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INTRODUCTION TO THE MANUAL

A. This introduction describes the purpose, structure and content of the Manual of Academic Regulations and Procedures (MARP) and its place in the University’s framework for academic quality management.

B. The academic quality management framework described in this Manual and the regulations and procedures contained, or referenced, in it apply to all categories of students, all academic programmes, and all types of award except where special regulations have been approved through the appropriate channels for specific types of provision, programmes, awards or for specific groups of students. The University validates the following range of awards:

(a) undergraduate degrees and certificates (including foundation degrees);
(b) postgraduate taught degrees, diplomas and certificates;
(c) postgraduate research degrees.

This range of awards includes those delivered on a collaborative basis with partner institutions.

C. The Manual is divided into two main sections:

Part One: Study and Assessment Regulations
Part Two: Quality Assurance and Standards

Part One contains regulations and procedures governing: the student academic experience (including academic appeals and complaints; assessment and examinations; and progression, results and awards).

Part Two contains regulations and procedures relating to quality and standards, including: the management of standards and quality; course design and approval; course review; external examiners and their reports; collaborative provision.

D. The University’s internal processes as described in the Manual are informed by the QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education.

E. Some sections of the Manual are explicitly designated as ‘regulations’ and must be complied with. It is expected that all other processes and procedures will normally be adhered to at the institutional, faculty, departmental and individual levels. Failure to comply with the Manual may result in actions which:

(a) put the University at unacceptable risk;
(b) significantly threaten the quality and standards of University programmes and awards;
(c) run counter to principles of natural justice;
(d) are in breach of external legislation; and
(e) jeopardise the quality of the student experience.
F. Where appropriate, the Manual may also contain guidance on operational matters which impact on the implementation of the Manual’s requirements, or make reference to University guidance on such matters provided elsewhere. Operational procedures are devised and implemented at local level e.g. professional services units, faculties, departments, institutes, and colleges. Such procedures must be consistent with standard practice and the overarching regulations and principles as described in this Manual.

G. In certain places, the Manual contains procedural references to approval “by the body or officers with delegated authority from Senate”. The Senate Schedule of Delegations details the body or officer with delegated authority to approve specific matters on behalf of Senate. This is updated on an annual basis and should be referred to when consulting MARP on these particular procedures. The Schedule is available at: https://gap.lancs.ac.uk/policy-info-guide/4-how-we-make-decisions/Pages/default.aspx

H. Where relevant, the Manual contains references to related policies and procedures, which are provided outwith the Manual on the Academic Standards and Quality website.

I. The Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC) has overall responsibility on behalf of Senate for the development, implementation and review of the policies, procedures and regulations described within MARP.

J. A designated officer (currently the Head of Academic Standards and Quality) is responsible for ensuring that the Manual is updated annually and reflects any changes that have been approved during the previous academic year.

K. The autonomy of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) is mediated by legislation, external regulations and procedures, codes of practice and guidelines. University regulations and procedures are therefore informed by and comply and align with the following:

(a) principles of good practice;
(b) national legislation;
(c) higher education agency requirements;
(d) professional, statutory and regulatory bodies (PSRBs).
PART ONE: STUDY AND ASSESSMENT REGULATIONS

STUDY REGULATIONS

1. UNDERLYING PRINCIPLES

1.1 EQUITY AND CONSISTENCY OF TREATMENT

1.1.1 In the management of quality and standards, the University needs to ensure and demonstrate consistency in approach between different departments and in the equitable treatment of all students in terms of admissions, learning, teaching and assessment, academic discipline and awards.

1.1.2 All members of University staff have a responsibility to treat all students fairly and equitably.

1.1.3 Students should be treated on the basis of capacity and potential and should not be disadvantaged on any grounds irrelevant to academic study.

1.2 COMMUNICATIONS WITH STUDENTS

1.2.1 Students should be provided with accurate, relevant and timely information and should be informed:

(a) of the primary means by which their academic departments, colleges, Student Based Services and other units will communicate with them and when this will happen;

(b) that it is assumed and expected that students will regularly check their Lancaster email accounts for official communications and notifications of the status of their registration and studies;

(c) that it is the responsibility of students to maintain links with their academic department and the central administration, respond to requests for information, acknowledge specific communications related to the status of their registration and studies, and keep the University informed as to any changes in their contact details.

2. ADMISSIONS

2.1 ADMISSIONS POLICY (UG AND PG)

The current University Admissions Policy is available at: https://gap.lancs.ac.uk/ASQ/Policies/Pages/AdmissionsPolicy.aspx.
2.1.1 The University aims to:

(a) attract and retain students who have the potential to succeed in their chosen programme, and to benefit from the experience;
(b) ensure that there is equality of opportunity for all applicants, whatever their background;
(c) treat all applicants and students equitably and fairly.

2.1.2 The University seeks to achieve these aims by:

(a) providing information and materials relating to the criteria for entry and to admissions procedures that are accurate, relevant, current and accessible, and are designed to help applicants to make informed decisions;
(b) ensuring that any significant changes to an advertised programme will be communicated to all applicants who will be affected by the changes;
(c) ensuring that recruitment and admissions procedures are fair, transparent and applied consistently;
(d) assessing each application on an individual basis, judging against published selection criteria, including prior learning and experience where appropriate;
(e) ensuring that all applications are processed in a timely and effective manner;
(f) ensuring that any potential student who has additional support needs is aware of the support the University can offer;
(g) ensuring that staff who are involved in recruitment and admissions are competent, trained and informed about relevant issues, operate in a clear and consistent way, and deal with applicants in a polite and helpful manner;
(h) regularly monitoring and reviewing matters relating to admission and progression.

2.1.3 The University’s Admissions Policy and associated procedures comply with relevant legislation and meet the expectations of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education, Chapter B2: Admissions.

2.2 GENERAL ADMISSIONS PROCEDURES (UG AND PG)

2.2.1 General entrance requirements for programmes leading to different levels of award are set by the University but particular requirements might be set for specific programmes by departments and faculties with the approval of the University.

2.2.2 The process for admitting students to the University is conducted in accordance with the University’s Admissions Policy and is overseen and co-ordinated by the University’s central Undergraduate Admissions Office and Postgraduate Management Office (Admissions) in co-operation with departments and faculties.

2.2.3 Clear entry criteria for each programme (including explicit qualification criteria) are given in all recruitment and admissions information and materials, to ensure that selection decisions are fair, transparent and consistent. Entry criteria are reviewed annually by the University, and updated as appropriate.
2.2.4 Applicants seeking credit for prior learning will be considered in accordance with University policy and procedures on the recognition and accreditation of prior learning.

2.2.5 Applicants for a second undergraduate degree, in a new subject, shall normally be accepted for entry direct into Part II unless it is determined by the accepting Department that they would be academically disadvantaged by not taking the relevant Part I subject.

2.2.6 All applicants who are offered a place shall be given clear information about conditions of acceptance.

2.2.7 All applicants who accept the offer of admission shall be given detailed information about registration and induction at the University, in a timely manner before their arrival.

2.2.8 Any student entering part-way through an award shall be given similar information to that given to new students registering at the start of a programme.

2.2.9 No student shall normally be allowed to register concurrently for more than the equivalent of one full-time higher or further education scheme of study. Exceptions may be made in cases where a second scheme of study is complementary to the first. Such exceptions must be approved by the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate.

2.2.10 Feedback will be provided to unsuccessful applicants but, due to the large number of applications the University receives each year, this may only be at the specific request of the applicant to the central Undergraduate Admissions Office or the relevant Faculty Postgraduate Admissions Office. Feedback will normally only be provided to the applicant themselves, not to any third party (such as parent or teacher).

2.2.11 The University does not allow appeals by unsuccessful applicants against admissions decisions. However, if an applicant believes that their application has not been dealt with fairly in accordance with the Admissions Policy or believes that University procedures have not been followed properly, then they can contact the Undergraduate Admissions Office or relevant Faculty Postgraduate Admissions Office in the first instance. Should the issues not be resolved by the Director of Admissions, a formal written complaint will be dealt with by the University’s Complaints Co-ordinator.

2.3 ADMISSIONS TO UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMMES

Process

2.3.1 Applications for full-time UK undergraduate programmes are made through the Universities and Colleges Admissions Service (UCAS): http://www.ucas.com/ and handled by the University’s Undergraduate Admissions Office. Applications for part-time undergraduate study are made direct to the Undergraduate Admissions Office.

2.3.2 Applications for undergraduate programmes which are offered in partnership with overseas partner institutions should be made in accordance with the processes and criteria published by the partner institution.
Admission to Foundation Degree and Hons Top-up programmes

2.3.3 Admission to the Foundation Degree and Hons Top-up programmes offered by the Centre for Training and Development (CETAD) on the basis of the Accreditation of Prior Learning (APL) is possible under University policy and procedures on the recognition and accreditation of prior learning.

2.4 ADMISSIONS TO POSTGRADUATE PROGRAMMES

Process

2.4.1 Each person desiring to undertake postgraduate study in the University shall apply to the relevant Faculty Postgraduate Admissions Office, using the My Applications online applications service: (www.lancs.ac.uk/study/postgraduate/how-to-apply-for-postgraduate-study/).

2.4.2 The Faculty which considers an application may decide that the application should be rejected, or may recommend to the University that the candidate be accepted unconditionally or on stated conditions. When a Faculty makes an offer to an applicant it shall specify, in accordance with these regulations:

(a) the degree or diploma for which the applicant is to be registered;
(b) the conditions, if any, which the applicant must satisfy in order to be admitted;
(c) any coursework or preparatory work that is required;
(d) in the case of a research student, the field of research;
(e) the minimum and maximum periods of registration;
(f) whether the applicant is to be registered as full-time or part-time;
(g) whether the work for the degree is to be carried out at the University; if elsewhere, it must specify how appropriate contact with the University will be maintained;
(h) the name of the supervisor(s);
(i) where applicable, the amount of any supplementary fee payable.

Admissions criteria for diplomas and certificates and taught Masters degrees (leading to the award of LLM, MA, MBA, MMu, MSc and MRes)

2.4.3 The admission requirements shall normally be:

*either* at least a second class honours degree of a British University;
*or* a recognised equivalent qualification from a University outside the UK;
*or* a relevant professional qualification at an equivalent level.

2.4.4 Candidates holding other academic qualifications may also be considered for admission provided that they have substantial relevant professional experience. Individual exceptions may be considered in the normal admission process; approval for systematic exceptions to normal admission requirements must be obtained in advance from the relevant faculty teaching committee(s), with advice and input from Academic Standards and Quality.
2.4.5 For entry to a postgraduate diploma or postgraduate certificate, candidates must be graduates of a recognised University or comparable institution, or must in other ways be qualified to be regarded by the University as the equivalent of such graduates.

MA/MSc by Research: admissions criteria

2.4.6 The admission requirements for the degree of MA/MSc by Research shall normally be a good honours degree of a recognised University or comparable institution or qualifications regarded by the University as the equivalent.

MPhil: admissions criteria

2.4.7 The admission requirements for the degree of Master of Philosophy (MPhil) shall normally be a good honours degree of a recognised University or comparable institution or qualifications regarded by the University as equivalent.

PhD: admissions criteria

2.4.8 Candidates for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) shall be good honours graduates of a recognised University or comparable University, or persons of equivalent qualifications who show evidence of exceptional ability, or who have demonstrated their ability in graduate studies. Before a candidate is registered for the degree of PhD the University may require:

(a) that the candidate obtain the degree of LLM, MA, MBA, MMus, MSc, or MRes; and/or
(b) that other prescribed coursework or preparatory work (which may be formally assessed) be undertaken and completed satisfactorily.

PhD by Published Work: admissions criteria

2.4.9 Candidates for the degree of PhD by submission of published work must be:

(a) members or past members of staff at Lancaster University or at one of Lancaster University's associated institutions (Edge Hill University, University of Cumbria, Blackburn College, and Blackpool and The Fylde College); or
(b) alumni of Lancaster University or of one of Lancaster University's associated institutions.

In order to be eligible for consideration, alumni must be graduates of at least five years' standing and have already obtained a master's degree or show evidence of having received research training or equivalent experience. In exceptional circumstances, other candidates may also be considered.
3. **REGISTRATION AND ENROLMENT**

3.1 **INDUCTION AND ORIENTATION**

3.1.1 The University will provide induction and orientation for all new students. There will be an Introductory Week at the start of each new academic session and other activities, as appropriate, for students whose programmes of study start at another point during the year.

3.1.2 A designated central administrative office (currently Student Based Services) will be responsible for coordinating the introductory programme with input from colleges, academic departments and other central services.

3.1.3 Induction activities will cover academic, administrative, social and welfare issues.

3.2 **MATRICULATION AND REGISTRATION**

3.2.1 All applicants who have firmly accepted offers of a place to study at Lancaster will be required to matriculate and register in order to become students of the University. These administrative procedures will be organised by the Student Registry. All students will be required to re-register at the start of every succeeding academic session.

3.2.2 No student shall normally be allowed to register concurrently for more than the equivalent of one full-time higher or further education scheme of study.

3.2.3 Every student becomes liable for the full sessional fee when s/he matriculates, and payment must be made according to the schedule published in advance to each student. It is a condition of the acceptance of matriculation that a binding undertaking to meet all University charges should be made. The University may refuse to matriculate a student who, on request before or at the time of matriculation, is unable to show that s/he has or may reasonably expect the means to pay his or her fees and meet other financial commitments whilst a student. Fees, appropriate to the form of registration and approved from time to time, are payable from the date of first registration to the date of completion of the course or submission of the thesis. Fees shall be charged pro rata to the appropriate rate for periods of registration of less than twelve months, including any period in excess of the prescribed minimum period which a student needs in order to complete the requirements of the degree. Fees are due within seven days of the date of the invoice. In accordance with the Rules of the University and the procedures in case of fee debt, any student who does not pay the tuition fees when due or make agreed special arrangements with the Credit Control Office regarding the timing of the payment of fees, may be excluded from the University. See Chapter 8: Fee Regulations and Debt Procedures for full details.

3.2.4 At the point of initial registration the Student Registry shall inform students of the University’s policy on intellectual property and offer the opportunity to read and complete a statement on assigning intellectual property rights. Students should familiarize themselves with any terms and conditions relating to intellectual property rights and their assignment which are set out in any funding arrangements they have undertaken with research councils or other funding bodies. The Rules of the University contain the regulations on intellectual property.
3.2.5 Students should be informed that the information they provide on registering with the University will be held securely and may be shared within the institution across relevant departments and administrative sections for the purpose of managing and administering their degree programme or course.

3.2.6 The Student Registry shall be responsible for the creation and maintenance of the definitive student record to be used for registration, the timetabling of teaching and examinations, results and awards, fees billing and data returns to HESA and HEFCE. The Student Registry shall be responsible for liaising with academic departments and colleges to ensure that data is up to date and accurate.

3.3 ENROLMENT

Undergraduate and postgraduate students

3.3.1 Newly matriculated and registered students are required to enrol for the modules and must enrol for the appropriate number and type of modules for the programme of study for which they are registered.

3.3.2 Enrolment will be coordinated by the Student Registry but academic advice and guidance will be provided by academic departments.

3.3.3 In order to enrol on certain Undergraduate modules, both at Part I and Part II, students may be required to have particular qualifications. This may be a particular ‘A’ level or GCSE or equivalent or the appropriate Part I module(s). The academic department is responsible for informing students in advance of the enrolment process of any additional requirements or exclusions relating to particular modules.

3.3.4 Where modules carry quotas to protect the quality of the learning experience for all students who take them, academic departments are responsible for informing the Student Registry, in advance of any enrolment process, of their intention to impose a quota on any modules for which they are responsible. The quota should be agreed, prior to enrolment, by the relevant faculty teaching committee(s).

3.3.5 Students should be informed of the quota for any of their selected modules at enrolment and academic departments, in conjunction with the Student Registry, should advise students who encounter difficulties in their module choices.

3.3.6 Students shall be permitted to change module enrolments within approved time limits which will be specified at the time of initial enrolment.

3.3.7 Academic departments shall inform students at the time of module enrolment of the assessment methods to be used for each module and of the system whereby marks for written examinations and coursework assessment are combined. Departments shall also inform students if formal examinations are to be held at times other than the main University examination session and also if there are to be any class examinations that may be held at any time during the term.
3.3.8 Undergraduate students who take additional modules – e.g. *ab initio* language modules, the Lancaster Award offered by the Careers office or additional information technology modules which are followed at a different level to Part II – must be informed, at the time of enrolment, that they may not include such courses in their array of Part II units for the purposes of degree classification. However, information about any such module shall be available to boards of examiners and can be drawn upon if there are special mitigating circumstances that merit a proposal to the Committee of the Senate. Students who enrol for such modules shall be told that upon completion of the modules and the associated assessment they shall have the marks they achieve recorded on the transcript which all students receive on completion of Part II.

**Part-time UG students**

3.3.9 Each department having part-time Part II major students shall designate a member of staff to be director of studies for such students. These directors of part-time studies (as they are referred to below) shall normally be appointed for a period of not less than 3 years.

3.3.10 Directors of part-time studies shall be responsible for advising on, and approving, part-time students’ programmes of study, including their individual course registrations and the timing of courses and examinations. Where a part-time student is registered for a combined major degree programme, the directors of part-time studies in the major departments concerned shall jointly advise the student on, and approve, his or her Part II programme of study.

3.3.11 At or before the beginning of the first year of Part II, and again at or before the beginning of the third year of Part II (where Part II lasts four years) – or at appropriate stages where Part II lasts three or five years – the director of studies shall discuss with the student and approve his or her scheme of study for the following two or more years, including the timing of individual course registrations and of examinations. The director(s) may approve variations in these schemes, in the light of changes in the student’s circumstances or interests.

4. **ACADEMIC GUIDANCE, TUTORIAL AND LEARNING SUPPORT**

**4.1 RESPONSIBILITIES**

4.1.1 The University has a responsibility to ensure that all students have access to tutoring provision through personal tutors or other forms of support within the academic department responsible for the degree programme for which the student is registered and that there is provision for personal welfare in conjunction with specialist services outside the department.

4.1.2 Departments are required to make arrangements for, and to monitor the provision of, academic guidance, tutorial and learning support and related services for students. For the academic support of undergraduate students, departments are required to implement the University’s Academic Tutor system, as approved by Senate, which sets out specific requirements for this group of students (see 4.2 below). Detailed information and guidance is available via the website at: [https://gap.lancs.ac.uk/ASQ/Policies/Pages/Academic-Tutors.aspx](https://gap.lancs.ac.uk/ASQ/Policies/Pages/Academic-Tutors.aspx).
4.1.3 Departments are required to define and communicate clearly to students how they assist students to realise the benefits of reflecting on and recording learning, the development of employment awareness and career planning.

4.1.4 Departments should ensure that they provide guidance and information to students on the following:

(a) the information needed for choices of degree programmes, modules, placement or professional practice;
(b) the requirements for academic progression;
(c) training opportunities to enable students to develop the discipline-specific and transferable skills relevant to the successful completion of a programme of study;
(d) teaching methods used for each programme of study;
(e) attendance requirements.

4.2 ROLES AND PROCEDURES

Undergraduate students

Academic Tutor Co-ordinator

4.2.1 Each department shall have an Academic Tutor Co-ordinator. The Academic Tutor Co-ordinator will allocate the Academic Tutors and be a single point of contact between the Colleges and the department.

4.2.2 The role of the Academic Tutor Co-ordinator is to:

(a) co-ordinate and monitor the academic tutorial system;
(b) report annually via the Annual Teaching Review;
(c) ensure tutors are trained and supported;
(d) facilitate joined-up support action as required with College Administrators;
(e) receive training and support as needed from Student Based Services.

Academic Tutor system

4.2.3 All undergraduates will have a named personal Academic Tutor who is a full member of academic staff (postgraduate research students and Research Assistants are not eligible to be an Academic Tutor).

4.2.4 Where students are registered on joint degrees, i.e. where they are taught by a number of departments, the administering department will have the responsibility to ensure Academic Tutors are assigned. Where students are co-located between departments (consortia-based degrees) the departments will agree modified arrangements.

4.2.5 Departments have the flexibility to determine how they implement an academic support system, however they must ensure that students are provided with a single Academic Tutor for the duration of their degree (where possible), that information on the academic support system is communicated to students through readily accessible means and that Academic Tutors provide the following support for their tutees:
(a) an initial meeting in Intro-week of their first year, and termly thereafter;
(b) help in module choice/selection;
(c) progress monitoring;
(d) career planning;
(e) sign-posting to services available elsewhere in the University.

4.2.6 In addition, the department must ensure that students are provided, either via an Academic Tutor or another clearly identified departmental or faculty-based source, with the following:

(a) support for the transition to independent learning, and study skills;
(b) information on academic opportunities (for example, study abroad, internships);
(c) information on academic expectations (for example, referencing, plagiarism);
(d) feedback on assessment.

Postgraduate taught students

4.2.7 Departmental procedures and arrangements for postgraduate students may vary, reflecting local arrangements and requirements. These may be designed to take account of the size of the department, its organisation, the characteristics of the student community and the requirements and features of its degree programmes.

4.2.8 Whatever procedures they adopt, academic departments should provide guidance to postgraduate students on the following:

(a) module choice/selection;
(b) information on academic expectations (for example, plagiarism, referencing);
(c) information on academic opportunities (for example, department/faculty research training courses);
(d) sign-posting to services available elsewhere in the University;
(e) feedback on assessment.

Specialist services

4.2.9 In addition to the provision of support and guidance at departmental level, departments are responsible for ensuring effective communication and liaison with Colleges, the Library and Information Systems Services (ISS), and with other central services including Student Based Services, the Student Registry and the Careers office which, between them, are responsible for providing students with a range of specialist services, including student advisory and counselling support, career advice and information, information relating to fees and loans, and provision for students with particular educational needs.

4.3 RETURN OF MARKED COURSEWORK

4.3.1 The time elapsed between a coursework submission deadline and the date when full feedback (including a mark or grade) is made available to students should be as small as possible; in particular, the time elapsed should be no more than four weeks, excluding University closure periods, for all undergraduate and taught postgraduate work. Students should be kept informed regarding any unforeseen delay.
4.3.2 Because dissertations and extended projects are longer and more complex, they are not subject to this requirement; however the expected time taken must be explicitly stated by a department in its published information for students at the start of the academic year.

4.4 INTERCALATION

4.4.1 Students who wish or need to interrupt their studies for a period of time may apply to intercalate. This process is co-ordinated by the Student Registry upon the submission of details from the academic departments.

Undergraduate students

4.4.2 Intercalating students and candidates for external reassessment who are due to be examined in a course already attended must write to the head of the relevant department at the beginning of the academic year, requesting:

(a) details of any changes of syllabus (including details of set books) for courses which will affect the scope of such examinations to be set that year;
(b) where changes of syllabus have taken place, whether he or she will be required to take:
   (i) the same examination paper as other undergraduates;
   (ii) the same examination paper as other undergraduates, but with additional special questions which take account of the changed syllabus;
   (iii) a specially set examination paper;
(c) any changes, since the last academic year, where coursework will be taken into account.

4.4.3 If, after replying to an initial enquiry, a department introduces further changes which will affect the scope of an examination to be taken during the year by an undergraduate or a candidate for external reassessment, that department shall be responsible for keeping the individual informed of such further changes.

4.4.4 Students shall be reminded by departments, in the Summer Term before final examinations begin, that it is essential for them to provide fully documented information about any continuing circumstances which may affect academic performance, especially if they wish such information to be taken into account by boards of examiners.

Postgraduate students

4.4.5 Requests for intercalations and extensions will only be approved by Student Registry, if they meet agreed criteria, are supported by appropriate evidence, and are formally submitted in advance. Intercalations and extensions will only be granted retroactively in exceptional circumstances, where the need could not reasonably have been foreseen. Where approved retroactively, the date of commencement of the period of intercalation will not, unless exceptional circumstances exist, be backdated more than three months prior to the date the intercalation request form is received by the Student Registry.
5. **ATTENDANCE AND REGISTRATION STATUS**

5.1 **UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS**

**Full-time students**

5.1.1 Full-time undergraduate students are required to register at times to be specified and to be engaged full-time on their studies for the full period of each term and/or for such other periods as may be stated in the regulations for particular courses. The place of work will be the University and/or such other places as the department(s) concerned may specify. Students must present themselves for examination when required to do so.

**Part-time students**

5.1.2 Part-time Part I students shall undertake coursework in the same manner and at the same times as full-time undergraduates registered for the same Part I course(s).

5.1.3 They shall take the relevant examination(s) in each Part I course in June of the academic year in which that course is completed.

5.1.4 Each department having part-time Part II major students shall designate a member of staff to be director of studies for such students. These directors of part-time studies (as they are referred to below) shall normally be appointed for a period of not less than 3 years.

5.1.5 Directors of part-time studies shall be responsible for advising on, and approving, part-time students’ programmes of study, including their individual course registrations and the timing of courses and examinations. Where a part-time student is registered for a combined major degree programme, the directors of part-time studies in the major departments concerned shall jointly advise the student on, and approve, his or her Part II programme of study.

5.1.6 At or before the beginning of the first year of Part II, and again at or before the beginning of the third year of Part II (where Part II lasts four years), or at appropriate stages where Part II lasts three or five years, the director of studies shall discuss with the student and approve his or her scheme of study for the following two or more years, including the timing of individual course registrations and of examinations. The director(s) may approve variations in these schemes, in the light of changes in the student’s circumstances or interests.

5.1.7 Where the assessment of a course includes formal examinations, a part-time student should normally be examined in the course either in May/June of the year in which the course was taken or in May/June of the following year. The timing of the examinations should take account of the student’s personal circumstances and work load. A part-time student is expected to complete coursework (including any dissertation) for a particular course by the same dates as full-time students registered for that course.
5.2 POSTGRADUATE STUDENTS

Full-time students

5.2.1 Full-time graduate students are required to register at times to be specified and, unless registered as part-time students, they are required to be engaged full-time on their studies for the duration of their course except for up to 20 days' holidays as approved in writing by their department(s) or supervisor(s). Students must present themselves for examination when required to do so.

Part-time students

5.2.2 A part-time postgraduate student is a person who is registered for a recognised scheme of study but undertaking the work over an agreed longer period of time.

Full-time students: paid employment

5.2.3 A full-time postgraduate student may, subject to the approval of the department(s) concerned, undertake demonstrating, teaching or other academic-related work, provided that the work is compatible with the student's academic obligations. The total time devoted to such work shall not exceed an average of six hours per week in any one term.

5.2.4 Students should consult the department(s) concerned prior to undertaking any other paid work, in order to ensure that the work would not interfere with their studies.

5.2.5 International students must also ensure that any work (paid or voluntary) will not conflict with their visa requirements.

5.2.6 The above regulations apply in addition to any such conditions laid down by grant-awarding bodies.

Further information on the employment of postgraduate students is available via the Code of Practice for the Employment of Postgraduate Students at: https://gap.lancs.ac.uk/ASQ/Policies/Pages/Policies%20and%20Guidelines.aspx

5.3 ATTENDANCE MONITORING

Undergraduate and postgraduate taught students

5.3.1 Each department should define a compulsory event for each module which occurs at least every fortnight (this can include submission of coursework, as well as attendance at seminars, tutorials, labs, etc.).

5.3.2 Attendance at compulsory events must be recorded on LUSI at least once every two weeks.

5.3.3 All students must be informed in writing, preferably in programme handbooks, at the start of the academic year of what is required of them in relation to attendance.
5.3.4 All departments must supply the list of compulsory events for each module to the Head of the Student Registry.

Further guidance on the implementation of the attendance monitoring requirements may be obtained from the Student Registry.

Postgraduate research students

5.3.5 Supervisors and students should agree at least one fortnightly interaction – whether by email, face-to-face contact, submission of a draft chapter, etc.

