Chancellor or nominee.

- a) The Course of Study

A student may only be a candidate for an award of the University if he or she has followed an approved course of study designed to lead to that award and has satisfied the Progression and Award Board for the course.

b) Distinction, Merit and Classification

The Progression and Award Board may recommend that an award be conferred with merit or distinction with an honours classification where scheme or course regulations make such provision and where the student has satisfied the requirements of the regulations for such an award.

c) Candidates Proceeding to a Further Award

Where scheme or course regulations make such provision, the Progression and Award Board may recommend that an award be conferred upon a student who has satisfied the requirements for that award, whether or not the candidate is proceeding directly to a programme of study leading to a further award.



LEEDS
BECKETT
UNIVERSITY

Academic Regulations

Glossary

Section 19

leedsbeckett.ac.uk

Section 19

Glossary

Originating Department:	Academic Quality Enhancement Office
Enquiries to:	quality@leedsbeckett.ac.uk
Approving Body:	Academic Board
Last Approved:	2 July 2025
Next due for approval:	July 2026
Document Type:	Regulation
Target Audience:	Relevant for all University staff and students and Collaborative Partners

Glossary

ADip	Advanced Diploma
ACERTLL	Advanced Certificate in Lifelong Learning
aHNC	Higher National Certificate
APAR	Apprenticeship provider and assessment register
APDip	Advanced Professional Diploma
ARB	Architects Registration Board
AQEO	Academic Quality Enhancement Office
BA	Bachelor of Arts
BA (Hons)	Bachelor of Arts (Honours)
BEd	Bachelor of Education
BEd (Hons)	Bachelor of Education (Honours)
BEng	Bachelor of Engineering
BEng (Hons)	Bachelor of Engineering (Honours)
BMedSci	Bachelor of Medical Science
BSc	Bachelor of Science
BSc (Hons)	Bachelor of Science (Honours)
BTEch	Bachelor of Technology
BTEch (Hons)	Bachelor of Technology (Honours)
Cert	Certificate
CertEd	Certificate in Education
CertHE	Certificate of Higher Education
CERTLL	Certificate in Lifelong Learning
CM	Certificate in Management
DA	Degree Apprenticeship
DBA	Doctor of Business Administration
DCA	Doctor of Creative Arts
Deng	Doctor of Engineering
Dip	Diploma
DipHE	Diploma of Higher Education
DLitt	Doctor of Letters
DMS	Diploma in Management Studies
Dprof	Doctor of Professional Practice
DSc	Doctor of Science
Dtech	Doctor of Technology
ECTS	European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System
EdD	Doctor of Education
EIF	Education Inspection Framework
EMBA	Executive Master of Business Administration
EngD	Doctor of Engineering
EPA	End Point Assessment (of apprentices)
ESFA	Education and Skills Funding Agency
FCert	Foundation Certificate
FdA	Foundation Degree Arts
FdEng	Foundation Degree Engineering
FdSc	Foundation Degree Science

FHEQ	Framework for Higher Education Qualifications
GCert	Graduate Certificate
GCSE	General Certificate of Secondary Education
GDip	Graduate Diploma
HA	Higher Apprenticeship
HE	Higher Education
HND	Higher National Diploma
IELTS	International English Language Testing System
IfATE	Institute for Apprenticeships and Technical Education
INA	Initial Needs Assessment (of apprentices)
ISSN/ISBN	International Standard Serial Number/ International Standard Book Number
KPIs	Key Performance Indicators
KSBs	Knowledge, Skills and Behaviours (for apprenticeship competency)
LLB	Bachelor of Laws
LLB (Hons)	Bachelor of Laws (with Honours)
LLD	Doctor of Laws
LLM	Master of Laws
MA	Master of Arts
MArch	Master of Architecture
MBA	Master of Business Administration
MBioms	Master of Biomedical Sciences
MEd	Master of Education
MEng	Master of Engineering
MFA	Master of Fine Art
MLA	Master of Landscape Architecture
MPA	Master of Public Administration
MPhil	Master of Philosophy
MPlan	Master of Planning
MRes	Masters by Research
MSc	Master of Science
MTL	Masters in Teaching and Learning
NS	Non Submission
OfS	Office for Students
Ofsted	Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills
OIA	Office of the Independent Adjudicator
PDip	Professional Diploma
PGCE	Postgraduate Certificate in Education
PGCert	Postgraduate Certificate
PGCHE	Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education
PGDip	Postgraduate Diploma
PhD	Doctor of Philosophy
PSRB	Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body
QAA	Quality Assurance Agency
QCF	Qualifications and Credit Framework
QTS	Qualified Teacher Status
RIBA	Royal Institute of British Architects