5.3.6 This programme of interactions must be written.

5.3.7 Supervisors must keep records of substantive interactions with students.

5.3.8 In the event of no contact at eight expected interactions, supervisors should notify the Head of the Student Registry.

6. **ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE**

6.1 In order to remain in good academic standing with the University it is expected that students will attend compulsory elements of the course as stipulated by the department and should attend examinations and submit coursework assignments at the times stipulated.

6.2 If students do not remain in good academic standing it is the responsibility of the departments to record attempts to contact the student and initiate an academic recovery plan.

6.3 For Postgraduate taught and Undergraduate students. The course director shall inform the head of the relevant department(s) if ever the student’s work or attendance is unsatisfactory. If the head(s) of department, after confirming that appropriate warnings in writing have been given to the student, consider(s) that the student should be excluded from the University, a recommendation to that effect shall be submitted to the Standing Academic Committee, which has power to exclude the student from the University permanently or for a stated time and to stipulate conditions for a resumption of study. (NB. Postgraduate research issues are managed through the requirements for progression as outlined in the Postgraduate Taught Assessment Regulations.)

6.4 It is the responsibility of the Student Registry to advise and support departments which have students who are no longer in good standing, and to take appropriate action.

6.5 There is a Standing Academic Committee of the Senate to which students in bad academic standing may be referred. This Committee is empowered to exclude students from the University, either temporarily or permanently.
7. **STUDENT COMPLAINTS**

7.1 **INTRODUCTION**

7.1.1 Lancaster University seeks at all times to provide its students with a high quality student experience. Through both formal representation and regular feedback students are engaged in the decision-making processes to ensure this, however, there may be occasions where students, either individually or in a group, are dissatisfied with a particular service or aspect of their education and want to make a complaint. These procedures set out how this will be managed, the responsibilities of all parties, and the opportunity for external scrutiny should students remain dissatisfied with the University.

7.1.2 These procedures apply to all current students registered on a Lancaster University programme, with the exception of those students registered on collaborative teaching programmes where an alternative complaints procedure has been formally approved as being procedurally equivalent. A student is expected to invoke the procedures within one month of the final element of the event(s) that will be subject to the complaint occurring. A student who has left the University can also invoke the procedures, again within one month of end of registration. Exceptions will be determined on an ad hoc basis by the Complaints Co-ordinator. These procedures do not apply to persons applying to come onto a Lancaster programme, i.e. admissions.

7.1.3 The complaints procedures abide by the following principles.

(a) Students will not be hindered in making a reasonable complaint. All parties will act without bias or prejudice and in a sensitive, fair and prompt manner.

(b) The objective of the procedure is to establish the facts and come to a reasonable and just resolution, which is both relevant and proportionate.

(c) No students will be disadvantaged for making complaints in good faith, and all reasonable complaints will be taken seriously and dealt with according to the agreed procedures. However, if it is established that complaints are frivolous or spurious, then they will not be considered reasonable, and the University may take disciplinary action.

(d) The University will deal with all complaints confidentially so far as it is able, and expects all parties involved to honour this approach.

(e) Members of staff who receive anonymous complaints will not investigate such complaints unless there is compelling evidence of a valid case and good reason why the students in the case would need to protect their anonymity.

(f) All reasonable measure will be taken to ensure that no student is disadvantaged within these processes due to location, requirements associated with protected characteristics, etc. Technology will be used, as appropriate, to facilitate these procedures.
7.1.4 Student complaints may be lodged against:

- members of University staff;
- constituent elements of the University (departments, faculties, the Library, colleges, administrative or support services, et al.);
- the entire University.

7.1.5 Under these procedures, students cannot complain about:

- other students;
- persons on campus who are not members of the University;
- on campus facilities over which the University has no authority (e.g. commercial businesses, transport links, et al.).

Students wishing to complain about these areas can seek the advice of either the Students’ Union or the Complaints Co-ordinator as to how best to take them forward.

7.1.6 These procedures also do not apply to dissatisfaction about:

- decisions of Boards of Examiners or other academic matters governed by the Academic Appeal Procedures (i.e. matters of academic judgement);
- actions and behaviours where other University procedures apply and take precedence (for example those elements considered under the auspices of the Standing Academic Committee);
- Services provided by the Students’ Union (they have their own complaints procedures);
- any potential breach of criminal law (these will normally be referred to the police);
- decisions made by College Deans/University Dean in line with the Rules of the University.

7.1.7 Complaints relating to allegations of bullying or harassment will normally be dealt with in accordance with the University’s Bullying and Harassment Policy.

7.1.8 Advice on how to use this procedure is available from the Students’ Union Education and Welfare Office or from the University Complaints Co-ordinator.

7.2 APPLICATIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROCEDURE

7.2.1 The complaints procedure only applies to complaints initiated and conducted by an individual student or group of students; a group will nominate a spokesperson for communication. A complainant has the right to be accompanied and supported at any meeting by one person, and may be represented where the complainant expressly authorises a third party in writing to act on their behalf.

7.2.2 The University will make every reasonable effort to complete complaints procedures in a timely manner and aims to complete all aspects of the complaints process within ninety calendar days. If the University is unable reasonably to comply (for example, due to vacation periods, in factually complex matters involving a number of individuals, etc.) it will provide the complainant with an explanation and inform them of the timeframe in which the procedure will be completed.
7.2.3 In this procedure any reference to named members of University staff also includes reference to her/his nominee and named staff may delegate their responsibilities to other appropriate members of staff without invalidating the procedure. The identity of nominees or members of staff to whom responsibilities are delegated will be notified to the complainant.

7.2.4 The Senate, on the recommendation of the University Chief Administrative Officer & Secretary, will appoint a University Complaints Co-ordinator who will oversee this process and provide advice to all parties, both students and those subject to complaints, on process. Any evidence of breaches of the principles as set out in 7.1.3 above should be brought to the attention of the Complaints Co-ordinator for investigation. The Complaints Co-ordinator is not, however, an advocate for either party. The Complaints Co-ordinator will play an advisory role in complaint reviews and will act as the primary liaison with the Office for the Independent Adjudicator.

7.2.5 Should a student wish to register a complaint against the Complaints Co-ordinator it should be sent to the University Chief Administrative Officer & Secretary.

7.2.6 A Complaints Panel, chaired by the Provost for Student Experience, Colleges and the Library, and comprised of Complaint Investigators, Complaint Officers and chairs of Complaints Panels, will meet on an annual basis to review all complaints and agree an annual report including recommendations for action by the University. The Colleges and Student Experience Committee will receive this report and is responsible to both Council and Senate for monitoring student complaints. UMAG and the Academic Quality and Standards Committee will also receive the report for information.

7.3 THE PROCEDURE

7.3.1 The University uses a three-stage complaints procedure.

7.3.2 Stage 1 – the Informal Stage

7.3.2.1 Many complaints are the result of either a misunderstanding or a lack of communication and can be resolved easily and quickly at a local level. Students wanting to complain are strongly advised to contact the member of staff who is most immediately relevant (either the subject of the complaint or the person best in a position to fix the problem). If the student feels unable to approach this person directly, then they should speak to the Head of Department, College Principal, Director of the relevant service, or equivalent senior member of staff.

7.3.2.2 Students who believe that their complaint has not been or cannot be appropriately, fairly or reasonably addressed through informal resolution may proceed to Stage 2 below.

7.3.3 Stage 2 – the Formal Stage

7.3.3.1 In order for the complaint to be considered formally, the complainant must put the complaint in writing using the Formal Complaint Form (available for online submission and in hard copy) and send it to the University Complaints Co-ordinator.
7.3.2 The University Complaints Co-ordinator will consider the complaint and make a *prima facie* decision as to whether it can be considered under this procedure. Where it cannot, the Co-ordinator will either:

(a) refer the complainant to an alternate more appropriate procedure;
(b) enter into a discussion with the complainant, and other parties as appropriate, as to how best to take forward the concerns (e.g. in cases where the concerns involve a number of elements which cross University procedures); or
(c) provide an explanation to the complainant as to why no action can be taken along with a Completion of Procedures letter which sets out their right to refer the matter to the Office for the Independent Adjudicator and describe the means to do so.

7.3.3 If the complaint has been deemed within the scope of this procedure, the complainant will be referred to a nominated Complaints Investigator within the appropriate College, Faculty, Partner Organisation, Professional Service or other relevant body. The complainant will be offered a personal meeting with the Complaints Investigator to explain their complaint and why they remain dissatisfied; a designated Complaints Officer will take meeting notes. The student, via the Students’ Union, will be offered support for their complaint. Similarly, the member of staff will also be offered support as appropriate.

7.3.4 The Complaints Investigator will instigate whatever investigation is considered appropriate and proportionate in order to establish the facts of the case, supported by a Complaints Officer. Investigations, unless agreed by both the University and the complainant, will take no longer than one calendar month. In the interests of transparency, fairness and integrity, the investigation will be conducted through a process of open correspondence, unless there are pressing reasons for any information or communication to remain confidential. As such, all parties will see all the relevant documentation (subject to data protection restrictions) and, if meetings are held with members of staff or other students, notes will be taken and all parties will be entitled to a copy.

7.3.5 Following investigation, the Complaints Investigator will present the findings to a Complaints Panel of three persons comprising a senior member of staff (in the Chair) plus another member of staff (appointed by the relevant Head – Dean, Director, etc.) and a student (appointed by the Students’ Union President through Students’ Union Council). A note taker will also be in attendance throughout. Dates for Complaint Panels will be formally scheduled into the timetable of meetings. The complainant may attend the event, although it is not required and failure to attend would not stop the proceeding. If present, the complainant, following the presentation by the Complaints Investigator, will be invited to make a short personal statement and, through the Chair, ask questions of the Complaints Investigator. The Investigator will not be allowed to question the complainant. The panel will be allowed, through the Chair, to question both the Complaints Investigator and the complainant. It will not normally be permissible to call witnesses as part of the panel hearing, as it is expected that these people will have been consulted during the investigation; however, the Chair may allow it at their discretion. Both the Complaints Investigator and the complainant will be given the opportunity to sum up their position. The burden of proof will be on the complainant, albeit within a recognition of the responsibilities of the University.
Following the proceeding, the panel will deliberate in private using the balance of probability as the standard of proof, and will either uphold or dismiss the complaint in whole or in part and agree actions/remedies accordingly. A Complaints Officer will be available to provide advice on the scope of actions/remedies available to the Panel.

7.3.3.6 The complainant will receive a written decision that addresses the points they have made and gives reasons for the conclusion reached. The letter will also advise the complainant of their right to refer the matter to Stage 3 and describe the means to do so.

7.3.3.7 Where recommendations are made as a consequence of the complaint, the complainant will be entitled to know what these may be and how the University intends to take them forward.

7.3.3.8 If the complainant feels their complaint is resolved, they should indicate this to the Complaints Co-ordinator in writing.

7.3.4 Stage 3 – the Review Stage

7.3.4.1 If the complainant feels their complaint has not been resolved under Stage 2, they may apply to the Complaints Co-ordinator within two weeks of the date of the Stage 2 written decision for a formal review. They should explain why they feel dissatisfied with the outcome at Stage 2 and what remedy they seek. Requests for Stage 3 consideration can only be made on the following grounds:

(a) that there exists evidence that could not reasonably have been made available at Stage 2; or
(b) that there exists evidence of a material procedural irregularity in Stage 2; or
(c) that there exists evidence that the judgement at Stage 2 was perverse.

No new ground of complaint may be requested at Stage 3, but the complainant may submit further evidence in support of their case (subject to point (a) above) or suggest a new remedy.

7.3.4.2 The University Complaints Co-ordinator will consider the application and make a *prima facie* decision as to whether or not to instigate a review. Where a review is rejected the Complaints Co-ordinator will write to the complainant explaining the reasons for the decision and providing a Completion of Procedures letter that sets out their right to refer the matter to the Office for the Independent Adjudicator and describes the means to do so.

7.3.4.3 Where a review is deemed within the scope of the procedures a Review Panel will be convened. The panel will consist of either the Provost for Student Experience, Colleges and the Library or the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) (in the chair) and two others (one member of staff and one student, appointed as in 7.3.3.5 above). No members of the panel will have been associated with the complaint or the institutional body (Faculty, *et al.*) against which the complaint has been made. Dates for Review Panels will be formally scheduled into the timetable of meetings.
7.3.4.4 The Complaints Co-ordinator, or nominee, will act as Clerk to the panel and will prepare the documentation. The Chair of the Stage 2 Panel will be invited to submit a statement addressing the complainant’s submission. The complainant may submit additional material only if there are good reasons why they were not submitted at Stage 2 (see 7.3.4.1 above). Both the complainant and the Chair of the Review Panel will be invited to attend; however failure to attend by either party will not invalidate the proceeding, as determination will be made via the submitted documentation.

7.3.4.5 If present, the complainant will be invited to make an opening statement as to why, in their view, the case should be subject to review. This will be restricted to consideration against the identified review grounds; the Review Panel will not rehear the original complaint. If present, the Chair of the Stage 2 Complaints Panel will then be invited to present an opening statement explaining how the Stage 2 decisions was determined and how, in their view, it was reasonable. If the complainant presents either new evidence or alternate remedies the Stage 2 Review Panel Chair will also be invited to comment on these. Neither the complainant nor the Stage 2 Chair will be allowed to question the other, but the members of the Review Panel, through the Chair, may question either. Both the Stage 2 Chair and the complainant will be given the opportunity to sum up their position. The burden of proof will be on the complainant, and the standard of proof will be on the balance of probability. Following the proceeding, the panel will deliberate in private and will determine their conclusions, including, as appropriate, any modifications and/or additions to the Stage 2 actions/remedies. Only in exceptional circumstances would a rehearing at Stage 2 be recommended. The Complaints Co-ordinator will provide advice on the scope of actions/remedies available to the Panel.

7.3.4.6 The complainant will receive a written decision that addresses the points they have made and gives reasons for the conclusion reached. They will also receive a Completion of Procedures letter that will advise the complainant of their right to refer the matter to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator and describe the means to do so.

7.4. OFFICE OF THE INDEPENDENT ADJUDICATOR

Once all internal complaints procedures have been exhausted, if the student is still not satisfied they have the right to take the case to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) for Higher Education, for further review. The application to the OIA must be made within 12 months of the issue of the Completion of Procedures letter. Information about OIA and its processes can be found at www.oiahe.org.uk.

8. FEE REGULATIONS AND DEBT PROCEDURES

8.1 TUITION FEES LIABILITY

8.1.1 Every student becomes liable for the full sessional fee when s/he matriculates, and payment must be made according to the schedule published in advance to each student. It is a condition of the acceptance of matriculation that a binding undertaking to meet all University charges should be made. The University may refuse to matriculate a student who, on request before or at the time of matriculation, is unable to show that s/he has or may reasonably expect the means to pay his or her fees and meet other financial commitments whilst a student. Fees, appropriate to the form of registration and approved from time to time, are payable from the date of first registration to the date of
completion of the course or submission of the thesis. Fees shall be charged pro rata to the appropriate rate for periods of registration of less than twelve months, including any period in excess of the prescribed minimum period which a student needs in order to complete the requirements of the degree.

8.2 SPECIAL ARRANGEMENTS APPLYING TO POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH STUDENTS

Supplementary fees for postgraduate research student

8.2.1 A special supplementary fee may be charged where the student's programme of research causes the University to be put to special expense, such as the supervision of work away from Lancaster. The amount of the supplementary fee shall be subject to the approval of Student Registry and shall be notified to the student in advance of registration or re-registration.

Duration of fee liability

8.2.2 Fee liability for PhD students is in accordance with the minimum registration i.e. 3 years full-time, 4 years part-time, but that may exceptionally be reduced by up to 6 months for both full-time and part-time students (with fees adjusted accordingly) where the student is able to submit their thesis early, with the support of the supervisors and the prior approval of Student Registry.

8.2.3 Fee liability for MPhil students is in accordance with the minimum registration i.e. 2 years full-time, 3 years part-time, but that may exceptionally be reduced by up to 6 months for both full-time and part-time students (with fees adjusted accordingly) where the student is able to submit their thesis early, with the support of the supervisors and the prior approval of Student Registry.

8.2.4 If the upgrade from MPhil to PhD or confirmation of PhD status has not taken place within the minimum registration period, after the change, the PhD fee liability shall be for a minimum of 12 months.

Fees for students who have reached their expected period of submission

8.2.5 A postgraduate student who, after completing the minimum registration period, continues to be registered but makes no demands on the facilities of the University apart from strictly limited supervision during the last stages of thesis preparation will be eligible for payment of a reduced composite fee at rates which shall be determined from time to time. The reduced composite fee shall be payable in full in respect of each year (excluding any period of suspension). In the case of part-time PhD programmes the expected period of registration will be taken to have expired when a complete first draft is presented. Where a postgraduate student has access to funding for a period longer than the University’s minimum period of registration and continues to need supervision and use of the University’s facilities in order to complete the thesis, the department may request that the University continues to charge that student the full fee. It is the responsibility of the department to notify Student Registry of any such cases and the Student Registry will then ensure the full fee will continue to be charged.

8.2.6 A student who transfers to extension status at any date during the academic year will be charged the annual extension fee.
8.3 NOTIFICATION AND PAYMENT PROCEDURES

8.3.1 All students shall receive notification, to the correspondence address current at the time, of the amount of fees due prior to their first registration, which will come into effect normally in October or at stated times of year for schemes of study that commence at other periods. The notification will set out the fees payable by students to the University and/or for IT/Library facilities. Failure to make payments on demand will result in matriculation or registration being withheld until satisfactory arrangements have been made. Payments shall be made in a form specified by the University and a receipt shall be given.

8.3.2 All students personally liable for all or part of their tuition fees shall receive an invoice, on dates to be published by the University, showing the sums to be paid in respect of fees and any balance outstanding. The balance shall be payable no later than seven days after the date of the issue of the invoice.

8.4 NON-PAYMENT OF FEES DUE

8.4.1 In accordance with the Rules of the University and the procedures in case of fee debt, any student who does not pay the tuition fees when due or make agreed special arrangements with the Credit Control Office regarding the timing of the payment of fees, may have IT and Library facilities suspended and this may be followed by exclusion from the University.

8.4.2 After the seven-day period from the due date has elapsed the University will initiate procedures to collect the debt. Students who have not paid their fees will be sent a letter requesting them to make immediate arrangements for the debt to be discharged or to make a case to Student Based Services for alternative payment arrangements. The case will be considered by the Director of Student Based Services, or nominee, and agreed arrangements for payment of the debt given in writing.

8.4.3 If at any time after registration students encounter unforeseen financial difficulties due to changes in circumstances, they shall consult Student Based Services in order to discuss what alternative arrangements for payment are available and on what conditions. Availability of this service shall continue throughout the steps listed below. Failure by the student to fulfil the conditions relating to any agreed alternative arrangements set down in writing will cause action to be taken under the same procedures as for the original debt.

8.5 DEBT PROCEDURES

8.5.1 All students who, after 90 days have elapsed since the due date, have neither paid their fees, nor made agreed arrangements to do so, shall be the subject of a review process. This process will initiate the suspension of IT and Library facilities. Students will be notified that their cases are being reviewed and provided with a date when IT and Library facilities may be suspended.

8.5.2 After a further 30 days have elapsed, the University reserves the right to appoint a debt collection agency and commence and commence appropriate legal action to recover fees and other dues payable to it, in addition to the procedures described above.
8.6 APPEAL TO THE VICE-CHANCELLOR

8.6.1 Any student whose membership of the University is terminated as a consequence of the application of the procedures under 8.5 above has the right of appeal under Ordinance 7.

8.7 REFUNDS

8.7.1 Any student who has overpaid will receive a refund.

8.7.2 Refunds for periods of absence shall normally be made only if suspension of registration is formally approved.

8.7.3 Fees are not normally refunded to or in respect of a student who withdraws or is excluded during a session. The University policy on the refunding of fees for students who have withdrawn or been excluded is as follows.

(a) Before the end of the first week of registration – no charge.

(b) After the first week but before the end of the fourth week – charged for the number of weeks of attendance (rounded up).

(c) After week four – no refund, charged for the full year.

(d) In applying the above policies, the University will have regard to the circumstances of individual cases and will act with sensitivity and compassion when dealing with special circumstances.

(e) In cases where a dispute arises, the matter would be referred in the first instance to the Student Registry.

8.8 OTHER FEES

Re-examination fees

8.8.1 A fee at a rate determined from time to time shall be payable by a student who is given permission to resit any examination or resubmit a dissertation.

8.8.2 A fee at a rate determined from time to time shall be payable by a candidate for the degree of PhD, MPhil, DClinPsy, DMgt, EngD or MD, who is allowed to resubmit a thesis. An appropriate tuition fee may be charged to students who are allowed to resubmit and who will require supervision to do so.

DSc/DLitt examination fee

8.8.3 A person who applies for the degree of DSc or DLitt shall be liable for an examination fee at a rate determined from time to time.
Fees for members of staff

8.8.4 Full-time paid employees of the University who are registered for the degree of MPhil or PhD of the University shall be charged no tuition fees except when it is necessary for an employee to have an external supervisor. In this case, Student Registry may determine an appropriate fee to cover all or part of the cost of external supervision.

8.8.5 Full-time paid employees who submit a thesis for the degree of PhD by Published Work more than six months after leaving the University shall be liable for an examination fee at a rate determined from time to time.

8.8.6 See also the Lancaster University ‘Policy on the reduction of fees for Lancaster University Staff undertaking part-time research degrees’, which can be found at http://www.lancs.ac.uk/hr/development/files/feesremissweb.html.
ASSESSMENT REGULATIONS

9. DEFINITIONS, PRINCIPLES AND CONDITIONS

9.1 DEFINITIONS

Taught programmes

9.1.1 Assessment is the primary means whereby students demonstrate achievement so as to merit attainment of credit, usually as partial fulfilment of a named award. The ultimate authority for the regulation of assessment practice rests with the Senate, which, in turn, may delegate operational authority to other constituent parts of the University or those institutions with which it enters into agreements.

9.1.2 Assessment regulations are defined as the collective rules governing the structures and processes under which assessment is undertaken and managed within the University, while assessment content is defined as the pieces of work assigned as both formative and summative assessment, including, but not limited to: essays, examinations, oral presentations, practical assessments, performance, portfolios of work, poster presentations, etc.

Research programmes

9.1.3 Within postgraduate research awards, assessment is the means whereby students demonstrate scholarly research in a chosen field of study that makes an original contribution to knowledge of a standard appropriate for scholarly publication. The ultimate authority for the regulation of assessment practice rests with the Senate, which, in turn, may delegate operational authority to other constituent parts of the University or those institutions with which it enters into agreements.

9.1.4 PhDs will involve, although not necessarily be limited to, the production of a thesis – a coherent body of work, albeit potentially in a number of formats. Additional learning, either formative or summative, is seen as critical to success, particularly for individual’s career progression, but there is flexibility in both mode of delivery and required outcomes. The primary means of assessment are the thesis (or alternative body of work – see Appendix 3 of the Postgraduate Research Assessment Regulations) itself and an oral examination which is objective, independent and which demonstrates an appropriate level of externality.

9.2 PRINCIPLES AND CONDITIONS

9.2.1 The University’s Learning, Teaching and Assessment principles summarise the values upholding learning, teaching and assessment for all undergraduate and postgraduate full-time and part-time degree programmes at Lancaster University. These principles and the regulations contained in this Manual are informed by the QAA Quality Code for Higher Education and the Higher Education Credit Framework for England and are designed to ensure that assessment:
(a) informs and promotes learning by providing students with feedback on the quality of their work;
(b) measures students’ academic achievement thereby informing progression within the programme and degree classification;
(c) assures standards by demonstrating that the University’s expectations of student achievement are consistent with other HEIs and employer expectations;
(d) provides data which aids the ongoing development of teaching and learning approaches.

LINK to Learning, Teaching and Assessment principles: http://www.lancaster.ac.uk/about-us/our-principles/learning-teaching-and-assessment/

9.2.2 All assessment will comply with these regulations unless otherwise specifically approved by the University through established due process and for good reasons (for example to meet professional or statutory requirements within a professionally accredited award or to meet the particular requirements of a collaborative award).

9.2.3 All general assessment criteria for programmes and modules are approved through the agreed academic approvals process (guidance concerning this is separately available). The University is responsible for ensuring through its appropriately delegated bodies (Faculties, Schools, Departments, Professional Services (including Academic Standards and Quality and Student Registry), constituent elements of collaborative institutions, etc.) that all assessment procedures and arrangements are made known to students through approved means (programme handbooks, module outlines, LUSI, etc.).

9.2.4 The University retains the right to change assessment regulations for entire degree programmes and also the assessment content for individual modules (or equivalent units of study) through agreed academic approval procedures. All such revisions will adhere to the University’s procedures for the approval of proposed revisions to existing programmes and modules, including appropriate consultation with students, as detailed in the Course Approval Process chapter of MARP.

9.2.5 Exceptionally, when on an occasion some provisions of these regulations have not been followed, the assessment results will remain valid provided that the Head of Academic Standards and Quality and the Head of the Student Registry or other appropriately delegated officer acting on behalf of the Senate, in consultation with appropriate colleagues, are satisfied that the assessment has been conducted substantially in accordance with the regulations.

9.2.6 Appropriate provision will be made for students with a formally recognised permanent or temporary disability in accordance with the relevant procedures (for details see Appendix 1 of the General Assessment Regulations for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught Programmes).

9.2.7 All information regarding student assessment will be considered personal data and as such will be subject to both freedom of information and data protection legislation.
9.3 INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

9.3.1 All work submitted for assessment is the property of the University of Lancaster, unless otherwise stated through legal agreement (such as International Collaboration Agreements). Any commercial exploitation or other intellectual property will be subject to agreement between the parties concerned. Consent by the University for such exploitation of assessed work will not be reasonably withheld. The Rules of the University contain the regulations on intellectual property.

LINK to the Rules of the University:
http://gap.lancs.ac.uk/policy-info-guide/5-policies-procedures/rules-of-the-university/Pages/default.aspx

10. GENERAL ASSESSMENT REGULATIONS FOR UNDERGRADUATE AND POSTGRADUATE TAUGHT PROGRAMMES

10.1 SETTING AND APPROVING ASSESSMENT

10.1.1 Each approved module contributing to any degree programme(s) of the University will incorporate a scheme of assessment which:

(a) assesses student performance against the intended learning outcomes of the module;
(b) includes an appropriate combination of formative and summative elements;
(c) deploys forms of assessment appropriate to the intended learning outcomes of the module, taking due account of its credit rating;
(d) defines the way in which the results of individual papers or units of assessment are to be aggregated, averaged or profiled in order to produce an overall module grade to be used in determining the overall classification of the degree programme(s) to which the module contributes; and
(e) assigns an appropriate and approved method of moderating marks for the module.

10.1.2 For all programmes of study leading to an Honours degree, at least 50% of the Part II modules (in credit equivalence) taken by a student should involve supervised individual assessment counting for at least 30% of the total assessment for the module. This is to be checked by departments; students whose enrolment does not satisfy this requirement will not be disadvantaged in any way, and in particular will not be debarred by this regulation from qualifying for a degree. Programme exemptions from this regulation on pedagogical grounds may be approved by faculty teaching committees.

10.1.3 In addition to schemes of assessment for each module, students will have access to information on the overall assessment scheme for the award for which they are registered, together with the regulations for degree classification, where applicable.

10.1.4 Guidance will be provided to students to specify how they will receive feedback to guide their subsequent learning. That feedback will normally include the grade outcomes of summative assessment. All marks are provisional until they are confirmed or amended by the relevant examining bodies.
10.1.5 Heads of Department, or equivalent, will appoint at least one Assessment Officer per department with the following delegated responsibilities:

(a) to ensure, in conjunction with the programme Director of Studies or equivalent, that the relevant course documentation accurately describes the assessment scheme and corresponding procedures;
(b) to oversee the preparation of the relevant forms of assessment under secure conditions and ensure compliance with Senate’s requirements in respect of preparing examination papers;
(c) to ensure that External Examiner(s) are provided with the learning outcomes of the programme and constituent modules, the intentions of the forms of assessment and the appropriate grading or classification scheme in use; and are supplied with marking schemes or other guides where these are employed;
(d) to ensure that all marks are collated and that no work is missed and that all marks are recorded accurately and in the required format;
(e) to convey provisional results and other information pertaining to the course, the assessment and the students to the External Examiner(s) and to the examining bodies in the required format;
(f) to convey the results authenticated by the examining bodies to the Student Registry or equivalent in an agreed format.

Where it is deemed necessary, and at the discretion of the Head of Department or equivalent, more than one Assessment Officer will be appointed. Where this is done there will be clear information provided to all interested parties as to which Officer is responsible for which elements of assessment.

10.1.6 Heads of departments or equivalent will ensure that the assessment schemes for programme(s), and their operation, are monitored through annual quality review processes.

10.2 ADMINISTRATION OF ASSESSMENT

Guidance to students

10.2.1 Assessment takes place in a number of formats: essays, examinations, oral presentations, practical assessments, performance, portfolios of work, poster presentations, etc. Clear guidelines on submission and/or examination procedures as applicable will be accessible to all registered students. Production of these guidelines is delegated to appropriate bodies (Departments or equivalent, Student Registry, etc.) and will include, as required: examination arrangements (including alternative arrangements for students with disabilities), marking criteria, plagiarism processes, reassessment arrangements, referencing requirements, submission arrangements (for example means of recording performance, presentation format for group work, provision of receipt, requirement for student to retain copies, use of cover sheet, etc.), submission deadlines, submission format (electronic and/or hard copy), etc.
Declaration of own work

10.2.2 Students shall be required to declare, in respect of every piece of submitted coursework (including dissertations and theses), that the submitted work is their own and has not been submitted in substantially the same form towards the award of a degree or other qualificatory work by the candidate or any other person, and affirming that acknowledgement has been made to assistance given and that all major sources have been appropriately referenced. No piece of work will be accepted without the inclusion of such a statement. In the case of group work where a single submission is made by its members, all the students within the group shall sign the same statement.

Submission deadlines and penalties for late work

10.2.3 Submission and/or examination deadlines must be clearly published for all summative assessment and provided to students at the commencement of each module or equivalent.

10.2.4 For undergraduate programmes, the last possible date for submission of Part II coursework for any module in any year of an undergraduate degree programme must be not any later than the end of the third week of the Summer Term. Exceptionally, where special approval has been given (at the time of programme approval) for submission of second year dissertations and projects by the end of the first week of the following Michaelmas Term, and the work is awarded a fail mark, then students may re-submit the work once, but by no later than the end of the first week of the Lent term.

10.2.5 Clear guidelines will be provided to students both for the process of applying for deadline extensions as well as what, in general terms, constitutes fair and reasonable cause for deadline extension.

10.2.6 For undergraduate work assessed using letter grades, work submitted up to three days late without an agreed extension will receive a penalty of one full grade and zero (non-submission) thereafter. Thus, for example, A- becomes B-, C+ becomes D+, while F1 becomes F2, F2 becomes F3, and F3 becomes F4. For undergraduate work assessed using percentages, see Appendix 1 of the Undergraduate Assessment Regulations. Saturdays and Sundays are included as days in this regulation; however, where the third day falls on a Saturday or Sunday, students will have until 10.00 a.m. on Monday to hand in without receiving further penalty.

10.2.7 For postgraduate assessment, work submitted up to three days late without an agreed extension will receive a penalty of 10 percentage points and zero (non-submission) thereafter. Saturdays and Sundays are included as days in this regulation; however, where the third day falls on a Saturday or Sunday, students will have until 10.00 a.m. on Monday to hand in without receiving further penalty.

Examinations

10.2.8 The University’s requirements for the administration of examinations (undergraduate provision) are set out in Appendix 1 of the General Assessment Regulations, which includes coverage of the following matters:
(a) examination schedules and deadlines;
(b) communication to students;
(c) invigilation;
(d) security and confidentiality of examination papers and scripts;
(e) alternative arrangements for students with disabilities;
(f) regulations for the use of electronic devices in examinations.

10.3 MARKING AND MODERATION OF ASSESSMENT

Undergraduate Programmes

10.3.1 There will be agreed grading and marking criteria for all types of assessment and these will be made available to students at the appropriate times.

10.3.2 Any individual piece of assessment which is worth more than 25% of a 30-credit module (or relative proportions for larger/smaller modules) and all examination scripts (regardless of the weighting) should be subjected to the method of moderating marks assigned to the module when it was validated, i.e.:

(a) unseen double marking, where student work is independently assessed by a second marker without the knowledge of marks assigned by the first marker;
(b) second marking, where student work is assessed by more than one marker, but the second marker knows the mark allocated by the first marker;
(c) sampling, where second markers review a representative sample of work first-marked by other colleagues for the purpose of: checking the consistent application of marking criteria and moderating marks awarded (a sample from a collection of n scripts should involve five scripts or the square root of n scripts, whichever is the greater);
(d) analyses of marking trends, where work is marked by only one marker, undertaking a comparative analysis of marking trends to compare individual students’ consequential marks on an individual course with their average mark on all their other courses.

10.3.3 For any assessed work where double marking or second marking is used, departments must follow a clear procedure for determining final marks and grades where the two markers are in disagreement, and there must be a clear audit trail to show how the final mark or grade was reached. For small disagreements, taking a simple average may be appropriate, but where the difference is significant (e.g. a difference of 10 percentage points or a full grade or more), and where the two markers remain unable to reconcile their differences even after discussion, an appropriate procedure is for the programme director or other appropriate person to ask a third internal marker to adjudicate.

10.3.4 All examination scripts at all levels will be anonymously marked, whereby the identity of students is masked from markers.
Judgement will be made through direct reference to the primary level descriptors for intended learning outcomes as set out in Appendix 2 of the Undergraduate Assessment Regulations. As well as the subsidiary information, departments are encouraged to amplify the primary level descriptors with more detailed secondary level descriptors specific to a particular field or level of study. For the purposes of classification these grades will then be converted into aggregation scores with reference to the conversion scheme in Appendix 2.

Where the outcome of the chosen mode of assessment can be demonstrated to be wholly quantitative, i.e. comprised of elements which collectively can be demonstrated to be sufficiently granular so as to be accurately graded against a one hundred percent outcome, percentile assessment is permissible. Percentage marks will then be converted into a final aggregation score by reference to the conversion scheme in Appendix 3 of the Undergraduate Assessment Regulations. For modules which are assessed by wholly quantitative assessments, the module mean as a percentage will initially be determined and this then converted to a module aggregation score.

For qualitative assessment where a piece of work merits a pass grade, markers should initially assign the grade in the middle of the appropriate class to a piece of work and then deliberately revise up or down if felt appropriate. For example, the upper second class is covered by grades B+, B and B− (17, 16 and 15 points respectively). If a piece of work is judged to match the intended learning outcomes of an upper second then the default should be to award the work a B grade and then only consider changing to either B+ or B− if the work shows particular strengths (B+) or weaknesses (B−).

Under certain circumstances it may be appropriate for marks to be scaled. See Appendix 4 of the Undergraduate Assessment Regulations for details of when and how scaling might be applied.

Where the assessment scheme for a specific module comprises two or more individual pieces of assessment, each piece should normally be awarded a grade as set out in the preceding paragraphs and each grade subsequently converted to an individual aggregation score as defined in the grading table.

Aggregation to establish a result for a module will require the computation of the mean of the relevant aggregation scores of the component assessments. Where appropriate the computation will employ weights as specified in the course documentation. The overall aggregation score for the module will be used for the purposes of calculating the final overall mean and hence degree classification.

Academic judgements on all forms of assessment (examination, practical/professional competency, written submission, etc.), subject to the moderation arrangements described above and confirmed through examining bodies or equivalent, are final and cannot be disputed by students. Nor can academic judgement form the basis of an academic appeal or student complaint. Procedures for academic appeals are described in the chapter on Academic Appeals.

For the degree transcript and Higher Education Achievement Record (HEAR) individual module results will be expressed as aggregation scores and degree classes. Where a mark has been changed owing to either penalty or reassessment this change will also be indicated. Departments should keep a record of both the original and reassessed mark.
10.3.13 Translation of marks from exchange programmes will be as described in Appendix 5 of the Undergraduate Assessment Regulations.

10.3.14 The guiding principles for assessment of Part II courses approved by Senate uphold the necessity for assessment to be moderated internally and also for the involvement of external examiners to ensure that standards of assessment approximate those of other universities, and also that consistency of assessment is maintained throughout each department. Accordingly a Board of Examiners which comprises internal and external examiners is constituted for each degree programme. Internal examiners are drawn from the body of academic staff of the University and External Examiners are appointed in accordance with agreed criteria and procedures (for details see the chapter on External Examiners (Taught Programmes)).

Postgraduate Taught Programmes

10.3.15 There will be agreed marking criteria for all types of assessment, of which all internal and external assessors and examiners will be made aware. The agreed grading and marking criteria for all forms of assessment will be made available to students.

10.3.16 Any single piece of assessment which is worth more than 7½ credits and all examination scripts (regardless of the weighting) should be subjected to the method of moderating marks assigned to the module when it was validated, i.e.:

(a) unseen double marking, where student work is independently assessed by a second marker without the knowledge of marks assigned by the first marker;
(b) second marking, where student work is assessed by more than one marker, but the second marker knows the mark allocated by the first marker;
(c) sampling, where second markers review a representative sample of work first-marked by other colleagues for the purpose of: checking the consistent application of marking criteria and moderating marks awarded (a sample is taken to mean square root \( n \) where \( n \) is the number of scripts for the course with a minimum result of five scripts); or
(d) analyses of marking trends, where work is marked by only one marker, undertaking a comparative analysis of marking trends to compare individual students’ consequential marks on an individual course with their average mark on all their other courses.

10.3.17 For any assessed work where double marking or second marking is used, departments must follow a clear procedure for determining final marks and grades where the two markers are in disagreement, and there must be a clear audit trail to show how the final mark or grade was reached. For small disagreements, taking a simple average may be appropriate, but where the difference is significant (e.g. a difference of 10 percentage points or a full grade or more), and where the two markers remain unable to reconcile their differences even after discussion, an appropriate procedure is for the programme director or other appropriate person to ask a third internal marker to adjudicate.

10.3.18 All examination scripts will be anonymously marked, whereby the identity of students is masked from markers.
Judgement will be made through direct reference to the primary level descriptors for intended learning outcomes as set out in Appendix 1 of the Postgraduate Taught Assessment Regulations. As well as the subsidiary information, departments are encouraged to amplify the primary level descriptors with more detailed secondary level descriptors specific to a particular field or level of study.

Under certain circumstances it may be appropriate for marks to be scaled. See Appendix 2 of the Postgraduate Taught Assessment Regulations for details of when and how scaling might be applied.

Aggregation to establish a result for a module will require the computation of the mean (to one decimal place) of the relevant percentage marks of the component assessments. Where appropriate the computation will employ weights as specified in the course documentation. The overall average for the module, correct to one decimal place, should be used for the purposes calculating the final degree classification.

Academic judgement on all forms of assessment (examination, practical/professional competency, written submission, etc.), subject to the moderation arrangements described above and confirmed through exam boards, or equivalent, are final and cannot be disputed by students. Nor can academic judgement form the basis of an academic appeal or student complaint. Procedures for academic appeals are described in the chapter on Academic Appeals.

For the degree transcript and diploma supplement, individual module results will be expressed as a single percentage mark. Where a mark has been changed owing to either penalty or reassessment but not to mitigating circumstances this change will also be indicated. Departments should keep a record of both the original and reassessed mark.

All departments or equivalent will have a Mitigating Circumstances Committee whose primary responsibility it is to consider claims of good cause for the programmes they administer. Any such claims would be subject to confirmation by the Examining bodies at a later date. The Mitigating Circumstances Committee would be required to meet at least once per annum prior to the final Examining bodies, but might usefully meet to consider claims of good cause on a more frequent basis. The Mitigating Circumstances Committee will produce minutes of its meetings to be submitted to the appropriate examination body.

Mitigating circumstances can be considered as such actions or events outside the control of the student which result in any circumstances which are thought reasonably to have caused an individual student:

(a) to fail to complete all the required assessment for a programme or contributing module by a stipulated deadline (e.g. missed exam or CWA deadline);

(b) to complete assessed work to a lesser standard of academic performance than might reasonably have been expected on the basis of performance elsewhere during their study (where the same circumstances have not applied).

These circumstances might need to be mitigated in order to arrive at a fair and correct judgement of the student’s academic performance. Such mitigating circumstances
might then be the basis for setting aside for review those marks thought to be atypical in calculating the overall degree result.

10.4.4 Mitigating circumstances are, by definition, *post hoc*; that is they are only considered after a submission deadline. Each department will have agreed arrangements and procedures for deadline extension.

10.4.5 Academic departments of the University, or equivalent, are required to undertake a systematic process to ensure that mitigating circumstances for which evidence has been provided are reviewed in advance of the awarding examination board. This will be by means of a Mitigating Circumstances Committee within the department. By these means the University must be able to demonstrate its fair and careful approach in advising examination boards upon their final academic judgement.

10.4.6 For Undergraduate students, the Student Registry, or equivalent, is required to publish a deadline each year for Part II students to submit their formal notification of mitigating circumstances to the University. Typically, this deadline occurs after the end of Part II examinations (end of week 8, Summer Term). For Postgraduate students, the department, or equivalent, is required to publish a deadline each year for students to submit their formal notification of mitigating circumstances to the University. Typically, this deadline occurs after the end of the examination period for the programme.

10.4.7 Students are required to submit written evidence of circumstances which prevented their attendance for formal examination within 48 hours of the missed event.

10.4.8 Mitigating Circumstances Committees (MCC) within each academic department or equivalent will undertake the following activity.

(a) Review reported circumstances, for which due written evidence has been provided to the department, in order to reach a judgement on whether those circumstances have been detrimental to a student’s academic performance. Where circumstances are agreed to have applied in such a case, the MCC will propose a remedy for consideration by the Examination board.

(b) Where mitigating circumstances have previously been addressed in the conduct of assessment – e.g. extra time for examination, extended coursework deadline – the MCC must consider whether circumstances were sufficiently compensated by that earlier response.

(c) Preparation of information on decisions which will be brought forward to the Examination board to inform final academic judgement. Formal minutes will record cases discussed; the MCC’s judgement on applicability of mitigating circumstances; and proposed remedy per each case. Minutes will contain such details of particular circumstances as is appropriate, but detailed discussion of circumstances will not be undertaken at the Examination board or other meetings of examiners.

10.4.9 A Mitigating Circumstances Committee may propose a number of actions including the opportunity to take a further examination or submit new coursework as a first sitting (for which therefore there will be no fee, the marks will not be capped and there will be a subsequent resit opportunity if required), or (for a graduating student) recommending
a class of award higher than that obtained by applying the rules in the normal way. However, it may not propose changing the marks obtained for any assessment; nor may it propose an uncapped resit, except at Level 4, where all resits are uncapped. For Level 5 and above, if there is to be no cap, then the new work has the status of a first sitting, not a resit.

10.4.10 Mitigating Circumstances Committees (MCC) will consist of the following members.

(a) A Chair, being an experienced academic member of staff who may hold (or have recently held) position as a Director of Study, Head of Department or other senior administrative role. The Chair for the MCC is recommended not to undertake the role of Chair of the final Examination Board simultaneously – i.e. within the same academic session or year.

(b) A Secretary, being an academic or administrative member of the department.

(c) Members of the Committee must be drawn from the department’s examiners, each with sufficient experience of teaching and assessment to advise upon cases brought before the MCC. A membership of between one and four examiners (excluding the Chair and/or Secretary) is recommended.

(d) The External Examiner(s) is(are) entitled to attend the MCC and will be briefed on the decisions if unable to attend prior to any examination board.

10.4.11 The Mitigating Circumstances Committee will meet at least once shortly in advance of the final Examination board per academic session or year. (Departments may find it useful or practicable to maintain a standing Committee to review and evaluate cases involving mitigating circumstances as they present throughout the academic year, for efficiency in the case of large programmes and/or to monitor consistency of approach throughout the period. The standing Committee may be conducted via electronic means in the course of the academic year should that be more practicable from time to time. However, electronic conduct would not normally be permitted for the final, summative MCC meeting shortly before the Examination board.)

10.5 EXAMINATION BOARDS

Establishment of examination boards

10.5.1 There shall be a board of examiners for each degree programme which comprises external and internal examiners. External examiners (at least one for each approved degree programme) shall be appointed in accordance with the procedures set out in the chapter on External Examiners (Taught Programmes) and internal examiners shall be drawn from the body of permanent academic staff of the University. Temporary members of the academic staff who have primary responsibility for the delivery of a programme or module are also eligible to be internal examiners.

Undergraduate Part I Board

10.5.2 The Part I Board of Examiners is responsible for making recommendations to the Committee of Senate concerning the overall assessment of undergraduates at the end of their Part I studies.
10.5.3 Following departmental consultation, each head of department/section offering Part I courses shall nominate annually an examiner to sit on the board. The board shall be provided with the appropriate administrative support, and be chaired by a senior member of the academic staff with appropriate knowledge and experience who shall be appointed by the Committee of the Senate. If the Chairperson is a head of department he or she may nominate instead another departmental representative, and he or she shall also have the discretion to allow attendance at meetings of non-voting representatives.

10.5.4 No member of the Part I Board shall be eligible to be the Chairperson or a member of an Academic Appeal or Review Panel as defined in the chapter on Academic Appeals.

10.5.5 Proceedings of the Part I Board shall be restricted to:

(a) members of the board itself;
(b) those officers allowed to act on behalf of the Committee of the Senate;
(c) members of Academic Appeal and Review Panels as defined in the chapter on Academic Appeals.

10.5.6 The Student Registry will send departments information about the timing of the Part I Board, the deadline for submission of marks and the format and medium in which the marks are to be submitted.

10.5.7 Departments shall ensure that Part I marks are entered into the student records system by the deadline specified in advance by the Student Registry, who will process all the marks for individual Part I modules in accordance with the progression rules approved by the Senate for Part I in general and for individual degree programmes.

10.5.8 The Vice-Chancellor, or Deputy Vice-Chancellor, or Pro-Vice-Chancellor who is not Chairperson of the Part I board, shall be empowered to ratify the board's decisions, on behalf of the Committee of Senate. These officers are also empowered to approve recommendations arising from results ratified by the board (e.g. the award of prizes based upon Part I results).

Undergraduate Part II and Postgraduate Taught Boards

10.5.9 Part II and Postgraduate Taught Boards of Examiners bring together internal and external assessors in order to make recommendations to the Committee of Senate (for undergraduate programmes) or the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate (for postgraduate taught programmes) regarding the granting of degrees and other awards of Lancaster University.

10.5.10 In addition to the external examiner(s) all permanent members of academic staff (and any temporary members of academic staff who have primary responsibility for the programme or modules) in the department(s) (or equivalent units) contributing to the degree programme will be entitled to be members of examination boards and will be termed "internal examiners".
Clinicians who are nominated by Lancaster Medical School because they have primary responsibility for part of the medical degree programme including assessment will be entitled to be members of examination boards and will be termed "internal examiners".

Individuals who teach and who participate in the assessment of students' work but who are neither permanent members of the academic staff of the University nor temporary members of staff with primary responsibility for specified programmes or modules will be termed "assessors". They will not be entitled to full membership of examination boards and will not be entitled to vote on decisions but they will be invited to have input into examination board discussions and may, subject to the discretion of the heads of departments concerned, be invited to attend meetings of examination boards.

Internal examiners will:

(a) have access to the relevant programme and module documentation;
(b) possess an appropriate level of knowledge of the subject matter, the programme and module aims and learning outcomes, and the corresponding materials;
(c) be provided with guidance as to how the grading or classification scheme is to be applied in the context of the particular assessment.

The following people will, ex officio, be members of all University examination boards and will be regarded as internal examiners:

(a) the Vice-Chancellor or nominee;
(b) the officers with delegated authority from Senate;
(c) Associate Deans for Teaching or nominees (as appropriate for undergraduate boards and postgraduate boards in their faculties).

The Head of Academic Standards and Quality and Head of Student Registry or nominee will be entitled to be present at any Examination board.

Designated Departmental Assessment Officers will ensure that:

(a) all internal examiners, and especially those who are not members of academic staff of the University, receive appropriate training and other preparation relevant to their role in the assessment procedure;
(b) each External Examiner has access to the necessary information and assessment material required to assist him or her in reaching a reasonable conclusion on assessment performance, and has the opportunity to attend oral examinations and presentations where practicable and desirable.

Conflicts of interest

No student may be a member of an examination board, or attend any examiners' meeting, other than as a student for assessment. If, however, a member of the University staff who is qualified to be an examiner or assessor for a degree programme under the criteria set out above, is also a registered student on another degree programme within the University, then this will not disqualify them from carrying out normal examining duties on degree programmes for which they are eligible to be an examiner.
If an approved external examiner is also a registered student of the University on a degree programme within the University other than the one for which they have been appointed as external examiner, then this will not disqualify them from carrying out normal examining duties on degree programmes in departments other than the one(s) in which they are registered.

Any examiner or assessor who is aware of any potential conflict of interest (for example being related to, or a close friend of, any student registered on the degree programme for which that person is an examiner) must declare their interest as soon as the possibility arises and must not be the sole examiner for the student concerned on any individual contributory module.

Any examiner who has a potential conflict of interests as described above, must draw this to the attention of the chair(s) of the appropriate examination board(s) and the connection must be recorded in the minutes of the meeting, and the person involved will not take any part in any discussion covering the student(s) or in any decisions affecting the student(s) concerned; but may, at the discretion of the chairperson, be permitted to remain in attendance for the duration of the discussion.

Composition of exam boards

For single subject degree programmes the examination boards will consist of all external and internal examiners. There will be a meeting of the Examination Board which all external examiners and all internal examiners and assessors who have been involved in the teaching of the degree programme(s) concerned will be expected to attend. If, for exceptional and unavoidable reasons, some external and internal examiners are unable to attend the meeting then the Examination board will be quorate only if the following people are present:

(a) at least one external examiner;
(b) at least two internal examiners from the department(s) subject area responsible for the degree programme although, in exceptional circumstances, only one internal examiner from the department responsible for the degree programme will be required to be present and the other internal examiner(s) may be academic members of staff from a cognate discipline.

For combined degree programmes the board will comprise:

(a) at least one or more internal examiners from each of the contributing departments to be agreed by the departments concerned;
(b) at least one external examiner from the administering department for the combined programme.

The external examiner(s) from contributing department(s) will not be required to attend the examination board but should be available for consultation by telephone, however, if they wish to attend they may do so.

Departments teaching courses which contribute to degree programmes offered by other departments will be entitled to representation at any Examination board which involves a module in their subject. However they will be required to send a representative if the
degree result(s) of any student(s) taking a module in another department require consideration owing to their aggregation score placing them in a borderline range. It will be the responsibility of the administering department to notify the other departments involved if attendance by a representative of a contributing department is necessary and, if so, to notify the date and time.

10.5.24 In the case of consortial or non-standard programmes of study, examination boards will be composed as follows:

(a) all examination boards will be required to have at least one external examiner present;
(b) if 50% of the modules (by credit weight) are offered by a department:
   (i) the board must include an external examiner from the department concerned who should be present if possible and, if not, should be available for consultation;
   (ii) at least one internal examiner from each of the subject(s)/department(s) concerned;
(c) if less than 50% but more than 25% of modules (by credit weight) are offered by a department, that department should send at least one internal examiner with appropriate knowledge and expertise to the board;
(d) if less than 25% of modules (by credit weight) are offered by a department, an internal examiner from that department will be entitled to attend the board if they wish but must attend the board, or be available for consultation, in the event of a marginal result.

Conduct of examination boards

10.5.25 Examination boards will take place at specific times as stipulated by the University and which enable results to be processed and awards made in time for students to graduate at the summer and winter degree ceremonies as appropriate. It will be the responsibility of heads of departments or equivalent to ascertain that sufficient examiners will be available to enable the examination board to take place on the scheduled date and to notify the Student Registry of any problems.

10.5.26 The business of the Examination board will be recorded and the minutes will include a record of the External Examiner's adjudications, comments and recommendations. The minutes must include a list of attendees together with their status as external or internal examiners or assessor. This record of the proceedings of the board will be restricted and made available only to: the participating examiners and assessors; the Vice-Chancellor and other officers of the University as appropriate; the Committee of Senate (for undergraduate programmes); the officer with delegated authority from Senate (for postgraduate taught programmes); and appropriate Academic Appeal and Review Panels as defined in the chapter on Academic Appeals.

Powers of examination boards

10.5.27 The Examination Board will consider the results of examinations and final marks and make recommendations to the Committee of Senate (for undergraduate programmes) or the officer with delegated authority from Senate (for postgraduate taught programmes) as to the award of degrees (and the classes of degrees) within approved degree programme classification regulations. Examination boards for undergraduate
programmes will also consider and confirm marks derived from all non-final year modules taken and examined in the academic year under consideration.

10.5.28 In considering marks, Examination Boards will take due cognisance of the recommendations of the Mitigating Circumstances Committee. Only in exceptional circumstances should an Examination Board overturn or disregard a decision of the Mitigating Circumstances Committee and all such decisions must be reported explicitly to the Committee of Senate (for undergraduate programmes) or the officer with delegated authority from Senate (for postgraduate taught programmes).

10.5.29 Examination Boards will normally note and confirm those students whose aggregation score places them wholly within the range of a degree classification. Only in exceptional circumstances, based on either academic or professional grounds as opposed to mitigating circumstances, should an Examination board recommend a classification other than that which is determined from the aggregation score and all such circumstances must be reported explicitly to the Committee of Senate (for undergraduate programmes) or the officer with delegated authority from Senate (for postgraduate taught programmes) for final confirmation of the student’s result.

10.5.30 Examination boards have the discretion to require a viva voce examination of individual students whose aggregation score falls in the borderline ranges after all other required assessment has been completed and reassessment opportunities exhausted, in order to decide upon an appropriate degree classification. Students are expected to be available if such an examination is required and therefore timely information about the likely dates of any viva voce examinations will be published. A viva voce examination will involve at least one external examiner.

10.5.31 Where the overall degree classification or the overall result for a unit of assessment remains unresolved as a result of differing opinions amongst examination board members then significant weight should be attached to the opinion of the external examiner(s) in reaching a decision. Final decisions however are subject to approval and confirmation by the Committee of Senate (for undergraduate programmes) or the officer with delegated authority from Senate (for postgraduate taught programmes). In the event of disagreement between external examiners, their views shall be reported to the Committee of Senate (for undergraduate programmes) or the officer with delegated authority from Senate (for postgraduate taught programmes) for consideration and resolution.

10.5.32 All results, final and interim, shall be submitted to the Student Registry and ratified by the Committee of Senate (for undergraduate programmes) or the officer with delegated authority from Senate (for postgraduate taught programmes).

10.6 PROCEDURES FOR THE COMMITTEE OF SENATE

10.6.1 The University has sole authority to determine whether or not a degree, certificate, or diploma should be awarded to a particular candidate, and, if so awarded, the specific class or other description of attainment, appropriate to the level of the award, whether postgraduate or undergraduate.

10.6.2 The Committee of Senate is the body through which these degree awarding powers are exercised.
10.6.3 The Committee of Senate provides:

(a) formal confirmation (or not) of recommendations from Boards of Examiners for the award to individual students of a named degree (i.e. qualification and subject) of a particular class;
(b) formal approval of recommendations from Boards of Examiners that students be awarded no degree;
(c) formal ratification of second year results (of courses finally assessed at the end of the second year) including the timing and nature of re-sit opportunities for failed elements;
(d) consideration of recommendations where there were differing opinions amongst members of Boards of Examiners as to the overall degree classification or the overall result for a unit of assessment;
(e) consideration of any cases where the Board of Examiners was unable to reach an agreed recommendation.