RPCL	Recognition of Prior Certificated Learning
RPEL	Recognition of Prior Experiential Learning
RPL	Recognition of Prior Learning
TOEFL	Test of English as a Foreign Language
TPR	Tripartite Review (of apprentices)
VCert	Vocational Certificate

Module

The standard ‘building block’ of all course delivery – identified in size by CATS credits. The most common module size across all courses is 20 CATS credits; other credit volumes can, however, be validated.

Course

A full or part-time award-bearing structure of modules, with defined learning outcomes and secure location within the *Framework for Higher Education Qualifications*. Not all courses will lead to awards of the University (they may, for example, be Edexcel or professional-body courses). Courses may be single honours or combined degrees. Each course will have a unique Course Specification – except where awards are ‘nested’ (in the case of, for example, CertHE and DipHE – but not FDA/FDSc and ‘top up’ BA/BSc).

Framework

A structure of modules which lead, through appropriate designation of common and optional modules, to a number of defined award outcomes. Frameworks will contain designated Pathways.

Frameworks may operate at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels, and will have a common structure at levels 4 (or below) and 5 of undergraduate awards and in the early stages of taught postgraduate awards. They will lead to a common set of named awards, designated as pathways, which will qualify a generic award title (which should be available to all students who choose, or fail, to meet the criteria for a designated pathway). This will be iterated in the structure of generic title - *BSc Basketweaving* – with the qualifier in parentheses – *BSc Basketweaving (Macrame)*, *BSc Basketweaving (Rattan)* etc. Pathways will be designated by having a minimum of 60 credits (including the dissertation or project, where that exists) at level 6, or 7 as applicable, which is particular to that pathway (and the associated qualified award title).

Up to the level of 60 level-6 credits differentiation, new pathways may be proposed within a framework, subject to approval of the qualified award title by Academic Quality and Standards Committee approval and subsequent approval of the pathway structure by the relevant School Committee. Related qualified award titles associated with these pathways will not require separate validation, unless the degree of change of an existing pathway is greater than that approved within the University’s policy for modifications. All

qualified award titles approved in this way will, however, be subject to review at the next review stage (no matter how soon after the validation of the pathway).

Pathway

A structure of modules within a framework which leads to a specific named award. Pathways will have defined learning outcomes and be securely located within the *Framework for Higher Education Qualifications*.

Pathways will be validated, en bloc, alongside their related frameworks. New pathways may be approved by an institutional course validation panel or University validation panel in accordance with section 13. Individual pathways will have a minimum of 60 credits at level 6, or 7 as applicable (including the dissertation or project, where that exists).

Apprenticeships

The Institute for Apprenticeships and Technical Education (IfATE) define an apprenticeship as:

“... a job with training to industry standards. It should be about entry to a recognised occupation, involve a substantial programme of on- and off-the-job training and the apprentice’s occupational competence should be tested by an independent, end point assessment. Apprenticeships are employer-led ...but the needs of the apprentice are equally important; to achieve competence in a skilled occupation, which is transferable and secures long-term earnings potential, greater security and the capability to progress in the workplace”.

Apprenticeships are available up to Level 8 and are available as:

- Degree apprenticeships which require the award of a Bachelor or Masters degree qualification
- Higher apprenticeships which do NOT require a degree but one may be offered by an awarding body

From 1st April 2021, all apprenticeships will fall under the remit of Ofsted (extract from the Ofsted Education and Skills Framework (EIF):

- Inspection provides independent, external evaluation and identifies what needs to improve in order for provision to be good or better. It is based on gathering a range of evidence that is evaluated against an inspection framework and takes full account of our policies and relevant legislation in areas such as safeguarding, equality and diversity.

- Inspection provides important information to parents, carers, learners and employers about the quality of education, training and care. These groups should be able to make informed choices based on the information published in inspection reports.