10.6.4 In practice, individual departmental Boards of Examiners (one for each scheme of study) determine the results (i.e. the marks/grades) of the assessments and examinations specified for a particular degree scheme and make recommendations to the Committee of the Senate about the award of a named degree and the class of that degree.

10.6.5 The Committee of Senate acknowledges the expertise and specialist knowledge of departmental Boards of Examiners in respect of:

(a) custom, practice and conventions in the Lancaster departments concerned;
(b) custom, practice and conventions in their specific subject in other HEIs, drawing on input from Lancaster’s external examiners and Lancaster staff who act as external examiners in other institutions.

10.6.6 However, when considering recommendations from all departments across the University, the Committee of Senate is required take a cross-institutional view of the cases under consideration in order to maintain equivalence of academic standards and also to ensure the fair, consistent and equitable treatment of students across the University.

10.6.7 Cases requiring specific approval from the Committee of Senate will be highlighted and discussed. Members may also wish to pause and discuss any other case as they consider appropriate.

10.6.8 It is not considered appropriate for detailed personal circumstances of individual student cases to be discussed at Committee of Senate. This is partly for reasons of confidentiality and protection of individual privacy but also because any such relevant information which has any bearing on the overall degree result should already have been taken into consideration by departmental Mitigating Circumstances Committees and reported to Boards of Examiners. Any material information which has not previously been made available and which might change the overall result, should be drawn to the attention of the Committee and the actual information communicated to the Head of the Student Registry after the meeting.
10.6.9 The status of the Committee of Senate is similar to that of a Board of Examiners and, as such, is covered by the same conventions that govern departmental Boards of Examiners in that business sent to and arising from the Committee is restricted (i.e. restricted to members of the Committee, members of Academic Appeal and Review Panels as defined in the chapter on Academic Appeals and appropriate administrative staff).

10.7 REPEAT MODULES, PERIODS OF STUDY OR WHOLE PROGRAMMES OF STUDY

10.7.1 With the exception of Part I students, it is University policy that no student shall be given an unfair advantage over fellow students through being allowed to automatically repeat individual modules, periods of study or a whole programme of study. Exceptional permission to repeat work may be granted by the designated Pro-Vice-Chancellor, the Provost for Student Experience, Colleges and the Library, an Academic Appeal or Review Panel as defined in the chapter on Academic Appeals, the Intercalations Committee or by the Standing Academic Committee in cases where a student’s academic performance has been adversely affected by personal, health or financial problems and where such cases have been properly documented.

10.7.2 With the exception of Part I students, it is University policy that no student shall normally be allowed to automatically replace modules in which he or she has failed or performed poorly by taking a different module in order to achieve better marks. Exceptional permission to do so may be granted by the designated Pro-Vice-Chancellor, the Provost for Student Experience, Colleges and the Library, by an Academic Appeal or Review Panel, as defined in the chapter on Academic Appeals, the Intercalations Committee or by the Standing Academic Committee in cases where a student’s academic performance has been adversely affected by personal, health or financial problems and where such cases have been properly documented.

10.7.3 Part I students may undertake a repeat of their first year under the procedures for progression and reassessment as set out in the Undergraduate Assessment Regulations, which include provision for registering on a new degree programme or new modules where the eligibility criteria have been met.

11. UNDERGRADUATE ASSESSMENT REGULATIONS

11.1 UNDERGRADUATE AWARDS

The University currently offers the following undergraduate awards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate awards</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>FTE period of study (normal)</th>
<th>Normal total credit value</th>
<th>Normal minimum credit at level of award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masters degree (Integrated): MAarts (Hons); MChem (Hons); MEcon (Hons); MEng (Hons); MLang (Hons); MPsys (Hons); MPsysch (Hons); MSSci (Hons); MSocial Wk (Hons); MStat (Hons)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 11.2 Structure of Bachelors Degree Programmes and Integrated Bachelors/Masters Degree Programmes

**11.2.1** Bachelors degrees, with the exception of Foundation degree top-ups, as well as Integrated Bachelors/Masters degrees, comprise learning across levels 4, 5, 6, and, in the case of the Integrated Masters 7, normally with 120 credits of assessment at each level. Level 4 learning is collectively referred to as Part I and is qualificatory, i.e. successful completion is required for progression to further study but obtained credit does not contribute to final classification of awards. Learning levels 5, 6 and, as appropriate, 7 are collectively referred to as Part II and comprise all credit upon which final classification of awards is determined.

**11.2.2** Undergraduate degree programmes and assessment arrangements for Part II are based on the principle that the load on students in terms of total teaching, learning and assessment activities should be equally distributed between each academic session i.e. normally four units (equivalent to 120 credits) in the second year and four units in the third and/or final year.

**11.2.3** A commensurate arrangement shall apply to students undertaking programmes of study that are divided into Part IIA and Part IIB. This shall not preclude the attribution of a differential assessment weighting between units studied and assessed in the second year and those studied and assessed in the final year. The arrangement for each programme of study shall be published in the Courses Handbook, available online for staff and current students at: [http://www.lusi.lancs.ac.uk/OnlineCoursesHandbook/](http://www.lusi.lancs.ac.uk/OnlineCoursesHandbook/).
11.3 CRITERIA FOR AWARD

11.3.1 The pass mark for undergraduate honours degrees and other undergraduate awards shall be 9.0, unless otherwise stipulated in the Appendix 6 of the Undergraduate Assessment Regulations, with credit for a module being awarded when the overall mark for the module is 9.0 or greater or the module has been condoned.

11.3.2 In order to qualify for the overall award, students must have attained in full the minimum credit requirement for the programme (including credit for failed modules which have been condoned) and passed all contributory modules with an aggregation score of at least 9.0 unless otherwise stipulated in Appendix 6. A pass degree may be awarded with an aggregation score of 8.1 or above.

11.4 PROGRESSION

General

11.4.1 Each programme will have progression requirements detailed and approved through the programmes approval process. Examining bodies will determine whether a student has successfully met the progression requirements for a programme giving full countenance to mitigating circumstances as reported from the Mitigating Circumstances Committee, reassessment and condonation opportunities as detailed below.

11.4.2 In order to qualify to progress to the next stage of the programme, students must have attained in full the minimum credit requirement for the stage completed (including credit for failed modules which have been condoned).

11.4.3 Additional progression requirements for programmes with professional accreditation are detailed in Appendix 6 of the Undergraduate Assessment Regulations.

Progression from Part I to Part II

11.4.4 In order to progress to Part II:

(a) an overall aggregation score of 10.3 is required in the major components, plus an aggregation score of at least 9.0 in both the coursework and exam elements. A major component is any module, theme or subject that is defined as core to the intended degree programme; and

(b) an overall aggregation score of 9.0 is required in all minor components. A minor component is any module, theme or subject that is defined as optional or non-essential to the intended degree programme. There is no further requirement for students to attain a particular score in the coursework or exam elements.

11.4.5 Students who initially fail one or more subjects at Part I will be offered an opportunity to resit the subjects failed. Students who choose not to participate in this resit opportunity will be deemed to have withdrawn from the University.

11.4.6 After taking resits as required, a student who passes all subjects with the required aggregation scores qualifies to progress to Part II. Otherwise, if and only if the proposed major department requests a condonation, failures up to 40 credits may be condoned.
where the aggregation score is at least 9.5 for a major subject or at least 7.0 for a minor subject. If the department which recorded a fail mark is unwilling to accede to this request for condonation, the final decision will be made by the Part I Board of Examiners.

11.4.7 Students who have not passed all subjects, and whose failures have not been condoned, will be offered, immediately following the examination board at which the student was considered, the choice of:

(a) one (and only one) further resit opportunity as an external candidate; or
(b) a repeat year.

11.4.8 Students opting for a repeat year will:

(a) have full-time student status;
(b) lose all credit, marks and grades gained in the original Part I year;
(c) undergo an assessment of support needs (both academic and general wellbeing) at the start of the repeat year;
(d) be placed on academic probation, with especially close monitoring of academic progress by the major department;
(e) otherwise be treated the same as any other Part I student;
(f) have one resit opportunity if necessary;
(g) not be allowed any further resit opportunity as an external candidate or another repeat year, except under exceptional mitigating circumstances where approved by the Part I Resit Board.

11.4.9 Students enrolling for a repeat year will have the right to be registered for the same degree programme as before; alternatively, it will normally be permissible to change to a new degree programme for which eligibility criteria have been met.

11.4.10 The award of Certificate of Higher Education shall be made to students who have achieved 80 credits with a mark of 9.0 or more at level 4 or above and a further 40 credits with a mark of 7.0 or more at level 4 or above, but who have ended their studies at the University without qualifying for either a degree or a Diploma of Higher Education.

11.4.11 For progression on Study Abroad degree programmes, and some degree programmes with significant levels of industrial engagement, students must achieve a pass, at the first attempt, as defined above. Additionally they should achieve higher overall grades in all units. The exact requirement is for each department to determine but it should normally be in the region of an aggregation score of at least 15.0 in major components plus at least 12.0 in minor components.

11.4.12 Students who were not admitted to the following degree programmes will have no entitlement to transfer into these programmes at the end of Part I even if they achieve a majorable mark in the appropriate Part I course:

- BSc Accounting, Auditing and Finance
- BSc Accounting and Finance
- BSc Accounting and Economics
- BSc Accounting, Finance and Mathematics
BSc Accounting, Finance and Computer Science  
BSc Accounting and Management Studies  
BSc Finance  
BSc Finance and Economics  
BSc Finance and Management Studies  
BSc Financial Mathematics  
BSc Financial Mathematics (Industry)  
MSc Financial Mathematics  
BBA Management  
BBA International Business Management  
BSc Management, Information and Information Technology  
BA Advertising and Marketing  
All Study Abroad (including North America/Australasia) degrees

Progression within Part II

11.4.13 Within Part II to proceed to the final year of a Bachelors with honours degree (or part-time equivalent) all students must achieve, following all opportunities for reassessment, an overall aggregation score of 9.0 with no more than 30 credits condoned.

11.4.14 Within Part II to progress from year 2 to year 3 in Integrated Masters degrees the regulations are the same as for a Bachelors Honours degree. All students who meet these progression requirements will remain on the Integrated Masters degree during year 3. To progress from year 3 to year 4, all students must achieve, at the first sitting, a cumulative overall aggregation score of 14.5 over the Part II studies completed up to that point with no more than 30 credits condoned in total over years 2 and 3. Any student who does not meet this requirement, or who does not wish to continue to year 4, will be considered for classification for a Bachelors degree.

11.4.15 The award of Diploma of Higher Education shall be made to students who have achieved 90 credits with a mark of 9.0 or more at level 5 or above and a further 30 credits with a mark of 7.0 or more at level 5 or above, but who have ended their studies at the University without qualifying for a degree.

11.5 CLASSIFICATION OF AWARDS

11.5.1 Each programme will have final award criteria detailed and approved through the programmes approval process. Examining bodies will determine whether a student has successfully met the final award criteria giving full countenance to mitigating circumstances as reported from the Mitigating Circumstances Committee, reassessment and condonation opportunities as detailed below.

11.5.2 In order to qualify for the overall award, students must have attained in full the minimum credit requirement for the programme (including credit for failed modules which have been condoned).

11.5.3 In order to qualify for the overall award, students must have passed all contributory modules with an aggregation score of at least 9.0 unless otherwise stipulated in Appendix 6 of the Undergraduate Assessment Regulations.
11.5.4 Where awards are classified the overall mean for the programme should be computed from the module aggregation scores in proportion with the approved credit weightings for each module. This overall mean score should be expressed to one decimal place and be used to determine the class of degree to be awarded in accordance with the class boundaries as defined below.

11.5.5 There will be four classes of honours: first, upper second, lower second and third. A student who is not placed in one of the four classes will not be eligible for the award of an honours degree. This will not prevent the award of an unclassified honours degree within the terms of the regulations.

11.5.6 Where the mean overall aggregation score falls within one of the following ranges, the examining bodies will recommend the award stated:

- 17.5 to 24.0  first class honours
- 14.5 to 17.0  upper second class honours
- 11.5 to 14.0  lower second class honours
- 9.0 to 11.0   third class honours
- 0.0 to 8.0    fail

11.5.7 Where the mean overall aggregation score falls within one of the ‘borderline’ ranges defined below:

- 17.1 to 17.4  either first or upper second class honours
- 14.1 to 14.4  either upper or lower second class honours
- 11.1 to 11.4  either lower second or third class honours
- 8.1 to 8.9    either pass degree or fail

The examining bodies will apply the following rubric for deciding the degree class to be recommended.

(a) For all students, where a student falls into a borderline then the higher award should be given where either half or more of the credits from Part II are in the higher class or the final year average is in the higher class.

(b) Borderline students not meeting either of the criteria described in (a) above would normally be awarded the lower class of degree unless (c) applies.

(c) That for all students, borderline or not, Examination Boards should continue to make a special case to the Committee of Senate for any student where the class of degree recommended by the Board deviates from that derived from a strict application of the regulations. Such cases would be based around circumstances pertaining to individual students where these circumstances have not already been taken into account.

11.5.8 Integrated Masters students who withdraw during the Level 7 final year of their programmes, or whose achievement at the end of that year does not qualify them to be awarded an Integrated Masters degree, may be awarded a classified Bachelors degree (BA, BSc, BEng, etc.) with Honours, in accordance with the regulations for the corresponding Bachelors award.
11.5.9 Students who wish to challenge the process by which judgments concerning marks/grades or the classification to be awarded were made may apply to have their cases reviewed under the procedures for Academic Appeals as defined in the chapter on Academic Appeals.

11.5.10 In addition to standard University classification requirements, certain degrees which carry professional accreditation have additional requirements. These are detailed in Appendix 6 of the Undergraduate Assessment Regulations.

11.6 REASSESSMENT

Part I reassessment

11.6.1 A student who fails a Part I module will be required to undertake a reassessment for that module in order to be considered for progression to Part II. If the module aggregation score after reassessment is an improvement on the original score, the reassessment score will count; otherwise the original aggregation score will stand. The reassessment score will not be subject to a cap. Condonation will not be considered until after reassessment.

Part II non-final year reassessment

11.6.2 A student who fails a module will be required to undertake a reassessment for that module in order to be considered for progression to the next stage. If the module aggregation score after reassessment is an improvement on the original score, the reassessment score will count subject to a cap of 9.0 aggregation points; otherwise the original aggregation score will stand. The resulting aggregation score will count towards the overall average. Condonation will not be considered until after reassessment.

Part II final-year assessment

11.6.3 **FOR STUDENTS WHO ENTERED PART II PRIOR TO 2016-17:** A student who fails a module with a score below 4.0 will be required to undertake a reassessment for that module in order to be considered for the award of a degree. In addition, if more credits are failed than can be condoned or the overall average aggregation score is below 9.0, a student must resit either all failed modules or sufficient failed modules to ensure that condonation may be a possibility.

**FOR STUDENTS WHO ENTERED PART II FROM 2016-17 ONWARDS:** A student who fails a module with a score below 7.0 will be required to undertake a reassessment for that module in order to be considered for the award of a degree. In addition, if more credits are failed than can be condoned or the overall average aggregation score is below 9.0, a student must resit either all failed modules or sufficient failed modules to ensure that condonation may be a possibility.

11.6.4 Where a student has undertaken a reassessment for a module and the module aggregation score after reassessment is an improvement on the original score, the reassessment score will count subject to a cap of 9.0 aggregation points; otherwise the original aggregation score will stand. The resulting aggregation score will count towards the overall aggregation average used for degree classification.
11.6.5 The normal expectation is that final-year students will resit all failed modules, even where this is not compulsory. However, if a student applies within five working days of results being made available, condonation will be applied immediately where consistent with the regulations without the need for resubmission.

**General principles**

11.6.6 The precise form of reassessment is for the department to decide, but the following principles should be borne in mind:

(a) the principal purpose of reassessment is to re-examine the learning objectives which have been failed at the first attempt;

(b) students who have failed all elements of assessment at the first attempt should not be advantaged over those who have failed only a part of the assessment.

11.6.7 Both final and non-final year students will be given the opportunity to undertake reassessment within the same academic year in which they made their first attempt.

11.6.8 Where reassessment is prohibited for reasons of professional accreditation this will be clearly stated in the assessment guidelines provided to students and alternative awards and other available options identified.

11.6.9 Students may not seek reassessment to improve a passing grade unless required for professional accreditation and allowed under specific accreditation arrangements (see Appendix 6 of the Undergraduate Assessment Regulations for further details).

11.6.10 When all the results of reassessment are available the overall profile will then be considered following procedures detailed below in the section on the consideration and confirmation of results.

**11.7 CONDONATION**

11.7.1 Where a student, after all opportunities for reassessment, has failed, the examination board should, subject to the learning outcomes for the programme being met, normally condone credit whereby said credit will be available as an element of either progression or final classification requirements of the award.

11.7.2 Where a programme separately assesses modules with a credit value of 15 or less, for specified undergraduate programmes recorded in Appendix 7 to the Undergraduate Assessment Regulations these may be combined to a maximum size of 30 credits for the consideration of condonation. Approved combinations must:

(a) ensure learning outcomes for the programme can continue to be met irrespective of the condonation of combined modules;

(b) be approved by the faculty teaching committee and notified to Academic Standards and Quality Committee; and

(c) be published prior to students’ enrolment on to any modules which have been combined for the purposes of condonation.

11.7.3 **FOR STUDENTS WHO ENTERED PART II PRIOR TO 2016-17:** When the results of all reassessments relating to the second year of a three-year Bachelors Hons degree or to
the second or third year of a four-year Bachelors Hons degree or Integrated Masters degree are available, the overall profile will be reviewed by the relevant examining bodies and up to 30 credits should normally be condoned where the aggregation score is between 4 and 9. No module may be condoned with an aggregation score of less than 4, nor may any module be condoned if a student has not attempted reassessment. **FOR STUDENTS WHO ENTERED PART II FROM 2016-17 ONWARDS:** When the results of all reassessments relating to the second year of a three-year Bachelors Hons degree or to the second or third year of a four-year Bachelors Hons degree or Integrated Masters degree are available, the overall profile will be reviewed by the relevant examining bodies and up to 30 credits should normally be condoned where the aggregation score is between 7 and 9. No module may be condoned with an aggregation score of less than 7, nor may any module be condoned if a student has not attempted reassessment.

11.7.4 **FOR STUDENTS WHO ENTERED PART II PRIOR TO 2016-17:** When the results of all assessments and reassessments relating to the final year of a three-year Bachelors Hons degree are available the overall profile will be reviewed by the relevant examination board and a maximum of 30 credits in total (for the whole of Part II) should normally be condoned where the aggregation score is between 4 and 9. No module may be condoned with an aggregation score of less than 4. The condonable maximum of 30 credits applies to all three-year programmes regardless of the total classified credit. **FOR STUDENTS WHO ENTERED PART II FROM 2016-17 ONWARDS:** When the results of all assessments and reassessments relating to the final year of a three-year Bachelors Hons degree are available the overall profile will be reviewed by the relevant examination board and a maximum of 30 credits in total (for the whole of Part II) should normally be condoned where the aggregation score is between 7 and 9. No module maybe condoned with an aggregation score of less than 7. The condonable maximum of 30 credits applies to all three-year programmes regardless of the total classified credit.

11.7.5 **FOR STUDENTS WHO ENTERED PART II PRIOR TO 2016-17:** When the results of all assessments and reassessments relating to the final year of a four-year Bachelors Hons degree or the final year of an Integrated Masters degree are available the overall profile will be reviewed by the relevant examination board and a maximum of 45 credits in total (for the whole of Part II) should normally be condoned where the aggregation score is between 4 and 9. No module may be condoned with an aggregation score of less than 4. The condonable maximum of 45 credits applies to all four-year and Integrated Masters programmes regardless of the total classified credit. **FOR STUDENTS WHO ENTERED PART II FROM 2016-17 ONWARDS:** When the results of all assessments and reassessments relating to the final year of a four-year Bachelors Hons degree or the final year of an Integrated Masters degree are available the overall profile will be reviewed by the relevant examination board and a maximum of 45 credits in total (for the whole of Part II) should normally be condoned where the aggregation score is between 7 and 9. No module may be condoned with an aggregation score of less than 7. The condonable maximum of 45 credits applies to all four-year and Integrated Masters programmes regardless of the total classified credit.

11.7.6 **FOR STUDENTS WHO ENTERED PART II PRIOR TO 2016-17:** For a pass degree, an examination board should normally condone an additional 30 credits to total of 60 credits maximum (for the whole of Part II) where the aggregation score is between 4 and 9. No module may be condoned with an aggregation score of less than 4.
FOR STUDENTS WHO ENTERED PART II FROM 2016-17 ONWARDS: For a pass degree, an examination board should normally condone an additional 30 credits to total of 60 credits maximum (for the whole of Part II) where the aggregation score is between 7 and 9. No module may be condoned with an aggregation score of less than 7.

Exceptions

11.7.7 The phrase “should normally” in 11.7.1 to 11.7.6 above means that condonation, where allowable and subject to the learning outcomes for the programme being met, must be granted unless the examiners believe that there is good reason not to do so. Any such reason must be described and justified in the examination board minutes. The final decision will be taken by Senate.

11.7.8 Where a reassessment is not available, for example for an outgoing study abroad student, the examination board may condone credit even where the aggregation score is below the condonable threshold. If such a student has failed more than 30 but not more than 45 credits, 15 credits may be set aside – normally this will be for the module with the lowest fail mark. The student may progress from the second year to the third year and will undertake an additional 15 credits (uncapped) in the final year.

11.8 INCOMPLETE ASSESSMENT AND MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES

11.8.1 For the purposes of these regulations ‘mitigating circumstances’ will mean properly evidenced and approved claims from students that demonstrate good cause as to why their performance and achievements have been adversely affected by means which have not been fully addressed through extension and other available assessment procedures.

11.8.2 For the purposes of these regulations ‘good cause’ will mean illness or other relevant personal circumstances affecting a student and resulting in either the student’s failure to attend an examination, or submit coursework at or by the due time, or otherwise satisfy the requirements of the scheme of assessment appropriate to his or her programme of studies; or, the student’s performance in examination or other instrument of assessment being manifestly prejudiced.

11.8.3 A chronic medical condition, for which due allowance has already been made, will not itself be considered a good cause although a short-term exacerbation of such a condition might be so judged.

11.8.4 ‘Evidence’ will mean a report descriptive of the medical condition or other adverse personal circumstances which are advanced by the student for consideration as amounting to good cause. Such a report should include a supporting statement from an appropriate person. Where the report refers to a medical condition of more than five days’ duration the report must be completed by an appropriate medical practitioner who would be requested to comment on how the medical condition concerned would be likely (if this were the case) to have affected the student’s ability to prepare for or carry out the assessment(s) in question.

11.8.5 Where an incomplete assessment may be the result of good cause, it will be the responsibility of the student concerned to make the circumstances known to their department or equivalent body and to provide appropriate evidence. Notification later
than forty-eight hours after the examination, or after the date at which submission of the work for assessment was due, will not normally be taken into account unless acceptable circumstances have prevented the student from notifying the department within this time.

11.8.6 All departments or equivalent will have a Mitigating Circumstances Committee whose primary responsibility it is to consider claims of good cause for the programmes they administer. Any such claims would be subject to confirmation by the examining bodies at a later date. The Mitigating Circumstances Committee would be required to meet at least once per annum prior to the final Examining bodies, but might usefully meet to consider claims of good cause on a more frequent basis. The Mitigating Circumstances Committee will produce minutes of its meetings to be submitted to the appropriate examination body.

Guidance on the management and operation of Mitigating Circumstances Committees can be found in Chapter 10 on General Assessment Regulations for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught Programmes.

11.8.7 In considering claims of good cause:

(a) the evidence provided by the student claiming good cause, and any relevant and available material submitted by him or her for assessment will be scrutinised;

(b) fairness to the individual student claiming good cause must be balanced with fairness to other students and the integrity of the assessment as a whole;

(c) in the event of the student having failed to attend an examination or examinations, or having failed to submit course material or other work for assessment at or by the due time, it will be determined whether the failure to attend or submit has been justified by good cause;

(d) in the event of the student having submitted work for assessment by examination or otherwise, it will be determined whether such work has been manifestly prejudiced by good cause. If such prejudice is established the work affected will normally be deemed not to have been submitted.

11.8.8 Where it is determined that the evidence presented does not support the student’s claim that s/he was prevented by good cause from attending an examination or from submitting work for assessment, the student will be awarded Grade N (an aggregation score of zero) for the assessment or assessments in question. Where work is submitted but the student makes a claim that it has been affected by good cause (or a late penalty is applied), and the evidence presented does not support the student’s claim then his or her work will be assessed (or penalised) as though no claim of good cause had been received and the student’s grade for the module will be calculated accordingly.

11.8.9 In the event of incomplete assessment arising from good cause being established the student will normally be expected to complete his or her assessment by attending the examination at a subsequent session, or submitting outstanding work for assessment, if an opportunity to do so occurs within his or her period of study. In considering whether this requirement should apply, the desirability of the student’s assessment being conducted in full should be balanced with the practical considerations and financial costs to the student and the University of providing a later completion date. Consideration should also be given to the student’s other assessment commitments to ensure that he or she is not unreasonably burdened. In order to permit such completion:
(a) a special sitting of an examination may be arranged, or the student will be required to attend for examination at a scheduled session; and/or

(b) a date for completion of non-examination assessment will be set; as appropriate in the circumstances. In any such event, that sitting or submission will be regarded as the student’s first attempt if the examination or assessment missed would itself have been his or her first attempt.

11.8.10 Where it is determined that the evidence presented supports the student’s claim that he or she was prevented by good cause from completing work for assessment on or by the due time and where no means of substituting an alternative assessment may be found, the assessment(s) in question will be excluded (without penalty) from the calculation of the module aggregation score(s) and the following regulations will apply.

(a) The extent to which the student’s total assessment has been completed will be determined as a percentage, taking into account the relative weights attributed to those assessments as published in the relevant approved assessment scheme.

(b) Examining bodies will make an overall judgement of the student’s work submitted for assessment, using as far as possible the standards and criteria applied in respect of the work of other students.

(c) At module level where the student has:

(i) completed 33% or more of the total summative assessment required, the examining bodies can recommend an overall module result on the basis of work completed so long as that work is deemed to demonstrate attainment against substantial elements of the module’s learning outcomes;

(ii) completed less than 33% of the work required for assessment, he or she will be regarded as not having completed sufficient assessment to be awarded a grade in the module. In such cases he/she should be given an opportunity to complete the missing work as a first attempt.

(d) At programme level where the student has:

(i) completed 75% or more of the total work required for programme assessment, the Examining bodies will recommend an award or other outcome on the basis of the work completed;

(ii) completed at least 30% but less than 75% of the work required for assessment, an Aegrotat (unclassified honours) degree may be recommended if the completed portion is of honours standard, or, if the completed portion is not of honours standard, no award will be made;

(iii) completed less than 30% of the work required for assessment he or she will be regarded as not having completed sufficient assessment to be awarded a degree.

11.8.11 Where examining bodies decide to recommend an Aegrotat (unclassified honours) degree, and this recommendation is approved by the Committee of Senate then the Aegrotat degree will be awarded forthwith and the student will be invited to attempt, within two years, to qualify for the award of a classified honours degree by completing
examinations and/or other work, under conditions and at times specified by the examining bodies, and approved by the Committee of Senate. Students who:

(a) undertake the further assessment specified, and who achieve the required level of attainment, will subsequently be awarded an appropriate classified honours degree;
(b) attempt further assessment, but who fail to achieve the required level of attainment for the award of a classified honours degree, will retain the Aegrotat degree already awarded;
(c) decline the invitation to attempt further assessment within two years, will retain the Aegrotat degree already awarded.

11.9 CONSIDERATION AND CONFIRMATION OF RESULTS

11.9.1 Senate has ultimate authority to determine all results of assessment leading to Lancaster University credit and awards. It exercises its authority to make final decisions as to granting of all credit-bearing University awards, primarily through the Committee of Senate, the terms of reference of which are set out in the University Ordinances.

11.9.2 The Committee of Senate provides:

(a) formal confirmation (or not) of recommendations from Boards of Examiners for the award to individual students of a named degree (i.e. qualification and subject) of a particular class;
(b) formal approval of recommendations from Boards of Examiners that students be awarded no degree with or without a further re-sit opportunity (i.e. Fails);
(c) formal ratification of second year results (of courses finally assessed at the end of the second year) including the timing and nature of re-sit opportunities for failed elements.

Further procedural details are set out in the section on Procedures for the Committee of Senate Chapter 10 on General Assessment Regulations for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught Programmes.

11.9.3 For each degree programme approved by the University there will be an Examination Board comprising external and internal examiners which will be responsible for the assurance of standards through the exercise of their academic judgement both directly in the assessment of students' work and indirectly in the design of specific forms of assessment. The constitution and terms of reference for examination bodies within the constituent elements of the University are set out in the section on examination boards in Chapter 10 on General Assessment Regulations for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught Programmes.

11.9.4 The examination bodies will receive decisions from the Mitigating Circumstances Committee. Examination bodies cannot, of themselves, reconsider or change decisions of the Mitigating Circumstances Committee. Examination bodies may challenge decisions of Mitigation Circumstances Committees by referring final decisions to the Committee of Senate, or equivalent body.

11.9.5 The Part I Board of Examiners will consider the results of examinations and final marks and make recommendations to the Committee of Senate as to whether students have
qualified to proceed from Part I to Part II and to which degree programmes. Details of the role and operation of the Part I Board can be found in the section on examination boards in Chapter 10 on General Assessment Regulations for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught Programmes.

11.9.6 Part II Boards of Examiners will consider the results of examinations and final marks and make recommendations to the Committee of Senate as to the award of degrees (and the classes of degrees) within the approved degree programme classification scheme. Part II Boards of Examiners also consider and confirm marks derived from all non-final year modules taken and examined in the academic year under consideration. Details of the role and operation of Part II Boards of Examiners can be found in Chapter 10 on General Assessment Regulations for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught Programmes.

11.9.7 The business of the examination boards will be minuted and the minutes will include a record of the External Examiner’s adjudications, comments and recommendations, as well as particular decisions made by the Board. The minutes will also record the decisions of the Mitigating Circumstances Committee for each candidate considered by that committee (although detailed discussion of circumstances should not be undertaken at the Examination Board). The minutes must include a list of attendees (together with their status as external or internal examiners or assessor). This record of the proceedings of the board will be restricted and made available only to: the participating examiners and assessors; the Vice-Chancellor and other officers of the University as appropriate; the Committee of Senate; and appropriate Academic Appeal and Review Panels as defined in the chapter on Academic Appeals. Where the examination body has exercised its discretion in a particular case, as provided by these Regulations, the Committee of Senate will normally uphold its decision providing it had the support of the majority of the external examiners present at that examination board.

11.10 PUBLISHED INFORMATION

11.10.1 The determination of results and the classification of University degrees are subject always to ratification by the Senate and will be regarded as provisional until ratified, normally through the annual meeting of the Committee of the Senate.

11.10.2 Immediately after the meetings of the relevant examining bodies, departments or equivalent may notify students of their provisional degree results.

11.10.3 Within forty days of the ratification of degree results, students will receive a transcript of their results together with a Higher Education Achievement Record, both of which will conform in scope and layout to principles agreed by Senate.

11.11 EXCLUSION

11.11.1 Students who, after undertaking agreed reassessment opportunities, fail to meet the stipulated criteria for progression or final award, shall be subject to the University’s Academic Appeals procedures, after which, if the failure is confirmed, they will be excluded from the University.
12. POSTGRADUATE TAUGHT ASSESSMENT REGULATIONS

12.1 POSTGRADUATE TAUGHT AWARDS

The University currently offers the following postgraduate taught awards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postgraduate taught awards</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>FTE period of study (normal)</th>
<th>Normal total credit value</th>
<th>Normal minimum credit at level of award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masters degree: LLM; MA; MBA; MMus; MRes; MSc</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma (PGDip)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Up to 1 year</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate (PGCert)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Up to 1 year</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Achievement (PGCertA)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Under 1 year</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma(^2)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.2 STRUCTURE OF MASTERS DEGREE PROGRAMMES

12.2.1 Masters degrees, with the exclusion of the Integrated Masters degree, comprise learning at level 7, normally with 180 credits of assessment of which a substantial portion represents a dissertation.

12.3 CRITERIA FOR AWARDS

12.3.1 The pass mark for taught Masters degrees, postgraduate diplomas and postgraduate certificates shall be 50%, with credit for a module being awarded when the overall mark for the module is 50% or greater. Any undergraduate module which contributes to the postgraduate programme (see below) is marked according to the undergraduate marking scale but postgraduate students taking the module are required to obtain a mark of at least 50% to pass the module. The mark is included in the normal way within the profile of marks contributing to the average mark for the postgraduate programme.

12.3.2 To qualify for an award, candidates should pass all the assessments required by their programme and be awarded credits, or have assessments condoned, as follows:

(a) for a taught Masters degree, a total of at least 180 credits, with no more than 30 credits having been defined as being undergraduate in level;
(b) for a Postgraduate Diploma, a total of at least 120 credits, with no more than 30 credits having been defined as being undergraduate in level;

\(^1\) The University categorises the MRes (Master of Research) as a postgraduate research degree award; however, such programmes are governed by the assessment regulations for postgraduate taught programmes for the purposes of assessment and classification and, for these purposes, the MRes is included within these regulations.

\(^2\) Although the Graduate Diploma is based on undergraduate material, it is taken usually by those who are already graduates in another discipline. Thus it is ‘postgraduate’ in time, but not in level.
(c) for a Postgraduate Certificate, a total of at least 60 credits, with no more than 20 credits having been defined as being undergraduate in level.

12.4 PROGRESSION

12.4.1 Requirements for progression from one stage (or element) of a postgraduate taught programme to the next (for example taught module stage to dissertation/project/placement) should be specified at the time the programme is approved and communicated to all students when they first enrol on the programme.

12.5 CLASSIFICATION OF AWARDS

12.5.1 Once students have attained sufficient credit, taking full countenance to mitigating circumstances as reported from the Mitigating Circumstances Committee, reassessment, and condonation opportunities as detailed below, they will be considered for awards of the University.

12.5.2 Classifiable postgraduate taught awards are as follows:

(a) Masters degrees;
(b) Postgraduate Diploma – where this is the target award of the candidate under consideration;
(c) Postgraduate Certificate – where this is the target award of the candidate under consideration.

The MRes is also a classifiable award.

12.5.3 Where awards are classified an overall average for the programme should be computed in accordance with the approved credit weightings for each module. This average should be expressed to one decimal place and be used to determine the class of degree to be awarded in accordance with the class boundaries as defined below. In respect of a redeemed failed module (capped at 50%), the resit module score will be used as part of the computation of the overall mean unless the resit module score is lower than the original, in which case the original score will be used.

12.5.4 There will be three classes of awards: distinction, merit and pass. Where the overall average, calculated to one decimal place, falls within one of the following ranges, the examination boards will recommend the award stated:

- 70.0%+ distinction
- 60.0-69.9% merit
- 50.0-59.9% pass
- Below 50.0% fail

12.5.5 Where the overall average falls within two percent points of the range (68%, 58% or 48% respectively) or in cases where most credits are in the class above the mean the examination boards will have discretion, on the basis of previously approved and published criteria, to decide which of the alternative awards to recommend. Departments must propose such criteria to the faculty teaching committee for approval and include the approved criteria in the department’s student information published at the start of the academic year.
12.5.6 Merit and distinction classifications are not awarded in programmes where all assessment is wholly collaborative, involving peer assessment in each assignment.

12.5.7 In exercising discretion the examination boards will take account of a variety of factors which may include the following:

(a) dissertation;
(b) core modules;
(c) optional modules;
(d) placements/study abroad;
(e) elements of reassessment/condonation.

12.5.8 Candidates for a taught Masters degree who fail to meet the requirements for the award of such a degree having exhausted all reassessment opportunities or who withdraw from the programme will be awarded either a Postgraduate Diploma or Postgraduate Certificate, provided that:

(a) such an award has been defined in the programme regulations; and
(b) the student has been awarded sufficient credit for these lower awards as defined above.

12.5.9 Candidates for a Postgraduate Diploma who fail to meet the requirements for such an award having exhausted all reassessment opportunities or who withdraw from the programme will be awarded a Postgraduate Certificate, provided that:

(a) such an award has been defined in the programme regulations; and
(b) the student has been awarded sufficient credit for these lower awards as defined above.

12.5.10 Students who wish to challenge the process by which judgments concerning marks/grades or the class of degree to be awarded were made may apply to have their cases reviewed under the procedures for Academic Appeals as defined in the chapter on Academic Appeals.

12.6 REASSESSMENT

12.6.1 A student who fails any module at any point in the degree programme will have one opportunity for reassessment for that module within the same academic year. If the mark for the module is below 40% then reassessment is compulsory; otherwise it is optional. Where for administrative or logistical reasons it is not possible for a student to complete the reassessment requirements to the published time (for example with a resubmitted dissertation) and an alternative form of assessment cannot be devised, the examination boards may propose an alternative date for reassessment. Such alternative reassessment arrangements will not give advantage or disadvantage compared with the original form of assessment.

12.6.2 The precise form of reassessment is for the department to decide, but the following principles should be borne in mind:

(a) the principal purpose of reassessment is to re-examine the learning objectives which have been failed at the first attempt;
students who have failed all elements of assessment at the first attempt should not be advantaged over those who have failed only a part of the assessment.

12.6.3 If the module percentage mark after reassessment is an improvement on the original mark, the new percentage mark will count subject to a cap of 50%; otherwise the original percentage mark will stand. The resulting percentage mark will count towards the overall average.

12.6.4 Where reassessment is prohibited for reasons of professional accreditation this will be clearly stated in the assessment guidelines provided to students and alternative awards and other available options identified.

12.6.5 Students may not seek reassessment to improve a passing grade unless required for professional accreditation and allowed under specific accreditation arrangements.

12.6.6 The overall profile will only then be considered for classification when all the results of reassessment are available.

12.7 CONDONATION

12.7.1 Where a student, after all opportunities for reassessment, has failed a module, the exam board should, subject to the learning outcomes for the programme being met, normally condone credit whereby said credit will be available as an element of either progression or final classification requirements of the award, subject to the maximum number of condonable credits as laid down in 12.7.2. Condonation may take place whether or not the student has taken advantage of the opportunity for reassessment. For the purposes of averaging, the mark obtained in any condoned module stands.

12.7.2 When all the results of all reassessments relating to postgraduate taught modules of 15 credits or more in size award are available the overall profile will be reviewed by the relevant exam board. For Masters programmes, up to a maximum of 45 credits should normally be condoned where the mark after all opportunities for reassessment is at least 40% (30 credits for Postgraduate Diplomas and 20 credits for Postgraduate Certificates). Where a module has a credit value of less than 15, these can be combined with other smaller values to create an assessment unit to a maximum value of 20 credits and therefore combined for condonation. However, such assessment units must be agreed and published in advance and not simply created for the purpose of condonation.

12.7.3 The number of credits available for condonation within a Masters degree programme may be reduced to 30 if this is approved by the faculty teaching committee. It is also permissible to declare any individual module uncondonable if this is properly approved. All such decisions must be clearly communicated to all students on the programme.

12.7.4 The phrase “should normally” in 12.7.1 and 12.7.2 above means that condonation, where allowable and subject to the learning outcomes for the programme being met, must be granted unless the examiners believe that there is good reason not to do so. Any such reason must be described and justified in the examination board minutes. The final decision will be taken by the University Dean for Academic Quality acting on behalf of Senate.
**12.8 INCOMPLETE ASSESSMENT AND MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES**

12.8.1 For the purposes of these regulations ‘mitigating circumstances’ will mean properly evidenced and approved claims from students that demonstrate good cause as to why their performance and achievements have been adversely affected by means which have not been fully addressed through extension and other available assessment procedures.

12.8.2 For the purposes of these regulations ‘good cause’ will mean illness or other relevant personal circumstances affecting a student and resulting in either the student’s failure to attend an examination, or submit coursework at or by the due time, or otherwise satisfy the requirements of the scheme of assessment appropriate to his or her programme of studies; or, the student’s performance in examination or other instrument of assessment being manifestly prejudiced.

12.8.3 A chronic medical condition, for which due allowance has already been made, will not itself be considered a good cause although a short-term exacerbation of such a condition might be so judged.

12.8.4 ‘Evidence’ will mean a report descriptive of the medical condition or other adverse personal circumstances which are advanced by the student for consideration as amounting to good cause. Such a report should include a supporting statement from an appropriate person. Where the report refers to a medical condition of more than five days duration the report must be completed by an appropriate medical practitioner who would be requested to comment on how the medical condition concerned would be likely (if this were the case) to have affected the student’s ability to prepare for or carry out the assessments in question.

12.8.5 Where an incomplete assessment may be the result of good cause, it will be the responsibility of the student concerned to make the circumstances known to their department or equivalent body and to provide appropriate evidence. Notification later than forty-eight hours after the examination, or after the date at which submission of the work for assessment was due, will not normally be taken into account unless circumstances have prevented the student from notifying the department within this time.

12.8.6 All programmes will have a Mitigating Circumstances Committee whose primary responsibility it is to consider claims of good cause for the modules they administer. Any such claims would be subject to confirmation by the examination boards at a later date. The Mitigating Circumstances Committee would be required to meet at least once prior to the final examination boards, but might usefully meet to consider claims of good cause on a more frequent basis. The Mitigating Circumstances Committee will produce minutes of its meetings to be submitted to the appropriate examination body.

12.8.7 In considering claims of good cause:

(a) the evidence provided by the student claiming good cause, and any relevant and available material submitted by him or her for assessment will be scrutinised;

(b) fairness to the individual student claiming good cause must be balanced with fairness to other students and the integrity of the assessment as a whole;
(c) in the event of the student having failed to attend an examination or examinations, or having failed to submit course material or other work for assessment at or by the due time, it will be determined whether the failure to attend or submit has been justified by good cause; and

(d) in the event of the student having submitted work for assessment by examination or otherwise, it will be determined whether such work has been manifestly prejudiced by good cause. If such prejudice is established the work affected will normally be deemed not to have been submitted.

12.8.8 Where it is determined that the evidence presented does not support the student’s claim that s/he was prevented by good cause from attending an examination or from submitting work for assessment, the student will be awarded a percentage score of zero for the assessment or assessments in question. Where work is submitted but the student makes a claim that it has been affected by good cause (or a late penalty is applied), and the evidence presented does not support the student’s claim then his or her work will be assessed (or penalised) as though no claim of good cause had been received and the student’s grade for the module will be calculated accordingly.

12.8.9 In the event of incomplete assessment arising from good cause being established the student will normally be expected to complete his or her assessment by attending the examination at a subsequent session, or submitting outstanding work for assessment, if an opportunity to do so occurs within his or her period of study. In considering whether this requirement should apply, the desirability of the student’s assessment being conducted in full should be balanced with the practical considerations and financial costs to the student and the University of providing a later completion date. Consideration should also be given to the student’s other assessment commitments to ensure that he or she is not unreasonably burdened. In order to permit such completion:

(a) a special sitting of an examination may be arranged, or the student will be required to attend for examination at a scheduled session; and/or

(b) a date for completion of non-examination assessment will be set; as appropriate in the circumstances. In any such event, that sitting or submission will be regarded as the student’s first attempt if the examination or assessment missed would itself have been his or her first attempt.

12.8.10 Where it is determined that the evidence presented supports the student’s claim that he or she was prevented by good cause from completing work for assessment on or by the due time, and where no means of substituting an alternative assessment may be found, the following regulations will apply.

(a) The extent to which the student’s assessment has been completed will be determined as a percentage, taking into account the relative weights attributed to the components of a complete assessment as published in the relevant approved assessment scheme.

(b) The examination boards will make an overall judgement of the student’s work submitted for assessment, using as far as possible the standards and criteria applied in respect of the work of other students.

(c) At module level where the student has:
completed 33% or more of the total summative assessment required the examination boards can recommend an overall module result using the full grading table on the basis of work completed so long as the work completed is deemed to demonstrate attainment against substantial elements of the module’s learning outcomes;

(ii) completed less than 33% of the work required for assessment he or she will be regarded as not having completed sufficient assessment to be awarded a grade in the module.

(d) At programme level where the student has:

(i) completed 75% or more of the total work required for programme assessment, the examination boards will recommend an award or other outcome on the basis of the work completed;

(ii) completed less than 75% of the work required for assessment he or she will be regarded as not having completed sufficient assessment to be awarded a degree.

12.8.11 Further guidance on the management and operation of Mitigating Circumstances Committees can be found in Chapter 10 on General Assessment Regulations for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught Programmes.

12.9 CONSIDERATION AND CONFIRMATION OF RESULTS

12.9.1 Senate has ultimate authority to determine all results of assessment leading to University of Lancaster credit and awards. For Masters degrees it delegates its authority to an officer of the University, who in turn delegates operational authority to individual examination boards.

12.9.2 The officer with delegated authority from Senate provides:

(a) formal confirmation (or not) of due process regarding the decisions from Boards of Examiners for the award to individual students of a named degree (i.e. qualification and subject) of a particular class;

(b) formal approval of due process regarding the recommendations from Boards of Examiners that students be awarded no degree with or without a resit opportunity (i.e. fails); and

(c) formal review of External Examiner reports of all postgraduate taught provision to ensure consistency across the University.

12.9.3 For each degree programme approved by the University there will be an exam board comprising external and internal examiners which will be responsible for the assurance of standards through the exercise of their academic judgement both directly in the assessment of students' work and indirectly in the design of specific forms of assessment. The constitution and terms of reference for examination boards within the constituent elements of the University are set out in the section on examination boards in Chapter 10 on General Assessment Regulations for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught Programmes.

12.9.4 The exam board will receive decisions from the Mitigating Circumstances Committee. Examination boards cannot, of themselves, reconsider or change decisions of the
Mitigating Circumstances Committee. Examination boards may challenge decisions of Mitigation Circumstances Committees by referring final decisions to the Committee of Senate, or equivalent body.

12.9.5 Examination boards will consider the results of examinations and final marks and make recommendations to the officer with delegated authority from Senate as to the award of degrees (and the classification of degrees) within the approved degree programme classification scheme.

12.9.6 Examination boards will agree condonation of assessment against understood and agreed criteria, details of which are available elsewhere.

12.9.7 The business of the examination boards will be minuted and the minutes will include a record of the External Examiner’s adjudications, comments and recommendations, as well as particular decisions made by the board. The minutes will also record the decisions of the Mitigating Circumstances Committee for each candidate considered by that committee. The minutes must include a list of attendees (together with their status as external or internal examiners or assessor. This record of the proceedings of the board will be restricted and made available only to: the participating examiners and assessors, the Vice-Chancellor and other officers of the University as appropriate; the officer with delegated authority from Senate and appropriate Academic Appeal and Review Panels as defined in the chapter on Academic Appeals. Where the exam board has exercised its discretion in a particular case, as provided by these Regulations, the officer with delegated authority from Senate will normally uphold its decision providing it had the support of the majority of the External Examiners present at that exam board.

12.10 PUBLISHED INFORMATION

12.10.1 The determination of results and the classification of University degrees are subject always to ratification by the Senate and will be regarded as provisional until ratified, normally through the officer with delegated authority from Senate.

12.10.2 Immediately after the meetings of the relevant examination boards, departments or equivalent may notify students of their provisional degree results.

12.10.3 Within forty days of the ratification of degree results, students will receive a transcript of their results together with a diploma supplement, both of which will conform in scope and layout to principles agreed by Senate.

12.11 EXCLUSION

12.11.1 Students who fail to meet the final award criteria and who have exhausted all reassessment opportunities shall be subject to the University’s Academic Appeals procedures, after which, if the failure is confirmed, they will be excluded from the University.

12.12 POSTGRADUATE CERTIFICATE OF ACHIEVEMENT

12.12.1 The University shall award a Postgraduate Certificate of Achievement for students who have obtained between 20 and 50 credits at M level on a named award.
12.12.2 Each named award shall be in the form of a proposal to the appropriate teaching committee(s) and shall consist of modules within a specific area of study that together make up a coherent programme. The elements that make up the award and their assessment, and the timescale for their achievement, shall be specified in the proposal.

12.12.3 The holder of a Certificate of Achievement may progress to a further M level award, including diploma and taught Masters courses, and shall receive credit for some or all of the credits received within the Certificate, provided that the holder shall surrender the Certificate of Achievement on successful completion of the studies specified for the further qualification. The award may not be used as a substitute for partial success in any other programme.

12.12.4 Each named award shall have a named director of studies who will admit students by means of the standard postgraduate admissions procedures.

12.12.5 Students who are registered for a programme leading to a named Certificate of Achievement shall have access to the same procedures governing postgraduate study as all other students; except that they may not attend a degree ceremony.

12.12.6 The fee payable will normally be a pro rata proportion of the standard postgraduate Masters fee, calculated by reference to the credit value of the particular award.
13. POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH ASSESSMENT REGULATIONS

13.1 RESEARCH AWARDS

13.1.1 The University currently offers the following awards (see Appendix 1 of these Regulations for definitions of these awards):

- Doctor of Science/Letters (DSc/DLitt)
- PhD (via publication, thesis or alternative format, including European, integrated and professional variants)
- Doctor of Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy)
- Doctor of Engineering (EngD)
- Doctor of Management (DMgt)
- Doctor of Medicine (MD)
- Master of Philosophy (MPhil)
- Master of Arts, Law or Science by Research (LLM/MA/MSc by Research)
- Master of Research (MRes) (see below)

13.1.2 The University categorises the Master of Research (MRes) as a postgraduate research degree award. Such programmes are, however, governed by the regulations for postgraduate taught programmes for the purposes of assessment and classification, and as such the MRes is included within the Postgraduate Taught Assessment Regulations.

13.2 PhD REGULATIONS

[The following regulations for the award of PhD also apply to other standard doctoral awards (DClinPsy; DMgt; EngD; MD).]

Criteria for the award

13.2.1 The degree shall be awarded on the examination of a thesis embodying the results of a candidate's research, and on an oral examination. The nature of the student's research programme should be on a scale which should be completed during three years, or at most four years, of full-time study or equivalent. In addition the candidate may be required to undertake such other tests as the examiners may decide.

13.2.2 A successful candidate for the degree of PhD shall show convincing evidence of the capacity to pursue scholarly research or scholarship in his or her field of study on a scale which should be completed during three years of full-time research. The results of this research shall then be embodied in a thesis which makes an original contribution to knowledge and the completed thesis must contain material of a standard appropriate for scholarly publication. The thesis shall comply with the requirements for the form, submission and deposit of theses.

13.2.3 A successful candidate for the degree of PhD should be able to demonstrate:

(a) an ability to conceptualise, design and implement a major project for the generation of significant new knowledge, applications and/or understanding, using appropriate concepts and methods, where necessary adapting these to meet unforeseen issues;
(b) a systematic acquisition of, and insight into, a substantial body of knowledge including the primary literature in their particular area of interest;
(c) an ability to relate theory and concepts to evidence in a systematic way and to draw appropriate conclusions based on the evidence;
(d) critical investigation of their research topic resulting in the creation and interpretation of knowledge which extends the forefront of their discipline through original research;
(e) a detailed understanding of, and ability to use, applicable techniques for research and advanced inquiry in their field;
(f) that they can make informed judgements on complex issues in their field, often in the absence of complete data;
(g) that the research is of publishable quality and is of a standard which satisfies peer review;
(h) that they are competent as an independent researcher in their discipline and capable of continuing to undertake research at an advanced level, contributing substantially to the development of new techniques, ideas or approaches;
(i) an understanding of the place of the research in the wider context;
(j) an ability to recognise the limitations of the research undertaken and to be able to suggest ways of overcoming these in future research;
(k) an ability to write clearly and effectively and to meet approved criteria for formal presentation of a written thesis;
(l) the qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring personal responsibility and autonomous initiative in complex and often unpredictable situations;
(m) the ability to communicate their ideas and conclusions clearly and effectively to specialist and non-specialist audiences.

Registration period

13.2.4 For full-time students the minimum period of registration for the degree shall normally be thirty-six calendar months from the date of commencement of studies to the date of submission of the thesis. The maximum period of registration shall be forty-eight months. Full-time students may, with the approval of the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate, be permitted to register for a shorter period, as proposed by the admitting department. A shorter period of registration, which may in no case be for a period of less than twelve months, may be justified by accrediting the applicant’s attainment in original research prior to application and not otherwise accredited for a degree already awarded. Normally an extension beyond the maximum period of registration will not be permitted, but can be at the discretion of the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate.

13.2.5 For part-time students the minimum period of registration for the degree shall normally be forty-eight calendar months from the date of commencement of studies to the date of submission of the thesis. The maximum period of registration shall be eighty-four months. Part-time students may, with the approval of the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate, be permitted to register for a shorter period, as proposed by the admitting department. A shorter period of registration, which may in no case be for a period of less than twenty-four months, may be justified by accrediting the applicant’s attainment in original research prior to application and not otherwise accredited for a degree already awarded. Normally an extension beyond the maximum
period of registration will not be permitted, but can be at the discretion of the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate.

13.2.6 In cases where a student combines periods of full-time and part-time registration the following applies when calculating the maximum period of registration permissible: if full-time for 12 months or more then treat as full-time throughout, if full-time for less than 12 months then treat as part-time throughout.

Registration period for students who registered on or before 30/09/2008

13.2.7 For students registered on or before 30 September 2008 see Appendix 4.

Schedule of work

13.2.8 Upon registration each student will be assigned a minimum of one main supervisor, who will normally be part of a supervisory team.

13.2.9 The nature of the student’s research programme should be on a scale which should be completed during three years, or at most four years, of full-time study or equivalent.

13.2.10 The supervisor(s) and student should agree a realistic completion timetable which will enable the student to produce a thesis of the required standard within the stipulated time-scale. The supervisor(s) and student will agree milestones throughout this schedule against which progress will be monitored. Progress is monitored through appraisal meetings between the supervisor(s) and student. Further details of the appraisal process may be found in the University’s Code of Practice on Postgraduate Research Programmes.

LINK to University Code of Practice on Postgraduate Research Programmes:
https://gap.lancs.ac.uk/ASQ/Policies/Pages/PGRC.aspx

Progression requirements

Year 1 (year 2 part-time)

13.2.11 Within the first six months all research students must fulfil the following, or an equivalent, process:

(a) attend an approved induction programme;
(b) carry out an approved development needs analysis (DNA) or equivalent in consultation with their supervisors, and keep a record of agreed follow-up to the DNA;
(c) take the appropriate research training activities, informed by the DNA as guided by their supervisors;
(d) complete a research proposal or plan of work which the supervisors approve as appropriate and viable;
(e) agree a projected completion timetable with their supervisors; and
(f) any additional requirements to meet the particular needs of the individual awards.
13.2.12 Any research student who does not demonstrate satisfactory progress during the first six months full-time should be: carefully monitored and supported, informed about any reasons for concern, set objectives, and their progress reviewed before the twelve month deadline. If their progress is still not satisfactory they will be excluded from the programme. Students who have been excluded for failing to make satisfactory progress may appeal against the exclusion under the Academic Appeals procedures as defined in the chapter on Academic Appeals.

13.2.13 Confirmation of PhD status, where appropriate, may be conferred at this stage in accordance with the procedures (see below).