Key characteristics of apprenticeships, that distinguish apprentices from students:

- Funded through the Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) therefore compliance with the ESFA funding rules is essential. Costs and responsibilities for those costs, are in line with ESFA funding rules and form part of the contractual agreements signed before an apprenticeship starts.
- Apprenticeships are employer-led; the consumer is the employer not the apprentice and as such the apprenticeship content/ delivery is directly linked to the on-going needs and priorities of both the apprentice AND the employer. A tripartite relationship is established for each apprenticeship where employers, apprentices and the university all contribute to the application of academic regulations and general delivery/ operation of the apprenticeship, the specific roles and responsibilities of each party are set out in legal documentation that is signed prior to the start of the apprenticeship.
- An Apprenticeship Standard sets out the occupational competencies required to be successful on the apprenticeship. These Standards are developed by employers (Trailblazers) and approved by the Institute for Apprenticeships and Technical Education (IfATE).
- Apprentice competency is assessed through an End Point Assessment (EPA), either as part of the degree (integrated degree apprenticeship) or separately, upon completion for the degree (non-integrated degree apprenticeship). The requirements of the EPA are defined in an Assessment Plan, produced by the Trailblazers to accompany the Apprenticeship Standard. For integrated degree apprenticeships, where the grading requirements of the EPA fall outside of academic regulations schools must submit regulatory exemption requests. EPAs must be conducted by independent assessors on the Apprenticeship provider and assessment register (APAR); Leeds Beckett is on the register for integrated degree apprenticeships.
- In addition to satisfying the standard entry criteria for the degree, all apprentices must satisfy ESFA eligibility criteria and have their learning needs assessed against the Knowledge, Skills and Behaviours (KSBs) of the Apprenticeship Standard through an Initial Needs Assessment (INA) prior to the start of the apprenticeship, the outcome of which will be captured within the required formal documentation. Expectations

relating to applicants holding English and Maths qualifications at entry will normally align with similar variants of the programme (where applicable) and with relevant requirements set out by Professional Statutory or Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs), those set out in the Apprenticeship Standard and Assessment Plan and with DfE requirements.

- The outcome of the INA will be used to create an individualised programme of study and training against which the apprentice's progress will be closely monitored.
- Learning activities are categorised as on-the-job and off-the-job. Off-the-job training is a statutory requirement for an English apprenticeship. It is training which is received by the apprentice, during the apprentice's normal contracted working hours, for the purpose of achieving the KSBs of the approved Apprenticeship Standard. ESFA funding is claimed to support the delivery of the off-the-job learning.
- Apprentices must spend at least 20% of their normal working hours (capped at 30 hours per week for funding purposes only), over the planned duration of the apprenticeship practical period, on off-the-job training. This means that the minimum requirement, for apprentices working 30 hours or more per week is an average of 6 hours of off-the-job training per week (i.e. 20% of 30 hours) over the planned duration.
- Tripartite Review (TPR) meetings, between the apprentice and university and employer representatives, must take place at least 4 times per year. These must be carried out at least every 12 weeks to ensure the apprentice is progressing as planned at the start of the apprenticeship and provide meaningful discussions regarding the apprentice's learning needs, additional support requirements, trajectory of learning to meet the projected apprenticeship outcome, etc. Final year apprentices must have an additional meeting to confirm that they have satisfied the Gateway requirements.
- Completion of the apprenticeship is when the EPA has been undertaken, not just upon completion of the degree element.

To ensure the university remains compliant with the ESFA Funding Rules, and delivers a high-quality apprenticeship provision in the view of Ofsted, bespoke resources and processes are deployed across the university.

Academic Regulations

Student Charter

Section 20

Section 20

Student Charter

Originating Department:	Student Services
Enquiries to:	studentservices@leedsbeckett.ac.uk
Approving Body:	Academic Board
Last Approved:	23 August 2018
Next due for approval:	July 2026
Document Type	Regulation
Target Audience:	Relevant for all University staff and students
Also of Relevance to:	Collaborative Partners
Brief Summary of Purpose:	The Student Charter explains how our University and our Students' Union work together in partnership with our students to provide an inclusive, safe and engaging learning environment.
Link to the Charter:	www.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/our-university/information-for-students-and-applicants/student-charter



LEEDS
BECKETT
UNIVERSITY

Academic Regulations University Committee Structure

Section 21

leedsbeckett.ac.uk

Section 21

University Committee Structure

Originating Department:	Academic Quality Enhancement Office
Enquiries to:	Governance@leedsbeckett.ac.uk
Approving Body:	Academic Board
Last Approved:	July 2024
Next due for approval:	July 2026
Document Type	Regulation
Target Audience:	Relevant for all University staff and students

Academic Board Committee Structure