Years 2 to 4 (or part-time equivalents)

13.2.14 Continued registration of each research student in years 2, 3 and 4 on standard PhD programmes is conditional upon agreed criteria including:

(a) submission of an appraisal (progress) report, involving input from the student, supervisors and department;
(b) evidence, confirmed in the appraisal (progress) report, that the student has:
   (i) attended the annual faculty-based progress briefing session;
   (ii) reviewed/revised their DNA;
   (iii) completed the agreed research training;
   (iv) been offered adequate supervision (as outlined in the University’s Code of Practice for Research students), accepted it, and attended supervisory sessions;
   (v) agreed a realistic completion timetable with their supervisors;
   (vi) demonstrated sufficient progress with their research/thesis; and
   (vii) any additional requirements previously agreed.

13.2.15 Where students fail to meet the criteria for continued registration they will be excluded. Students who have been excluded for failing to make satisfactory progress may appeal against the exclusion under the procedures for Academic Appeals as defined in the chapter on Academic Appeals.

13.2.16 During the first six months of the second year (or part-time equivalents) any student whose PhD registration has not yet been confirmed will be referred to the PhD Confirmation Panel (see below).

Confirmation of PhD status

13.2.17 Each department and faculty shall publish clear information for students on the procedures for confirmation of PhD. A student supervised in more than one department shall follow the procedures used by the administering department.

13.2.18 The procedures shall include details of:

(a) membership of the panel;
(b) volume, level and type of work to be submitted as evidence to the panel;
(c) normal expected period in which a student should expect to have his/her PhD registration status confirmed, bearing in mind the mode of study, periods of suspension and any other relevant factors; and
(d) number of times a student may be considered for confirmation of PhD status (normally a maximum of two attempts).

The PhD confirmation panel:

(a) must normally be held no later than eighteen months after initial registration (twenty-four months for part-time); if the panel is held within twelve months of registration then the report of the panel should replace the first year’s annual progress report. Where the student’s confirmation/transfer panel takes place more than twenty-four months (thirty-six months part-time) after initial registration they are liable for fees for a further twelve months from the date of the panel;

(b) must see and approve evidence that the student has attended induction, carried out the Development Needs Analysis (DNA), attended the agreed research training, has a viable research proposal, and has a completion timetable approved by their supervisors;

(c) must be able to confirm that the student’s work is of appropriate quality and standard, and the project is viable within the registration period, on the basis of draft chapters and/or evidence of data gathered; and

(d) will have four possible recommendations – confirm as PhD; continue as a probationary PhD student; downgrade to MPhil; exclusion.

13.2.19 Students not successful in receiving confirmation of PhD status may appeal against the recommendation under the procedures for Academic Appeals as defined in the chapter on Academic Appeals.

Submission of thesis

13.2.20 The decision to submit a thesis for examination is taken by the student, although the opinion of the supervisor should be taken into account.

13.2.21 A candidate shall make a declaration that the thesis is her/his own work, and has not been submitted by this candidate in substantially the same form for the award of a higher degree elsewhere. Any sections of the thesis which have been published, or submitted for a higher degree elsewhere, shall be clearly identified. If the thesis is, in whole or in part, the result of joint research, a statement indicating the nature of the candidate’s contribution to that research shall be included, confirmed by either the supervisor(s), or the principal author of the material(s) accepted for publication.

Format of thesis

13.2.22 A thesis for the degree of PhD shall not normally exceed 80,000 words (including any footnotes and appendices but excluding the bibliography). A candidate, with the support of her/his supervisor and Head of Department, may apply for exceptional permission to exceed the word limit, which approval may be granted by the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate.

13.2.23 The thesis shall be written in English. A candidate, with the support of her/his supervisor and Head of Department, may apply for exceptional permission to present the thesis in whole or in part in another language, which approval may be granted by the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate.
13.2.24 A candidate for the degree of PhD may apply to submit the thesis in a format other than
the traditional single volume format (alternative format); one such example being a
series of related articles suitable for journal publication – see Appendix 1 and
Appendix 3 for further details on this format). Such an application shall:

(a) be in accordance with the department’s published guidelines on alternative
format theses, which must have been approved in advance by the faculty
postgraduate teaching committee;

(b) be submitted as part of the procedure for the Recommendation for the
Appointment of Examiners for Research Degrees. A candidate may make only
one such application, which shall be made no earlier than twelve months after
initial registration for full-time PhD (twenty-four months part-time), and must be
made prior to the appointment of examiners;

(c) be supported by the supervisor(s) and Head of Department to confirm:

(i) the design of the alternative format;

(ii) that the alternative format is more appropriate for the research project;

and

(iii) that the applicant is distinguished by her/his intellectual capacity and
possession of the skills necessary to take full advantage of the
alternative format.

Note: supervising departments are encouraged to seek, where practicable, the
advice of the External Examiner(s) with respect to the alternative format
proposed;

(d) be approved by the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate (with
the exception of the format which comprises a series of related articles suitable
for journal publication). Such approval shall be granted only in advance of a
submission in an alternative format. The withholding of approval shall be
deemed an academic judgement.

13.2.25 A copy of any thesis relating to the award of a research degree made by Lancaster
University must be deposited with the University at the prescribed time. For details on
the format of submission see Appendix 2.

Examination

13.2.26 Examiners (including at least one External Examiner) shall be appointed by the body or
officer with delegated authority from Senate on the nomination of the department(s)
concerned (see section on Appointment of Examiners (All Research Degrees)). Two
External Examiners shall be appointed for theses submitted by candidates who qualify
for remission of fees as members of staff, unless in exceptional circumstances the body
officer with delegated authority from Senate decides otherwise. The candidate’s
supervisor shall not act as an examiner.

13.2.27 Each examiner shall report independently on the thesis before the oral, or any other
examination required by the examiners, takes place and submit the report to the
University prior to the examination. All examiners shall participate in the oral
examination. The examiners may at their discretion invite the student’s supervisor to be
present at the oral examination. After the oral examination, each examiner shall report
on the examination and make a recommendation based on both the report on the thesis
and on the evidence from the oral, and any other examinations that have taken place.
Examination outcomes

13.2.28 The examiners shall make one of the following recommendations:

(a) that the degree of PhD be awarded forthwith;
(b) that the degree of PhD be awarded subject to corrections being made within three months from the date of notification of the result of the decision. The term ‘corrections’ refers to typographical errors, occasional stylistic or grammatical flaws, corrections to references, etc.;
(c) that the degree of PhD be awarded subject to minor amendments being made within six months from the date of notification of the decision. The term ‘amendments’ refers to stated minor deficiencies, requiring some textual revision;
(d) that the degree of PhD should not be awarded but that the candidate should be permitted to revise the thesis and resubmit it for the degree of PhD within twelve calendar months from the date of formal notification of the decision;
(e) that the degree of MPhil be awarded;
(f) as (d), except that the candidate shall resubmit for the degree of MPhil.

13.2.29 Outcomes (e) and (f) above are not available for the DClinPsy and MD programmes.

13.2.30 Students may appeal against the outcome of the examination under the procedures for Academic Appeals as defined in the chapter on Academic Appeals.

13.2.31 Students given the opportunity to make corrections or amendments shall normally be given only one opportunity to make the changes required as specified by the examiners.

13.2.32 Examiners’ reports and recommendations will be considered by the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate on behalf of the Committee of the Senate.

Disagreement between examiners on first submission of thesis

13.2.33 If there is no unanimity among the recommendations from the examiners of the thesis at the first submission the following procedure shall be adopted.

13.2.34 In the first instance, the Student Registry shall consult with the examiners to see whether an agreed recommendation can be drawn up.

13.2.35 If agreement is not achieved, the body officer with delegated authority from Senate may at his or her discretion appoint one or more additional external examiners or may determine other action as appropriate. Any additional examiners shall be informed that the examiners appointed initially have submitted conflicting recommendations but shall not be told the identity of these examiners nor their specific recommendations. Unless the additional examiners recommend that the candidate pass, a further oral examination must be held. The student’s supervisor or the departmental tutor for research students shall attend this examination as an observer.

13.2.36 A recommendation based on the reports from all of the examiners shall be made by the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate to the Committee of the Senate. If
this recommendation is for re-submission of the thesis it shall include the nomination of the panel of examiners for the resubmitted thesis.

Resubmission

Resubmission for the degree of MPhil

13.2.37 After examination of the resubmitted thesis the examiners shall, after holding an oral examination if they wish, recommend one of the following recommendations:

(a) that the degree of MPhil be awarded;
(b) that the degree of MPhil be awarded subject to minor presentational corrections being made within one month of notification of the decision;
(c) that no award shall be made.

A student is not entitled to a second oral defence; this is at the discretion of the examiners.

13.2.38 Students may appeal against the outcome of the examination under the procedures for Academic Appeals as defined in the chapter on Academic Appeals.

Resubmission for the degree of PhD

13.2.39 After examination of the resubmitted thesis, which may include a second oral examination if the examiners require it, the examiners shall make one of the following recommendations:

(a) that the degree of PhD be awarded;
(b) that the degree of PhD be awarded subject to minor presentational corrections being made within one month of notification of the decision;
(c) that the thesis be judged to be already of a standard that would justify the award of the MPhil degree forthwith;
(d) that the thesis may be resubmitted for a second time but for the degree of MPhil (within six months of the date of formal notification of the decision); or
(e) that no award be made.

A student is not entitled to a second oral defence; this is at the discretion of the examiners.

13.2.40 Students may appeal against the outcome of the examination under the procedures for Academic Appeals as defined in the chapter on Academic Appeals.

Resubmission for the degree of DClinPsy/MD

13.2.41 After examination of the resubmitted thesis, which may include a second oral examination if the examiners require it, the examiners shall make one of the following recommendations:

(a) that the degree be awarded;
(b) that the degree be awarded subject to minor presentational corrections being made within one month from the date of notification of the decision;
that no award shall be made.

A student is not entitled to a second oral defence; this is at the discretion of the examiners.

13.2.42 Students may appeal against the outcome of the examination under the procedures for Academic Appeals as defined in the chapter on Academic Appeals.

Disagreement between examiners upon thesis resubmitted

13.2.43 The body or officer with delegated authority from Senate shall consider each case where the examiners of a resubmitted thesis are unable (after attempts have been made to reconcile their views) to reach an agreed recommendation. She or he shall have discretion to determine an appropriate course of action, including if necessary the appointment of an additional external examiner.

13.2.44 The following procedure shall be followed when the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate appoints an additional examiner for a resubmitted thesis.

13.2.45 The additional examiner shall make an independent report on the resubmitted thesis.

13.2.46 If the additional external examiner or the candidate so requests, an oral examination shall be arranged after that examiner has submitted his report on the thesis. The previous examiners of the thesis shall not be invited to attend but the student's supervisor shall be required to be present as an observer.

13.2.47 The additional external examiner shall make one of the following recommendations, taking into account the candidate's performance at an oral examination if one has been held.

For theses resubmitted for the degree of PhD:

(a) (subject only to any minor amendments to be made to the satisfaction of the examiners) that the degree of PhD be awarded; or,
(b) that no degree be awarded; or,
(c) that the degree of MPhil be awarded.

For theses resubmitted for the degree of D Clin Psy/MD/M Phil:

(a) (subject only to any minor amendments to be made to the satisfaction of the examiners) that the degree be awarded; or,
(b) that no degree be awarded.

13.2.48 The body or officer with delegated authority from Senate shall consider the reports of all examiners on the resubmitted thesis, the examiners' final recommendations and the results of any oral examination held and, in the light of these, shall decide its recommendation to the Committee of the Senate.
13.3 MPhil Regulations

Criteria for the award

13.3.1 The degree shall be awarded on the examination of a thesis embodying the results of the candidate's research, and on an oral examination. The work for the degree shall consist mainly of research and directed study; the candidate may in addition be required to undertake coursework, and the award of the degree may be conditional on satisfactory performance in this coursework.

13.3.2 A successful candidate for the degree of MPhil shall display a convincing grasp of the techniques of research appropriate to the field of study on a scale which can be completed during two years, or at most three years, of full-time study or equivalent. The thesis embodying the results of the research shall demonstrate evidence of originality, at least in the exercise of an independent critical faculty, and shall achieve a high standard of competence in argument and presentation. The thesis shall comply with the requirements for the form, submission and deposit of theses.

Registration period

13.3.3 For full-time students the minimum period of registration for the degree shall normally be twenty-four calendar months from the date of commencement of studies to the date of submission of the thesis. The maximum period of registration shall be 36 months. Full-time students may, with the approval of the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate or nominee, be permitted to register for a minimum period of less than twenty-four months but in no case less than twelve months. Full-time students may, with the approval of Student Registry, be permitted to extend registration for a further twelve months. Normally an extension beyond the maximum period of registration will not be permitted.

13.3.4 For part-time students the minimum period of registration for the degree shall normally be thirty-six calendar months from the date of commencement of studies to the date of submission of the thesis. The maximum period of registration shall be 60 months. Part-time students may, with the approval of the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate or nominee, be permitted to register for a minimum period of less than thirty-six months but in no case less than twenty-four months. Part-time students may, with the approval of Student Registry, be permitted to extend registration for a further twelve months. Normally an extension beyond the maximum period of registration will not be permitted.

13.3.5 For students registered as full-time the maximum period shall be thirty-six months and for those registered as part-time the maximum period shall be sixty months. The Head of the admitting Department may recognise all or part of a period of study for the degree of LL.M., MA, MBA, MMus, MSc, MRes, or PhD in this University, or for an appropriate higher degree in another University, as counting towards the total period for the degree of MPhil. Such recognition shall not, however, be granted if the higher degree has already been awarded.
13.3.6 In cases where a student combines periods of full-time and part-time registration the following applies when calculating the maximum period of registration permissible: if full-time for 12 months or more then treat as full-time throughout, if full-time for less than 12 months then treat as part-time throughout.

Registration period for students who registered on or before 30/09/2008

13.3.7 For students registered on or before 30 September 2008 see Appendix 4.

Schedule of work

13.3.8 Upon registration each student will be assigned a minimum of one main supervisor, who will normally be part of a supervisory team.

13.3.9 The nature of the student’s research programme should be on a scale which should be completed during two years, or at most three years, of full-time study or equivalent.

13.3.10 The supervisor(s) and student should agree a realistic completion timetable which will enable the student to produce a thesis of the required standard within the stipulated time-scale. The supervisor(s) and student will agree milestones throughout this schedule against which progress will be monitored.

Progression requirements

Year 1 (year 2 part-time)

13.3.11 Within the first six months all research students must fulfil the following, or an equivalent process:

(a) attend an approved induction programme;
(b) carry out an approved development needs analysis (DNA) or equivalent in consultation with their supervisors, and keep a record of agreed follow-up to the DNA;
(c) take the appropriate research training activities, informed by the DNA as guided by their supervisors;
(d) complete a research proposal or plan of work which the supervisors approve as appropriate and viable;
(e) agree a projected completion timetable with their supervisors; and
(f) any additional requirements to meet the particular needs of the individual awards.

13.3.12 Any research student who does not demonstrate satisfactory progress during the first six months full-time should be: carefully monitored and supported, informed about any reasons for concern, set objectives, and their progress reviewed before the twelve month deadline. If their progress is still not satisfactory they will be excluded from the programme. Students who have been excluded for failing to make satisfactory progress may appeal against the exclusion under the procedures for Academic Appeals as defined in the chapter on Academic Appeals.
13.3.13 Where work is deemed to be of sufficient merit a recommendation may be put to the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate that the student’s registration be transferred from MPhil to a doctoral programme in which case the transfer procedure will apply (see below).

Submission of thesis

13.3.14 The decision to submit a thesis for examination is taken by the student, although the opinion of the supervisor should be taken into account.

13.3.15 A candidate shall make a declaration that the thesis is her/his own work, and has not been submitted by this candidate in substantially the same form for the award of a higher degree elsewhere. Any sections of the thesis which have been published, or submitted for a higher degree elsewhere, shall be clearly identified. If the thesis is, in whole or in part, the result of joint research, a statement indicating the nature of the candidate’s contribution to that research shall be included, confirmed by either the supervisor(s), or the principal author of the material(s) accepted for publication.

Format of thesis

13.3.16 A thesis for the degree of MPhil shall not normally exceed 60,000 words (including any footnotes and appendices but excluding the bibliography). A candidate, with the support of her/his supervisor and Head of Department, may apply for exceptional permission to exceed the word limit, which approval may be granted by the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate.

13.3.17 The thesis shall be written in English. A candidate, with the support of her/his supervisor and Head of Department, may apply for exceptional permission to present the thesis in whole or in part in another language, which approval may be granted by the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate.

13.3.18 A candidate for the degree of MPhil may apply to submit the thesis in a format other than the traditional single volume format (alternative format); one such example being a series of related articles suitable for journal publication - see Appendix 1 and Appendix 3 for further details on this format). Such an application shall:

(a) be in accordance with the department’s published guidelines on alternative format submissions, which must have been approved in advance by the faculty postgraduate teaching committee;

(b) be submitted as part of the procedure for the Recommendation for the Appointment of Examiners for Research Degrees. A candidate may make only one such application, which shall be made no earlier than twelve months after initial registration for full-time MPhil (twenty-four months part-time), and must be made prior to the appointment of examiners;

(c) be supported by the supervisor(s) and Head of Department to confirm:

(i) the design of the alternative format;

(ii) that the alternative format is more appropriate for the research project; and

(iii) that the applicant is distinguished by her/his intellectual capacity and possession of the skills necessary to take full advantage of the alternative format.
Note: supervising departments are encouraged to seek, where practicable, the advice of the External Examiner(s) with respect to the alternative format proposed;

(d) be approved by the body and officer with delegated authority from Senate (with the exception of the format which comprises a series of related articles suitable for journal publication). Such approval shall be granted only in advance of a submission in an alternative format. The withholding of approval shall be deemed an academic judgement.

13.3.19 A copy of any thesis relating to the award of a research degree made by Lancaster University must be deposited with the University at the prescribed time. For details on the format of submission see Appendix 2.

Examination

13.3.20 Examiners (including at least one external examiner) shall be appointed by the body and officer with delegated authority from Senate on the nomination of the department(s) concerned. Two external examiners shall be appointed for theses submitted by candidates who qualify for remission of tuition fees as members of staff, except where the body and officer with delegated authority from Senate determines otherwise. The candidate's supervisor shall not act as an examiner.

13.3.21 Each examiner shall make an independent report on the thesis. These reports shall be written before any oral or any other examination required by the examiners takes place and submitted to the Student Registry prior to the examination. All examiners shall participate in any oral examination. Each examiner shall then make a recommendation based on both the report on the thesis and on the evidence from the oral examination. The examiners may at their discretion invite the student's supervisor to be present at the oral examination.

13.3.22 An oral examination is required. The examiners shall have discretion whether or not to hold an oral examination on a resubmitted thesis.

Examination outcomes

13.3.23 The examiners shall make one of the following recommendations:

(a) that the degree of MPhil shall be awarded forthwith;
(b) that the degree of MPhil shall be awarded with distinction;
(c) that the degree of MPhil shall be awarded subject to corrections being made within three months from the date of notification of the decision. The term ‘corrections’ refers to typographical errors, occasional stylistic and grammatical flaws, corrections to references, etc.;
(d) that the degree of MPhil shall be awarded subject to minor amendments being made within six months from the date of notification of the decision. The term ‘minor amendments’ refers to stated minor deficiencies requiring some textual revision;
(e) that the degree of MPhil should not be awarded but that the candidate should be invited to revise the thesis and resubmit it for the degree of MPhil;
(f) that no award should be made.
13.3.24 Students may appeal against the outcome of the examination under the procedures for Academic Appeals as defined in the chapter on Academic Appeals.

13.3.25 Students given the opportunity to make corrections or amendments shall normally be given only one opportunity to make the changes required as specified by the examiners.

13.3.26 Examiners’ reports and recommendations will be considered by the body and officer with delegated authority from Senate on behalf of the Committee of the Senate.

Disagreement between examiners on first submission of thesis

13.3.27 If there is no unanimity among the recommendations from the examiners of the thesis at the first submission the following procedure shall be adopted.

13.3.28 In the first instance, the Deputy Head of Student Registry shall consult with the examiners to see whether an agreed recommendation can be drawn up.

13.3.29 If agreement is not achieved, the body and officer with delegated authority from Senate may at his or her discretion appoint one or more additional external examiners or may determine other action as appropriate. Any additional examiners shall be informed that the examiners appointed initially have submitted conflicting recommendations but shall not be told the identity of these examiners nor their specific recommendations. Unless the additional examiners recommend that the candidate pass, a further oral examination must be held. The student’s supervisor or the departmental tutor for research students shall attend this examination as an observer.

13.3.30 A recommendation based on the reports from all of the examiners shall be made by the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate to the Committee of the Senate. If this recommendation is for re-submission of the thesis it shall include the nomination of the panel of examiners for the resubmitted thesis.

Resubmission

13.3.31 The examiners shall, after holding an oral examination if they wish, recommend either:

(a) that the degree of MPhil be awarded;
(b) that the degree of MPhil be awarded subject to minor presentational corrections being made within one month of notification of the decision;
(c) that no award be made.

A student is not entitled to a second oral defence; this is at the discretion of the examiners.

13.3.32 Students may appeal against the outcome of the examination under the procedures for Academic Appeals as defined in the chapter on Academic Appeals.

Disagreement between examiners upon thesis resubmitted

13.3.33 The body and officer with delegated authority from Senate shall consider each case where the examiners of a resubmitted thesis are unable (after attempts have been made to reconcile their views) to reach an agreed recommendation. She or he shall
have discretion to determine an appropriate course of action, including if necessary the appointment of an additional external examiner.

13.3.34 The following procedure shall be followed when the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate appoints an additional examiner for a resubmitted thesis.

13.3.35 The additional examiner shall make an independent report on the resubmitted thesis.

13.3.36 If the additional external examiner or the candidate so requests, an oral examination shall be arranged after that examiner has submitted his report on the thesis. The previous examiners of the thesis shall not be invited to attend but the student’s supervisor shall be required to be present as an observer.

13.3.37 The additional external examiner shall make one of the following recommendations, taking into account the candidate’s performance at an oral examination if one has been held:

(a) (subject only to any minor amendments to be made to the satisfaction of the examiners) that the degree of MPhil be awarded; or,
(b) that no degree be awarded.

13.3.38 The body or officer with delegated authority from Senate shall consider the reports of all examiners on the resubmitted thesis, the examiners’ final recommendations and the results of any oral examination held and, in the light of these, shall decide its recommendation to the Committee of the Senate.

**Transfer of registration from MPhil to PhD**

13.3.39 Students who are initially registered for an MPhil and who wish to upgrade and transfer their registration to PhD shall follow the established procedures. Departments and faculties shall publish clear information for students on these procedures for upgrading from MPhil to PhD. A student supervised in more than one department shall follow the procedures used by the administrating department.

13.3.40 The procedures shall include details of:

(a) membership of the panel;
(b) volume, level and type of work to be submitted as evidence to the panel;
(c) normal expected period in which a student should expect to transfer his/her registration, bearing in mind the mode of study, periods of suspension and any other relevant factors; and
(d) number of times a student may attempt to transfer his/her registration (normally a maximum of two attempts).

13.3.41 The transfer of registration panel:

(a) must normally be held no later than eighteen months after initial registration (twenty-four months for part-time); if the panel is held within twelve months of registration then the report of the panel should replace the first year’s annual progress report. Where the student’s transfer panel takes place more than
twenty-four months (thirty-six months part-time) after initial registration they are liable for fees for a further twelve months from the date of the panel;

(b) must see and approve evidence that the student has attended induction, carried out the Development Needs Analysis (DNA), attended the agreed research training, has a viable research proposal, and has a completion timetable approved by their supervisors;

(c) must be able to confirm that the student’s work is of appropriate quality and standard, and the project is viable within the registration period, on the basis of draft chapters and/or evidence of data gathered; and

(d) will have two possible recommendations – upgrade and transfer to PhD registration status; continue as a probationary MPhil student.

13.3.42 Students who are not permitted to transfer to PhD may appeal against the recommendation under the procedures for Academic Appeals as defined in the chapter on Academic Appeals.

13.4 LLM/MA/MSc BY RESEARCH REGULATIONS

Criteria for the award

13.4.1 The degree shall be awarded on the examination of a dissertation embodying the results of the candidate’s research. An oral examination will also be required. The work for the degree shall consist mainly of research and directed study; the candidate may in addition be required to undertake coursework, and the award of the degree may be conditional on satisfactory performance in this coursework.

13.4.2 A successful candidate for the degree of MA/MSc by Research shall display a convincing grasp of the techniques of research appropriate to the field of study on a scale which can be completed during one year, or at most two years, of full-time study or equivalent. The dissertation embodying the results of the research shall demonstrate evidence of originality, at least in the exercise of an independent critical faculty, and shall achieve a good standard of competence in argument and presentation. The dissertation shall comply with the requirements for the form, submission and deposit of MPhil theses except that the dissertation should not normally exceed 35,000 words (including any footnotes and appendices but excluding the bibliography).

Registration Period

13.4.3 For full-time students the minimum period of registration for the degree shall normally be twelve calendar months from the date of commencement of studies to the date of submission of the dissertation. Full-time students may, with the approval of Student Registry, be permitted to extend registration for a further twelve months. Normally an extension beyond that period will not be permitted.

13.4.4 For part-time students the minimum period of registration for the degree shall normally be twenty-four calendar months from the date of commencement of studies to the date of submission of the dissertation. Part-time students may, with the approval of the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate or nominee, be permitted to register for a minimum period of less than twenty-four months but in no case less than twelve months. Part-time students may, with the approval of Student Registry, be permitted to
extend registration for a further twelve months. Normally an extension beyond that period will not be permitted.

13.4.5 For students registered as full-time the maximum period shall be twenty-four months and for those registered as part-time the maximum period shall be thirty-six months. Any extension of the maximum period must be approved by Student Registry after consideration of evidence of the student’s progress submitted by the department concerned. For both full- and part-time students the absolute maximum period shall not exceed forty-eight months. The body or officer with delegated authority from Senate may recognise all or part of a period of study for the degree of LLM, MA, MBA, MMus, MSc, MRes, MPhil, or PhD in this University, or for an appropriate degree in another university, as counting towards the total period for the degree of MA/MSc by Research. Such recognition shall not, however, be granted if the higher degree has already been awarded.

Submission of dissertation

13.4.6 A candidate must make a declaration that the dissertation is her/his own work, and has not been submitted in substantially the same form for the award of a higher degree elsewhere. Any sections of the dissertation which have been published, for a higher degree elsewhere, shall be clearly identified. If the dissertation is the result of joint research, a statement indicating the nature of the candidate’s contribution to that research, confirmed by the supervisor(s), shall be included.

Consideration of results by boards of examination

13.4.7 Examiners (including at least one External Examiner) shall be appointed by the body and officer with delegated authority from Senate on the nomination of the department(s) concerned. Two External Examiners shall be appointed for a dissertation submitted by a candidate who qualifies for remission of tuition fees as a member of staff, except where the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate determines otherwise. The candidate’s supervisor shall, where practicable, not act as an examiner. When a supervisor is appointed as an examiner, an additional examiner (internal or external) shall be appointed unless, in exceptional circumstances, the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate decides otherwise.

13.4.8 Each examiner shall make an independent report in the dissertation. These reports shall be written before any oral or any other examination required by the examiners takes place and submitted to the Student Registry prior to examination. All examiners shall participate in any oral examination. Each examiner shall then make a recommendation based on both the report on the dissertation and on the evidence from any examinations which may have been held. The examiners may at their discretion invite the student’s supervisor to be present at any oral examination.

13.4.9 An oral examination is required.

13.4.10 Following the oral examination, the examiners shall make one of the following recommendations:

(a) that the degree of LLM/MA/MSc by Research shall be awarded forthwith;
(b) that the degree of LLM/MA/MSc by Research shall be awarded with distinction;
that the degree of LLM/MA/MSc by Research shall be awarded subject to corrections being made within one month from the date of notification of the decision. The term ‘corrections’ refers to typographical errors, occasional stylistic and grammatical flaws, corrections to references, etc.;

that the degree of LLM/MA/MSc by Research shall be awarded subject to minor amendments being made within three months from the date of notification of the decision. The term minor amendments refers to stated minor deficiencies that some textual revisions be made;

that the degree of LLM/MA/MSc by Research should not be awarded but that the candidate should be invited to revise the dissertation and resubmit it for the degree of LLM/MA/MSc by Research within six months;

that no award should be made.

13.4.11 Following resubmission, the examiners shall recommend either:

(a) that the degree of LLM/MA/MSc by Research shall be awarded forthwith;
(b) that the degree of LLM/MA/MSc by Research shall be awarded subject to minor corrections being made within one month of notification of the decision;
(c) that no award be made.

13.4.12 Examiners’ reports and recommendations will be considered by the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate.

13.4.13 Students may appeal against the outcome of the examination under the procedures for Academic Appeals as defined in the chapter on Academic Appeals.

13.4.14 In the case of a disagreement between examiners a decision will be taken by the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate. If this decision confirms the recommendation that no degree be awarded the student may appeal under the Academic Appeals procedures as defined in the chapter on Academic Appeals.

13.5 APPOINTMENT OF EXAMINERS (ALL RESEARCH DEGREES)

General requirements

13.5.1 All research students, whether studying towards the MPhil or PhD, submit a thesis for examination which is assessed by examiners appointed specifically according to the student’s area of study. As well as the assessment of the work itself, all PhD, MPhil and MA/MSc by Research students undergo an oral examination.

13.5.2 There shall always be at least one internal examiner and one external examiner. If a student has had a connection with the department or university beyond that of being a research student, i.e. as a member of staff or a research assistant, then a second external examiner is required. If a suitable internal examiner cannot be found or if only the supervisor would be suitable, then a second external examiner would also be required.

External Examiners: Eligibility and appointment

13.5.3 The external examiner shall normally be a senior academic from another institution qualified to assess the thesis within its own field and to compare its quality with work of
MPhil/PhD standard at other British universities although where appropriate an examiner from outside the university sector may be appointed.

13.5.4 All external examiner(s) shall:

(a) be competent in the area of work being examined;
(b) be experienced in research, including having published;
(c) be experienced in the examination of research students.

13.5.5 Where it is deemed to be appropriate to appoint an examiner from outside the university sector, the person nominated must have an understanding of the examination process, and if s/he has not previously examined a research student, then the internal examiner must be widely experienced as an examiner.

13.5.6 The University shall appoint appropriate external examiners on the nomination of heads of departments and subject to approval by the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate on behalf of the Committee of Senate.

Internal examiners: eligibility and appointment

13.5.7 Internal examiners shall be members of staff from either the same department or an area cognate to the student’s field of research. Where the internal examiner is not an expert in the precise field of research they shall be acquainted with the broad area within which it falls. In addition, the internal examiner should normally hold a degree at least equivalent to that for which the student is being examined, and should be experienced in research. Lancaster University Guidance for the Examination of Research Degrees is available via http://www.lancs.ac.uk/sbs/registry/docs/ExternalExaminers/guidance-notes-research-degrees.pdf. The Guidance confirms that the internal examiner must be and be seen to be independent; and thus wherever practicable he/she should not have played any significant role in either the supervision of the student or the assessment of the student during his/her studies.

Conflicts of interest

13.5.8 The student’s supervisor should not normally act as the internal examiner. If the supervisor has to act as internal examiner, then an additional examiner (internal or external) shall be appointed.

13.5.9 The external examiner(s) shall not:

(a) have any previous specific contact with the student;
(b) be a former member of Lancaster’s staff or have a formal connection with the student’s department within the past five years;
(c) have been a student of Lancaster University or its associated colleges within the last five years;
(d) have examined more than four Lancaster University research students within the last five years;
(e) be a close relative or closely connected with any other party to the examination.
14. ASSESSMENT REGULATIONS FOR THE BACHELOR OF MEDICINE, BACHELOR OF SURGERY (MBChB) UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE

The MBChB programme is under continuous review both internally and by the General Medical Council. As a result, it may sometimes be necessary to amend these regulations over the course of a student’s registration to match national decisions about undergraduate medical education and to ensure continued alignment with sector standards. Changes will be made only where necessary to ensure the appropriate level of competence in graduates from the programme as they move onto their postgraduate training, and to ensure patient safety.

14.1 STRUCTURE OF THE MBCHB DEGREE PROGRAMME

14.1.1 The MBChB degree comprises learning across levels 4, 5, 6 and 7 over a five-year full-time programme. There is no stipulated credit length for each year of study as medical qualifications are not typically credit-rated.

14.1.2 The arrangements for the programme of study shall be published in the Courses Handbook, available online for staff and current students at: http://www.lusi.lancaster.ac.uk/CoursesHandbook/.

14.2 CRITERIA FOR AWARD

14.2.1 In order to qualify for the MBChB degree, students must have attained a pass in all components of each of the five years. No condonation of failed components is permitted. The standard setting procedure described below is a requirement of the General Medical Council, as included in their assessment advice in the publication Promoting Excellence: standards for medical education and training (July 2015).

14.2.2 The pass mark for each summative component of the assessment of each year of the MBChB degree will be arrived at as follows.

(a) Written examinations in years 1-4: each examination paper will be standard-set by a panel of content experts, and according to a modified Angoff technique. The initial pass mark will be determined by the panel without prior knowledge of the students’ performance. The pass mark will then be adapted in the light of additional information such as the analysis of the performance of test items and feedback from the students, again using the Angoff method. The Board of Examiners for each year will receive a report from the standard-setting panel (including the recommended pass marks for each of the written papers) for consideration.

(b) Practical examinations (the Objective Structured Clinical Examinations, (OSCEs) in years 1-4, and the Lancaster Clinical Assessment (LCA) in year 4): each OSCE and the LCA will be standard-set using a borderline regression approach. The marks of all students are used to determine the passing score for each station, and in order to pass overall, students must achieve the “cut score”, which is the sum of the pass marks for each station in that examination. Students are also required to pass a minimum of 64% of stations in the OSCEs and in the LCA.
(c) Special Study Modules (coursework) in years 1-4: Standardised mark sheets are used to mark the Special Study Modules, with a pass mark of 50%. Standard-setting for SSMs is achieved via the SSM Moderating Board, made up of staff involved in the delivery of SSMs. The Board verifies that marks have been assigned correctly and can also moderate marks up or down, or provide additional marking of reports if deemed appropriate.

(d) Professional Practice, Values and Ethics coursework (year 3) – pass mark of 50%, as Special Study Modules above, and with a similar moderating process.

(e) Health, Culture and Society coursework (year 4) – pass mark of 50% as Special Study Modules above, and with a similar moderating process.

(f) The five component clinical placement rotations of year 5 are assessed through the student’s portfolio, on a pass/fail basis; each rotation must be passed. The clinical supervisor for the rotation assesses the student using the PETA process (Professional Education and Training Appraisal); signing the final PETA form as a pass indicates that the student has attended and has acquired the appropriate skills, knowledge, and professional attitudes to proceed into their Foundation Doctor years.

(g) The ‘Preparing for Practice’ programme in year 5 must also be passed. It is made up of three elements:

- The 2 week ‘Preparing for Practice’ component at the start of the year is assessed through completion of a logbook of clinical skills and medicines management and must be passed.

- Attendance at the ‘Leadership and Management’ 1 week course is compulsory (except for students undertaking an Erasmus placement).

- The mid-year review of the student’s progress as demonstrated by their portfolio must be passed.

14.3 PENALTY FOR LATE SUBMISSION OF COURSEWORK

14.3.1 Work submitted up to three days late without an agreed extension will receive a penalty of 10 percentage points and zero (non-submission) thereafter. Saturdays and Sundays are included as days in this regulation; however, where the third day falls on a Saturday or Sunday, students will have until 10.00 a.m. on Monday to hand in without receiving further penalty.

14.4 PROGRESSION

14.4.1 The progression requirements of the MBChB degree have been detailed and approved through the programmes approval process and are as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progression</th>
<th>Required to pass with the pass marks as detailed above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1 to 2</td>
<td>Paper 1; Paper 2; Paper 3; SSM1; OSCE; Community course (satisfactory attendance and completion of presentation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2 to 3</td>
<td>Paper 1; Paper 2; Paper 3; SSM2; OSCE; Hospital and GP placements (satisfactory attendance and logging of cases); Community Resources course (satisfactory attendance and poster presentation); Patient-centred Review (satisfactory completion of report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3 to 4</td>
<td>Paper 1; Paper 2; Paper 3; SSM3; OSCE; hospital and GP placements (satisfactory attendance and logging of cases); Professional Practice, Values and Ethics coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4 to 5</td>
<td>Paper 1; Paper 2; Paper 3; SSM4; OSCE; hospital and GP placements; Health, Culture and Society coursework; satisfactory completion of Elective report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td>Pass in all components of the ‘Preparing for Practice’ programme. Pass in the PETA assessment of the five placement blocks (Ward Care; Acute Care-Emergency Medicine; Selectives in Advanced Medical Practice 1 and 2; Community-Orientated Medical Practice.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examination Boards will determine whether a student has successfully met the progression requirements to move to the next year of the programme and to graduation, giving full countenance to mitigating circumstances as reported from the Mitigating Circumstances Committee and reassessment opportunities as detailed below.

14.4.2 Students are required to pass each element of the course independently, in order to progress (i.e. compensation between elements is not allowed). Opportunities to re-sit a written paper, re-take a clinical exam, resit a Special Study Module or any other piece of coursework, or retake a clinical placement block in year 5 are offered where appropriate, and are signposted for students.

14.4.3 Students have a chronological seven-year period following registration, within which they must complete their studies. This period includes time that may be taken out to repeat a year of study, complete an intercalated degree between years 4 and 5, or suspend studies for personal reasons. If exceptional circumstances mean that a student will exceed this period, their case will be considered by the Head of the Medical School.

14.4.4 Any student repeating a year must pass the resit year in order to progress. Students will not be permitted to repeat more than one year of study; if a student has previously resat a year, a repeat of a subsequent year is not permitted. In exceptional circumstances, the student’s case will be considered by the Head of the Medical School.

14.5 CLASSIFICATION OF AWARDS

14.5.1 The final award criteria for the MBChB degree have been detailed and approved through the programmes approval process. The Year 5 Examination Board will determine whether a student has successfully met the final award criteria giving full countenance to mitigating circumstances as reported from the Mitigating Circumstances Committee, and reassessment opportunities as detailed below.
In order to qualify for the overall award, students must have attained in full the minimum credit requirement for the programme by passing all of the components of all years.

There will be three classes of MBChB degree awarded, calculated on the basis of the student’s overall ranking in the cohort. All medical schools are required to rank their students, based on their assessment performance across the programme, in preparation for their applications to the UK Foundation Programme early in year 5. Rankings are derived at the start of year 5 following the calculation of a weighted mean score (range 0 to 6.75) according to the formula shown below. Year 4 assessments receive more weight than those in Years 1 to 3, as they are the final written and practical assessments.

Formula for calculating an individual student’s overall performance across the course:

\[
score = \frac{2(x_1 + x_2 + x_3) + 3x_4}{4}
\]

where \(x_1\) = mean score for year 1 (i.e. total points score over all assessments for year 1 ÷ number of assessments) and similar \(x_2, x_3, x_4\) for years 2-4.

The score for an individual assessment is calculated as follows.

(a) The standard-set pass mark for an individual written exam is adjusted to a 60% pass mark by arithmetic scaling. The new mark is then banded according to the following ranges:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Mark</th>
<th>Band</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80-100%</td>
<td>85% Band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td>75% Band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>65% Band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59%</td>
<td>55% Band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 50%</td>
<td>45% Band</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) The percentage mark which the student has obtained in the OSCE and the LCA is banded according to the following ranges:

- > cut score + 2 standard deviations: 85% Band
- between > cut score + 1 s/d and cut score + 2 s/d: 75% Band
- between cut score and cut score + 1 s/d: 65% Band
- Failed (below cut score and/or failed on no of stations): 55% Band

(c) Points are then assigned to the banded marks according to the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of study</th>
<th>Written examinations, OSCEs and LCA</th>
<th>Special Study Modules</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>Band 85 = 3 points</td>
<td>80% or over = 3 points</td>
<td>PPVE case analysis coursework (year 3) and HCS coursework (year 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Band 75 = 2 points</td>
<td>65-79% = 2 points</td>
<td>80 or over = 3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Band 65 = 1 point</td>
<td>50-64% = 1 point</td>
<td>65 – 79% = 2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fail (first attempt) (bands 55 and 45) = 0 points</td>
<td>Fail &lt;50% (first attempt) = 0 points</td>
<td>50-64% = 1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fail &lt;50% (first attempt) = 0 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14.5.6 When the rankings have been calculated, they are given to the students and passed to the North West Foundation Programme Office where they contribute to the students’ success in obtaining their choice of Foundation programme. At the final Examination Board, the rankings (which are divided into deciles) are used to classify the awards as follows.

(a) Students in the 1st decile are awarded the degree of MBChB with Honours.

(b) Students in the 2nd decile are awarded the degree of MBChB with Commendation.

(c) All other students are awarded the degree of MBChB.

14.6 REASSESSMENT

14.6.1 A student who fails any component of the assessment in a given year (including all coursework elements) will be required to undertake a reassessment for that component and must pass it before they can progress to the next year or graduate.

14.6.2 Students in years 1-4 will be given the opportunity to undertake reassessment within the same academic year in which they made their first attempt. If a student fails one of the rotations of year 5, they will not be able to undertake reassessment within the same academic year but will be required to repeat some or all of the final year in the following academic year, subject to discussion of the case at the Year 5 Examination Board.

14.6.3 A student undertaking reassessment of a failed Special Study Module 1, 2 or 3 will be required to sit a new project with a new supervisor. The maximum mark permissible for the resat Special Study Module 1, 2 or 3 is 50%.

14.6.4 A student undertaking reassessment of a failed Special Study Module 4 will be required to resubmit the report during the same academic year. The maximum mark permissible for the resubmitted Special Study Module 4 is 50%. If a student fails the resubmission they will be permitted to progress to year 5 but will be required to repeat the Special Study Module in that academic year, using a new topic. The maximum mark permissible for the repeated Special Study Module 4 is 50%.

14.6.5 A student undertaking reassessment of a failed piece of year 3 Professional Practice, Values and Ethics Case Analysis coursework will be required to resubmit the coursework during the same academic year. The maximum mark permissible for the resubmitted coursework is 50%. If the student fails at the resubmission stage, they will be permitted to progress to year 4 but will be required to repeat the Case Analysis coursework in that academic year, submitting a different case. The maximum mark permissible for the new case will be 50%.

14.6.6 A student undertaking reassessment of a failed piece of year 4 Health, Culture and Society coursework will be required to resubmit the coursework during the same academic year. The maximum mark permissible for the resubmitted coursework is 50%. If the student fails at the resubmission stage, they will be permitted to progress to year 5 but will be required to repeat the Health, Culture and Society coursework in that
14.6.7 When all the results of reassessment are available the overall profile will then be considered following procedures detailed in Consideration and confirmation of results.

14.6.8 The following exit awards will be available for students who leave the MBChB programme before the final year, as follows:

(a) BSc (Hons) Medical Sciences will be awarded to a student who has passed all of the components of years 1-3 of the programme but will not progress into year 4 for the following reasons:

- poor academic performance
- not wishing to continue with a career in medicine
- being found not fit to practise medicine

(b) The students’ marks for the assessments are converted to a score using the formula

\[
\text{score} = \frac{x_1 + x_2 + x_3}{3}
\]

where \(x_1, x_2\) and \(x_3\) are calculated as described under 14.5.4 – 14.5.6. The scores of all students in the cohort are ranked and then divided into deciles. The BSc (Hons) degree will be classified according to the decile as:

Deciles 1 and 2 – first class
Deciles 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 – upper second class
Deciles 8 and 9 – lower second class
Decile 10 – third class

(c) BSc (Hons) Advanced Medical Sciences will be awarded to a student who has passed all of the components of years 1-4 of the programme but will not progress into year 5 for the following reasons:

- poor academic performance;
- not wishing to continue with a career in medicine;
- being found not fit to practise medicine.

The students’ marks for the assessments are converted to a score using the formula shown in paragraph 14.5.4. The scores of all students in the cohort are ranked and then divided into deciles. The BSc (Hons) degree will be classified according to the decile as:

Deciles 1 and 2 – first class
Deciles 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 – upper second class
Deciles 8 and 9 – lower second class
Decile 10 – third class
14.7 INCOMPLETE ASSESSMENT AND MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES

14.7.1 For the purposes of these regulations ‘mitigating circumstances’ will mean properly evidenced and approved claims from students that demonstrate good cause as to why their performance and achievements have been adversely affected by means which have not been fully addressed through extension and other available assessment procedures.

14.7.2 For the purposes of these regulations ‘good cause’ will mean illness or other relevant personal circumstances affecting a student and resulting in either the student’s failure to attend an examination, or submit coursework at or by the due time, or otherwise satisfy the requirements of the scheme of assessment of the MBChB programme; or, the student’s performance in examination or other instrument of assessment being manifestly prejudiced.

14.7.3 A chronic medical condition, for which due allowance has already been made, will not itself be considered a good cause although a short-term exacerbation of such a condition might be so judged.

14.7.4 ‘Evidence’ will mean a report descriptive of the medical condition or other adverse personal circumstances which are advanced by the student for consideration as amounting to good cause. Such a report should include a supporting statement from an appropriate person. Where the report refers to a medical condition of more than five days’ duration the report must be completed by an appropriate medical practitioner who would be requested to comment on how the medical condition concerned would be likely (if this were the case) to have affected the student’s ability to prepare for or carry out the assessment(s) in question.

14.7.5 Where an incomplete assessment may be the result of good cause, it will be the responsibility of the student concerned to make the circumstances known to Lancaster Medical School and to provide appropriate evidence. Notification later than forty-eight hours after the examination, or after the date at which submission of the work for assessment was due, will not normally be taken into account unless acceptable circumstances have prevented the student from notifying the Medical School within this time.

14.7.6 Lancaster Medical School will have a Mitigating Circumstances Committee whose primary responsibility it is to consider claims of good cause for the MBChB programme. Any such claims would be subject to confirmation by the Examination Boards at a later date. The Mitigating Circumstances Committee would be required to meet at least once per annum prior to the final Examination Boards, but might usefully meet to consider claims of good cause on a more frequent basis. The Mitigating Circumstances Committee will produce minutes of its meetings to be submitted to the appropriate Examination Board.

14.7.7 Guidance on the management and operation of Mitigating Circumstances Committees can be found in Appendix 1 of the General Assessment Regulations for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught Programmes.
14.7.8 In considering claims of good cause:

(a) the evidence provided by the student claiming good cause, and any relevant and available material submitted by him or her for assessment will be scrutinised;

(b) fairness to the individual student claiming good cause must be balanced with fairness to other students and the integrity of the assessment as a whole;

(c) in the event of the student having failed to attend an examination or examinations, or having failed to submit course material or other work for assessment at or by the due time, it will be determined whether the failure to attend or submit has been justified by good cause;

(d) in the event of the student having submitted work for assessment by examination or otherwise, it will be determined whether such work has been manifestly prejudiced by good cause. If such prejudice is established the work affected will normally be deemed not to have been submitted.

14.7.9 Where it is determined that the evidence presented supports the student’s claim that her/his academic performance was affected by good cause during the academic year, or by circumstances which occurred during the summative examination period, the student will be automatically granted the right to take the resit examinations in August as if they were the first attempt, should she/he fail one or more components of the summative examinations. Should the student then fail the reassessment, she/he will be permitted to repeat the whole year of study. In this repeat year, she/he will sit those assessment components which were failed in the previous academic year in the summative exam period as if they were the second attempt. If the OSCE examination (and the LCA examination in the case of a year 4 student) had been previously passed, it will be taken again in order for the students’ clinical skills to be kept current.

14.7.10 Where it is determined that the evidence presented supports the student’s claim that her/his academic performance was affected by good cause by circumstances which occurred during the resit examination period, the student will be automatically granted the right to repeat the whole year of study. In this repeat year, she/he will sit those assessment components which were failed in the previous academic year in the summative exam period as if they were the second attempt. If the OSCE examination (and the LCA examination in the case of a year 4 student) had been previously passed, it will be taken again in order for the student’s clinical skills to be kept current.

14.7.11 Where it is determined that the evidence presented supports the student’s claim that her/his academic performance was affected by good cause during a period of coursework such as a four-week Special Study Module, meaning that she/he was not able to complete the coursework or was awarded a fail mark, she/he will be permitted to take a further Special Study Module during the summer which will be treated as the first attempt. Should this coursework be failed, another Special Study Module will be sat during the summer as the second attempt if there are sufficient weeks available to do this. If there is insufficient time, the student will be automatically granted the right for a further attempt at the Special Study Module but will suspend studies rather than repeat the year; it is not possible for the student to progress into the next year until the Special Study Module has been passed. A student in this position will not be required to resit the OSCE examination.

14.7.12 Repeating the whole year of study is the only option for students on the MBChB programme of study if they have not passed all of the assessments by the completion of
the resit examination period. It is not possible for any failed components to be carried into the next year of study, with the exception of the Year 3 Professional Practice, Values and Ethics coursework (see paragraph 14.6.4), the Year 4 Health, Culture and Society coursework (see paragraph 14.6.5) and the Year 4 Special Study Module 4 (see paragraph 14.6.4).

14.7.13 Where it is determined that the evidence presented does not support the student’s claim that her/his academic performance was affected by good cause during the academic year, or by circumstances which occurred during the examination periods, or during a period of coursework, the student’s original assessment result will stand and they will have to resit any failed assessment components as the second and final attempt for the year. If they fail at the resit stage, their studies will be terminated.

14.8 CONSIDERATION AND CONFIRMATION OF RESULTS

14.8.1 Senate has ultimate authority to determine all results of assessment leading to Lancaster University credit and awards. It exercises its authority to make final decisions as to granting of all credit-bearing University awards, primarily through the Committee of Senate, the terms of reference of which are set out in the University Ordinances.

14.8.2 The Committee of Senate provides:

(a) formal confirmation (or not) of recommendations from Boards of Examiners for the award to individual students of the MBChB degree of a particular class;
(b) formal approval of recommendations from Boards of Examiners that students be awarded no degree with or without a further re-sit opportunity (i.e. Fails);
(c) formal ratification of first, second, third, fourth and fifth year results in the MBChB degree, including the timing and nature of re-sit opportunities for failed elements.

Further procedural details are set out in Procedures for the Committee of Senate.

14.8.3 For each year of the MBChB programme approved by the University there will be an Examination Board comprising external and internal examiners which will be responsible for the assurance of standards through the exercise of their academic judgement both directly in the assessment of students’ work and indirectly in the design of specific forms of assessment. Clinicians who are nominated by Lancaster Medical School because they have primary responsibility for part of the medical degree programme including assessment will be entitled to be members of examination boards and will be termed “internal examiners”. The constitution and terms of reference for examination bodies within the constituent elements of the University are set out in the section on Examination Boards.

14.8.4 The Examination Boards will receive decisions from the Mitigating Circumstances Committee. Examination Boards cannot, of themselves, reconsider or change decisions of the Mitigating Circumstances Committee. Examination Boards may challenge decisions of Mitigating Circumstances Committees by referring final decisions to the Committee of Senate, or equivalent body.

14.8.5 The Examination Boards for years 1-4 will consider and confirm marks derived from all assessments taken and examined in the academic year under consideration. The Year 5
Examination Board will receive the results of assessments from years 1-4 and will consider and confirm the year 5 assessments. The year 5 Examination Board will make recommendations to the Committee of Senate as to the award of the MBChB degree (and the class of degree) within the approved degree programme classification scheme. Details of the role and operation of Examination Boards can be found [here](#).

14.8.6 The business of the Examination Boards will be minuted and the minutes will include a record of the External Examiner’s adjudications, comments and recommendations, as well as particular decisions made by the Board. The minutes will also record the decisions of the Mitigating Circumstances Committee for each candidate considered by that committee (although detailed discussion of circumstances should not be undertaken at the Examination Board). The minutes must include a list of attendees (together with their status as external or internal examiners or assessor). This record of the proceedings of the Board will be restricted and made available only to: the participating examiners and assessors, the Vice-Chancellor and other officers of the University as appropriate; the Committee of Senate; and appropriate review and appeal committees. Where the Examination Board has exercised its discretion in a particular case, as provided by these Regulations, the Committee of Senate will normally uphold its decision providing it had the support of the majority of the external examiners present at that Examination Board.

14.9 PUBLISHED INFORMATION

14.9.1 The determination of results and the classification of University degrees are subject always to ratification by the Senate and will be regarded as provisional until ratified, normally through the annual meeting of the Committee of Senate.

14.9.2 Immediately after the meeting of the relevant Examination Board, Lancaster Medical School may notify students of their provisional degree results.

14.9.3 Within forty days of the ratification of degree results, students will receive a transcript of their results together with a Higher Education Achievement Report, both of which will conform in scope and layout to principles agreed by Senate.

14.10 EXCLUSION

14.10.1 Students who, after undertaking agreed reassessment opportunities, fail to meet the stipulated criteria for progression or final award, shall be subject to the University’s approved review and appeal procedures, after which, if the failure is confirmed, they will be excluded from the University.

14.11 ACADEMIC APPEALS

Principles

14.11.1 Matters relating to a mark or grade for any assessment or an overall result shall be subject to the authority of the University, and agents acting on its behalf, in reaching academic judgements. The University, exercising its authority under its Statutes, acting through the decisions of boards of examiners as confirmed by the Committee of the Senate, has sole authority to determine whether or not a degree, certificate or diploma
should be awarded to a particular candidate and, if so awarded, the specific class or other description of attainment, appropriate to the level of the award.

14.11.2 However, it is recognised by the University that there are non-academic elements to assessment judgements which might have adversely affected the outcome and that there are occasions where students may wish to appeal against an assessment outcome on such grounds. The procedures set out in this section explain how this appeal process will be managed, the responsibilities of all parties, and the opportunity for external scrutiny should students remain dissatisfied with the University’s decisions.

14.11.3 These procedures apply to all current students registered on the Lancaster University MBChB programme. Students who want to appeal and feel that they have good reason to do so must declare their intention to appeal within 10 calendar days of the publication of results. Exceptions to this timescale will be determined on a case-by-case basis by the Head of the Student Registry.

14.11.4 The University, through its academic staff and assessment mechanisms, ensures that proper academic judgement is used in all assessment and moderation (see the General Assessment Regulations). Academic judgement thus stands outside of these procedures and cannot be subject to appeal.

14.11.5 The right of appeal is available to all students who:

(a) have failed to qualify to proceed from one stage of the degree programme to the next;
(b) have failed to qualify for the award of the degree for which they were registered;
(c) wish to challenge, on procedural grounds, the class of degree to be awarded;
(d) received a lower class of degree than would otherwise have been the case had plagiarism penalties not been applied.

14.11.6 A prima facie case for appeal will be deemed to exist if there is evidence of one or more of:

(a) material administrative error or irregularity in the conduct of assessment which adversely affected the student’s performance and results;
(b) significant extenuating circumstances which adversely affected the student’s performance and results;
(c) unfair treatment or discrimination, outwith the exercise of academic judgement;

which, for good reason, could not be brought to the attention of boards of examiners at the relevant time and which could have influenced their recommendations had the information been available at that time.

14.11.7 Students will not be hindered in making a reasonable appeal. All parties will act without bias or prejudice and in a sensitive, fair and prompt manner.

14.11.8 The objective of the procedure is to establish the facts and come to a reasonable and just resolution, which is both relevant and proportionate.
14.11.9 No students will be disadvantaged for making appeals in good faith, and all reasonable appeals will be taken seriously and dealt with according to the agreed procedures. However, if it is established that appeals are frivolous or spurious, then they will not be considered reasonable, and the University may take disciplinary action.

14.11.10 The University will deal with all appeals confidentially so far as it is able, and expects all parties involved to honour this approach.

14.11.11 All reasonable measure will be taken to ensure that no student is disadvantaged within these processes due to location, requirements associated with protected characteristics, etc. Technology will be used, as appropriate, to facilitate these procedures.

14.11.12 Advice on how to use these procedures is available from the Students’ Union Education and Welfare Office or the Student Registry.

Applications and Implementation of the Procedure

14.11.13 The Academic Appeals procedure only applies to appeals initiated and conducted by an individual student or group of students. A group of students wishing to appeal collectively will need to provide reasons as to why they should be considered collectively. These will be subject to consideration and judgement by the Head of the Student Registry whose decision will be final (a decision to not consider an appeal collectively does not preclude students from pursuing individual appeals). Where a collective appeal has been agreed, the group will nominate a spokesperson for communication.

14.11.14 An appellant has the right to be accompanied and supported at any meeting by one person, and may be represented where the appellant expressly authorises a third party in writing to act on their behalf.

14.11.15 The University will make every reasonable effort to complete academic appeal procedures in a timely manner and aims to complete all aspects of the appeals process within ninety calendar days. If the University is unable to reasonably comply (for example, in factually complex matters involving a number of individuals, etc.) it will provide the appellant with an explanation and inform them of the timeframe in which the procedure will be completed.

14.11.16 In this procedure any reference to named members of the University staff also includes reference to her/his nominee and named staff may delegate their responsibilities to other appropriate members of staff, including those suitably qualified in partner organisations, without invalidating the procedure. The identity of nominees or members of staff to whom responsibilities are delegated will be notified to the appellant.

14.11.17 The Academic Appeals procedures, as set out, act to fulfil the University’s obligations under Ordinance 7 in relation to appeals against exclusion on academic grounds.

14.11.18 The Head of the Student Registry will oversee this process and provide advice. Any evidence of breaches of the principles as set out in 14.11.4-14.11.11 above should be brought to the attention of the Head of the Student Registry for investigation.
14.11.19 Should a student wish to register a concern about the actions of the Head of the Student Registry it should be sent to the Director of Student Based Services.

14.11.20 The Academic Quality and Standards Committee will receive an annual report on academic appeals and is responsible to both Council and Senate for monitoring academic appeals and agreeing institutional actions as required. UMAG will also receive the report for information.

THE PROCEDURE

The University uses a two-stage procedure.

Stage 1 – the Formal Appeal

14.11.21 In order for an academic appeal to be considered formally, the appellant must indicate their intention to appeal using the Academic Appeal form (available for online submission and in hard copy) and send it to the Head of the Student Registry.

14.11.22 Should the issue be immediately resolvable (for example, a simple recording error), the Head of the Student Registry will draw this to the attention of the relevant Exam Board Chair who will agree amendments by Chair’s Action. If this is not the case, the Head of the Student Registry will refer the case to the Head of Lancaster Medical School for consideration by the Medical School’s Academic Appeals Panel against the criteria set out in 14.11.6.

14.11.23 It is expected that the student will provide full information with accompanying evidence for consideration by the Panel. However, in exceptional cases, where appropriate, an investigation to determine the facts of the appeal can be undertaken; an academic member of staff unconnected to the appeal will do this supported by the Student Registry.

14.11.24 The Medical School’s Academic Appeal Panel will have the following membership:

- Associate Dean for Undergraduate Teaching (Chair) with the caveat that if the Associate Dean had been previously involved in an Examination Board which considered the student(s) in question then they would be excluded);
- Head of Lancaster Medical School;
- Deputy Director of Medical Studies;
- Director of Undergraduate Medical Education, University Hospitals of Morecambe Bay NHS Foundation Trust;
- a representative from another department with similar issues, e.g. Social Work or Clinical Psychology;
- an external member e.g. the Postgraduate Dean from the North West Deanery;
- the MBChB Administrator will also be in attendance throughout as note taker.

The date for the Academic Appeals Panel following the resit exams will be formally scheduled into the timetable of meetings, but the Panel can also be called on an ad hoc basis as necessary. In each case, the Panel shall have the right of access to detailed marks in the candidate’s units of assessment. In addition all details of cases where the board of examiners have permitted a student to be reassessed as first attempt candidates will be available to the Panel. The appellant may attend the event, although
it is not required and failure to attend would not stop the proceeding. If present, the
appellant will be invited to make a short personal statement to further elucidate the
submitted materials. The Panel will be allowed, through the Chair, to question the
appellant. It will not normally be permissible to call witnesses as part of the Panel
hearing; however, the Chair may allow it at their discretion. The appellant will be given
the opportunity to sum up their position. The burden of proof will be on the appellant,
albeit within a recognition of the responsibilities of the University. Following the
proceeding, the Panel will deliberate in private using the balance of probability as the
standard of proof, and reach a decision. A member of the Student Registry will be
available to provide advice on the scope of actions/remedies available to the Panel.

14.11.25 The potential options for outcomes are as follows:

(a) Exclusion
(b) Confirmation of failure
(c) Confirmation of existing degree classification
(d) Reconsideration of candidate in accordance with the regulations relating to
    incomplete and mitigating circumstances, as detailed in the General Assessment
    Regulations and the Undergraduate Assessment Regulations
(e) Agreement to allow the student to retake the entire year
(f) Agreement to temporarily exclude the student allowing a reassessment the
    following year
(g) Amendment to the awarded degree classification.

14.11.26 The appellant will receive a written decision that addresses the points they have made
and gives reasons for the conclusion reached. The letter will also advise the appellant of
their right to refer the matter to Stage 2 and describe the means to do so.

Stage 2 – the Review Stage

14.11.27 If the appellant feels their appeal has not been resolved under Stage 1, they may apply
for a formal review to the Head of the Student Registry within two weeks of the date of
the Stage 1 written decision. They should explain why they feel dissatisfied with the
outcome at Stage 1 and what remedy they seek. Requests for Stage 2 consideration can
only be made on the following grounds:

(a) that there exists evidence that could not reasonably have been made available
    at Stage 1; or
(b) that there exists evidence of a material procedural irregularity in Stage 1; or
(c) that there exists evidence that the judgement at Stage 1 was perverse.

No new ground of appeal may be requested at Stage 2, but the appellant may submit
further evidence in support of their case (subject to point (a) above) or suggest a new
remedy. For those students facing exclusion this fulfils the University’s obligations
under Ordinance 7.

14.11.28 The Head of the Student Registry will consider the application and make a prima facie
decision as to whether or not to instigate a review. Where a review is rejected the Head
will write to the appellant explaining the reasons for the decision and providing a
Completion of Procedures letter that sets out their right to refer the matter to the Office
of the Independent Adjudicator and describes the means to do so.
14.11.29 Where a review is deemed within the scope of the procedures a Review Panel will be convened. The panel will consist of either the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) or the Provost for Student Experience, Colleges and the Library (in the chair) and two other members of academic staff (appointed by the Vice-Chancellor). No members of the panel will have been associated with the appeal or the Faculty or equivalent institutional body of the appellant. Dates for Review Panels will be formally scheduled into the timetable of meetings, but can also be arranged ad hoc as required.

14.11.30 The Head of the Student Registry, or nominee, will act as Clerk to the panel and will prepare the documentation. The Chair of the Medical School Academic Appeals Panel will be invited to submit a statement addressing the appellant’s submission. The appellant may submit additional material only if there are good reasons why it was not submitted at Stage 1 (see 14.11.28 above). Both the appellant and the Chair of the Appeal Panel will be invited to attend; however failure to attend by either party will not invalidate the proceeding, as determination can be made via the submitted documentation.

14.11.31 If present, the appellant will be invited to make an opening statement as to why, in their view, the case should be subject to review. This will be restricted to consideration against the identified review grounds; the Review Panel will not rehear the original appeal. If present, the Chair of the Stage 1 Medical School Academic Appeals Panel will then be invited to present an opening statement explaining how the Stage 1 decision was determined and how, in their view, it was reasonable. If the appellant presents either new evidence or alternate remedies the Stage 1 Academic Appeal Panel Chair will also be invited to comment on these. Neither the appellant nor the Stage 1 Academic Chair will be allowed to question the other, but the members of the Review Panel, through the Chair, may question either. Both the Stage 1 Chair and the appellant will be given the opportunity to sum up their position. The burden of proof will be on the appellant, and the standard of proof will be on the balance of probability. Following the proceeding, the panel will deliberate in private and will determine their conclusions, including, as appropriate, any modifications and/or additions to the Stage 1 actions/remedies. Only in exceptional circumstances would a rehearing at Stage 1 be recommended. The Head of the Student Registry will provide advice on the scope of actions/remedies available to the Panel.

14.11.32 The appellant will receive a written decision that addresses the points they have made and gives reasons for the conclusion reached. They will also receive a Completion of Procedures letter which will also advise the appellant of their right to refer the matter to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator and describe the means to do so.

Office of the Independent Adjudicator

14.11.33 Once all internal procedures have been exhausted, if the student is still not satisfied they have the right to take the case to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) for Higher Education, for further review. The application to the OIA must be made within 12 months of the issue of the Completion of Procedures letter. Information about the OIA and its processes can be found at http://www.oihea.org.uk/.
15. **GRADUATION**

15.1 Students with a significant tuition fee debt to the University shall not be permitted to graduate until they have paid the debt or made acceptable arrangements for payment.

15.2 Students whose awards have been confirmed by the Committee of the Senate (or a body or individual empowered by the Senate to act on its behalf) shall be eligible to attend a ceremony for the conferment of degrees.

15.3 It is the responsibility of the Student Registry to issue students who have successfully completed their degree with a degree certificate and a transcript.

16. **AWARD OF DEGREES POSTHUMOUSLY**

16.1 The Committee of Senate may grant the award of degrees, diplomas and certificates to deceased students (undergraduates or postgraduates) who had, before they died, completed all the required modules and assessment (examinations and/or coursework) and had fully met the approved criteria for the award of a degree.

16.2 The Committee of Senate shall also have discretion, on the recommendation of the relevant board of examiners, to grant the award of degrees, diplomas and certificates to deceased students (undergraduates or postgraduates) who had not completed all the required modules and assessment (examinations and/or coursework) nor fully met the approved criteria for the award of a degree. In making such recommendations, boards of examiners shall be guided by the principle set out in the section entitled *Incomplete Assessment and Mitigating Circumstances* of the appropriate assessment regulations, as will the Committee of Senate in considering the recommendations.

16.3 The certificate in respect of the qualification awarded shall bear a date earlier than that of the candidate’s death and shall be sent to the next of kin as soon as possible after the grant of the award.

17. **PLAGIARISM AND MALPRACTICE REGULATIONS AND PROCEDURES**

17.1 **DEFINITION AND FORMS OF ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE**

The University values a culture of honesty and mutual trust (academic integrity) and expects all members of the University to respect and uphold these core values.

Academic malpractice is an academic offence for a candidate to commit any act designed to obtain for himself or herself an unfair advantage with a view to achieving a higher grade or mark than he or she would otherwise secure. Any attempt to convey deceitfully the impression of acquired knowledge, skills, understanding, or credentials, shall represent a contravention of Rule 6 of the University, and may constitute grounds for exclusion.

17.1.1 **Cheating in examinations and class tests**

Occurs when a candidate communicates, or attempts to communicate, with a fellow candidate or individual who is neither an invigilator or member of staff; copies, or attempts to copy from a fellow candidate; attempts to introduce or consult during the
examination or test, any unauthorised printed or written material, or electronic calculating or information storage device; or mobile phones or other communication device, or personates or allows himself or herself to be impersonated.

17.1.2 Collusion

Occurs where a piece of work prepared by a group is represented as if it were the student’s own. This can also occur by enabling a fellow student to obtain academic credit to which they are not entitled. This includes providing material, especially electronic copies of work, or performing all or part of an assigned task so that unfair advantage or credit may be obtained by another student.

17.1.3 Plagiarism

Is understood to include, in whatever format it is presented, including written work, online submissions, group work or oral presentations, the following:

(a) the act of copying or paraphrasing a paper from a source text, whether in manuscript, printed or electronic form, without appropriate acknowledgement (this includes quoting directly from another source with a reference but without quotation marks);

(b) the submission of all or part of another student’s work, whether with or without that student’s knowledge or consent;

(c) the commissioning or use of work by the student which is not his/her own and representing it as if it were;

(d) the submission of all or part of work purchased or obtained from a commercial service;

(e) the submission of all or part of work written by another person, whether by another member of the University or a person who is not a member of the University;

(f) reproduction of the same or almost identical own work, in full or in part, for more than one module or unit of assessment of the same Lancaster University programme of study;

(g) directly copying from model solutions/answers made available in previous years.

17.1.4 Fabrication or falsification of results

Occurs when a student claims to have carried out tests, experiments or observations that have not taken place or presents results not supported by the evidence with the object of obtaining an unfair advantage.

17.2 GUIDELINES FOR USE OF ELECTRONIC DEVICES IN UNIVERSITY EXAMINATIONS

17.2.1 The use in examinations of electronic calculators and other portable micro computing and electronic devices (hereafter shortened to ‘electronic devices’) will only be allowed when permission has been granted by the appropriate department, subject (where appropriate) to the approval of the external examiner(s) and prior consultation with those students taking the course. Any change in a department’s regulations for the use of electronic devices in examinations shall be announced not later than the beginning of the Lent term.
Carrying a mobile phone, or similar electronic device such as a pager in an examination is an academic offence. If a candidate has such a device, it should be switched off and placed at the perimeter of the room with the candidate's other belongings, or handed to an invigilator.

Electronic devices under 17.2.1, where permitted, must be of the hand-held type, quiet in operation, compact and having their own power supply. External or user-written programs, or storage media, and/or instruction manuals may not normally be taken into the examination room and students must be able to demonstrate that internal user storage has been cleared before the start of the examination. Candidates shall be entirely responsible for ensuring that their electronic devices are in good working order (e.g. fully charged), and for making alternative provision (e.g. slide rule) in case the instrument should fail.

Where required by a department, and so indicated on the examination question paper, candidates shall state the make and model of their electronic device on the examination script.

In setting questions for examinations in which candidates may use their own electronic devices examiners should take careful account of the different potentialities of such devices, and require candidates to show sufficient intermediate calculations to demonstrate that they understand what they are calculating.

Candidates shall not be allowed to borrow electronic devices from each other during examinations.

Departments, with the agreement of external examiners (where relevant) and after consultation with the students concerned, may introduce supplementary regulations (additional to these general regulations) for particular examinations. Such regulations may specify or limit the types and facilities of electronic calculators or other electronic devices which can be used in particular examinations.

PROCEDURE IN CASES OF SUSPECTED MALPRACTICE IN UNDERGRADUATE AND POSTGRADUATE EXAMINATIONS

If a student is suspected of an academic offence under Section 17.1.1, the invigilator shall at once telephone the Head of the Student Registry (or nominee) who will immediately go to the examination venue to investigate and will also inform the University Dean (or the Deputy Dean) or the relevant Academic Officer of the incident. The student will be permitted to continue the particular examination in which he or she is suspected of malpractice, but the invigilator will request that the student remains behind at the end of the examination for interview by the Head of the Student Registry (or nominee), at which a representative of Lancaster University Students’ Union shall be invited to be present and written notes will be made. If after this preliminary interview it is clear that no offence has taken place then the investigating officer(s) shall take no further action. If it is decided to carry out a formal investigation the student shall be informed of this but also told that he or she will be permitted to complete all the examinations he or she would normally take at that stage in his or her course. The invigilator shall, immediately after the examination, provide the Head of the Student Registry with a written report giving full details of the alleged offence and enclosing any material evidence relevant to the case. The report and any material evidence shall be
submitted to the Head of the Student Registry, who shall inform the head(s) of the student’s major department(s) and, if different, of the department responsible for the examination.

17.3.2 On receipt of the report, the University Dean or relevant Academic Officer shall investigate the alleged offence, making such enquiries as he or she sees fit and with access to all relevant documents. The student shall be interviewed and asked whether he or she wishes to say anything or to provide any information relevant to the alleged offence. If after preliminary investigation the University Dean or Academic Officer is not satisfied that there is a prima facie case to answer, he or she shall inform the student and the other parties concerned, and the matter shall end there. If the University Dean or Academic Officer is satisfied that there is a prima facie case to answer, he or she shall formally notify the student in writing of the charge and inform him or her that the case will be referred to the Standing Academic Committee of the Senate.

17.3.3 Approval by an examination board of a degree classification shall not prevent the reasonable application of retrospective review - see 17.6.

17.4 PROCEDURE IN CASES OF SUSPECTED MALPRACTICE IN UNDERGRADUATE AND POSTGRADUATE COURSEWORK

17.4.1 Definition of roles relating to suspected malpractice including plagiarism in assessed coursework and tests

(a) Academic Marker

Each Academic Marker identified as such by a department or equivalent shall be responsible for providing an appropriate mark and feedback for student work. They shall report where appropriate on cases for which they have marking responsibilities to the relevant Academic Officer, and produce evidence in support of such a claim. Where the Academic Marker is not permanently employed by the University in an academic position then these responsibilities shall be upon the named Module Convenor or relevant Head of Department.

(b) Academic Officer

Each department or equivalent shall designate one academic member of staff, to be known as the Academic Officer, who shall take responsibility for the investigation of and subsequent action where appropriate for academic malpractice in coursework at undergraduate and postgraduate levels. The Academic Officer shall include reporting cases of poor academic practice or malpractice and keeping a written record of all cases of alleged academic malpractice.

(c) Student Registry

Student Registry shall be responsible for recording or providing the means for Academic Officers and Academic Markers to record all alleged and detected cases of academic malpractice, including plagiarism in coursework and cheating in examinations. Student Registry shall also provide information and other support to Academic Officers to assist them in discharging their duties;
communicating information between departments about academic malpractice as appropriate; and offering assistance and advice to Academic Officers about procedures and best practices.

(d) **LU Students’ Union**

Any student who is alleged to have been involved in an act of academic malpractice shall have access to LU Students’ Union support and advice at all stages in the procedures that follow, and appropriate LU Students’ Union staff may accompany the student in any meetings or correspondence with the department, an Academic Officer or the Standing Academic Committee.

(e) **Standing Academic Committee**

The Standing Academic Committee of the Senate shall hear cases:

(i) referred to it by an Academic Officer;
(ii) relating to offences where the student does not accept the decision of the Academic Officer on the grounds of proper procedures having not been followed;
(iii) relating to alleged multiple offences after the Senate deadline for the final submission of coursework (or postgraduate equivalent). The Committee’s decisions shall be informed by the seriousness of the offence rather than by the time of year.

The Committee shall in all instances where it hears a case use the procedures set out in 17.5.

17.4.2 **Procedures dealing with academic malpractice and poor academic practice in coursework**

17.4.2.1 All academic markers shall make a positive effort to identify poor scholarship practices, plagiarism or academic malpractice, in all assessment items. This is a responsibility of their academic employment and a vital part of delivering the high quality learning experience that students expect.

17.4.2.2 Academic markers shall, when concern is identified, use their judgement to decide if some form of poor academic practice or some form of academic malpractice has occurred.

17.4.2.3 **Dealing with poor academic practice**

17.4.2.3.1 Where it is decided that student work displays some form of poor academic practice but not malpractice the academic marker will deal with this as part of the normal feedback and assessment procedures. The academic judgement of the academic marker may be that the poor academic practice should lead to a significant reduction in the mark awarded. The student must be informed of the nature of the problem and why it is unacceptable and a note of ‘poor academic practice’ shall be recorded by the department in the LUSI Student Record.
17.4.2.3.2 Where the student work displays some form of poor academic practice as above, but the student has not taken note of previous advice of similar problems, then the student must be informed of the repeated problems, be required to meet with their Director of Studies and an 'academic warning' shall be recorded by the department in the LUSI Student Record.

17.4.2.4 Dealing with academic malpractice

17.4.2.4.1 Where the Academic Marker believes that academic malpractice in the form of plagiarism has occurred then they may, as prescribed in the University’s Plagiarism Framework, choose to deal with this within the normal feedback and assessment procedures by ‘striking out’ all the plagiarised material and assessing the work on what remains. Where this is done the student must be informed and guided towards appropriate advice. A record of ‘Poor academic practice’ or ‘Minor plagiarism’ or ‘Major plagiarism’ will be recorded by the department in the LUSI Student Record as appropriate. Where the Academic Marker does not believe this is appropriate or suspects that some other form of academic malpractice has occurred then the case should normally be referred to the Academic Officer as the first step in an investigation.

17.4.2.4.2 Hearings by the Academic Officer

When informed of a case of possible academic malpractice the Academic Officer shall conduct an investigation of the matter and arrange for a Hearing with the student. The Hearing shall include the Academic Marker and at least one other (non-academic) staff member from the student’s department who should take a record of the Hearing.

Prior to the Hearing

(a) The student should be encouraged to be accompanied by a friend (e.g. a LU Students’ Union representative or College personal tutor).

(b) The student should be able to review any documentary evidence prior to any hearing, including in the case of plagiarism any Turnitin reports or coursework annotated by the Academic Marker.

(c) The Academic Officer shall check in the LUSI Student Record System for any previous offences.

At the Hearing

(a) The student will be asked to respond to the allegations regarding their work and may also wish to consider if there are any mitigating circumstances which should be made known to the Academic Officer.

(b) The Academic Officer may ask the Academic Marker or course convener to present evidence.
17.4.2.4.3 Outcomes of a Hearing

The Academic Officer may decide that the appropriate action after hearing any case is that:

(a) no action of any kind will be taken. Where appropriate this may mean that the Academic Marker shall be instructed to mark the work normally;

(b) the matter should be considered as a matter of poor academic practice and dealt with as described in 17.4.2.3;

(c) the student will be required to submit an alternative piece of work and such work shall be eligible to receive only the minimum pass mark appropriate to the student’s programme of study. If the student refuses or fails to repeat and resubmit the work, a mark of zero or equivalent grade shall be recorded;

(d) that no form of resubmission should be allowed and a mark of zero or equivalent grade should be recorded for the work;

(e) that the case should be referred to the Standing Academic Committee because of its serious nature, or there being repeated offences.

17.4.2.4.4 The Academic Officer should inform the student of his/her decision as soon as possible and at latest, in writing within seven days. Where appropriate the record of ‘Poor academic practice’, ‘Plagiarism’ or ‘Academic malpractice’ will be recorded by the department in the LUSI Student Record.

17.4.2.4.5 Where multiple offences are discovered after the Senate deadline (or postgraduate taught equivalent) the case shall be referred to the Standing Academic Committee.

17.4.2.4.6 If the student does not accept the decision of the Academic Officer, he/she shall have the right to appeal it to the Standing Academic Committee, at which he/she shall have the right to be heard, accompanied by a representative if desired.

17.5 THE STANDING ACADEMIC COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE

17.5.1 The Standing Academic Committee shall investigate all cases of alleged academic malpractice referred to it by the University Dean or relevant Academic Officers and determine whether an academic offence has been committed.

17.5.2 The Standing Academic Committee shall consist of three members (including the Chairperson), each representing a different faculty. In no case may a serving member of the Standing Academic Committee be a member of any of the departments in which the student has studied, or is studying, or be a witness for the Academic Officer or for the student.

17.5.3 The procedures of the Standing Academic Committee shall be as follows.

(a) All hearings shall be held in private.

(b) The Committee will be convened with all possible speed. Once the time, date and place of its meeting are known the referred student shall be informed in writing:

(i) that he or she is to be called to a hearing;
of the nature, date and time of the alleged offence;

(ii) that he or she may present evidence in his or her defence orally at the hearing and/or in writing;

(iii) that he or she may be accompanied by a friend who will normally be a member of the University;

(iv) that he or she may call witnesses to support his or her case (whose identity must be notified to the secretary of the Committee prior to the hearing in order that their attendance can be assured).

(c) The Committee shall have the power to adjourn, continue or postpone an investigation at its discretion but shall at all times endeavour to complete its examination of the matter at the earliest opportunity. If the student does not appear on the date and time or at the place appointed, reasonable notice having been given, the Committee may proceed to investigate the matter in his or her absence.

(d) If the student wishes to admit the charge, he or she may so in writing to the secretary of the Committee. In this event the student will be advised that he or she should still appear before the Committee for the formal presentation of evidence by the University Dean or relevant Academic Officers and for examination of the evidence by the Committee.

(e) If the student wishes to deny the charge, he or she shall so inform the secretary of the Committee once notice of the hearing has been received. If no letter of admission is received, it will be assumed that the charge is denied. The University Dean or relevant Academic Officer shall present the case in person to the Standing Academic Committee.

(f) The Committee may hear evidence in any way it sees fit. This includes the testimony of witnesses, and the production of documents or other relevant material evidence. The University Dean or relevant Academic Officer and the student (or the person accompanying the student) shall be entitled at the hearing to make an opening statement, to give evidence, to call witnesses, to cross examine witnesses and to address the Committee.

(g) The Committee will find the charge proven if all or all but one of its members agree, on the evidence before it, that it is beyond all reasonable doubt that the offence was committed. If the Committee does not find the charge proven, it shall inform the student and all parties concerned immediately, and the matter shall end there. If the Committee finds the charge proven, it may take one of the following courses of action, as appropriate.

Malpractice in examinations:

(i) decide that no further action is required;

(ii) require the student to resit the examination in which he or she cheated and if deemed appropriate other examinations or units of assessment;

(iii) award a mark of 0 or equivalent grade for the examination;

(iv) award a mark of 0 or equivalent grade for the entire unit of assessment;
(v) direct that the student be awarded a classification lower than the one derived from the mark profile (after any 0 mark or equivalent grade awarded under (iii) or (iv) has been included);
(vi) direct that the student be awarded no more than a Pass degree;
(vii) in addition to one of (ii) to (vi) temporarily exclude the student from the University;
(viii) permanently exclude the student from the University without a degree;
(ix) exceptionally not impose a specific penalty, but refer the case to the appropriate board of examiners with a full statement of findings together with suggestions for appropriate action (see 17.5.6).

Malpractice in coursework:

The Standing Academic Committee, having considered the evidence shall have the authority to confirm the recommendation for permanent exclusion, subject to 17.5.5 or to impose one of the following penalties:

(x) to permit the student to repeat the work, subject to receiving only the minimum pass mark appropriate to the piece of work;
(xi) to award zero or equivalent grade for the work in question;
(xii) to award zero or equivalent grade for the whole coursework or dissertation;
(xiii) to award zero or equivalent grade for the unit or course module;
(xiv) to award zero or equivalent grade as under (iv) and, where the inclusion makes no difference to the class of award, to recommend that one class lower than the one determined by the arithmetic be awarded;
(xv) to exclude the student permanently from the university, where the offence is detected before the final assessment is completed;
(xvi) not to award the degree, where the offence is detected after the final assessment has been completed.

17.5.4 The Standing Academic Committee shall act on behalf of the Senate and the Committee of the Senate, and its decisions (subject to 17.5.5) shall be binding on boards of examiners.

17.5.5 Any student excluded either temporarily or permanently under any of 17.5.3 (g) shall have the right of appeal using the Academic Appeals procedures.

17.5.6 Procedure where the Standing Academic Committee refers a case of malpractice in an examination to a board of examiners

Any student found by the Standing Academic Committee to be guilty of an academic offence under Section 17.1.1, and whose case is referred to a board of examiners, shall have the right to submit to the board a written plea in mitigation but he or she shall not have the right to appear or to be represented by another before the board. Boards of examiners have absolute discretion to take into account, in making their decisions, such evidence as they may consider relevant to a student’s academic performance and to decide whether to call for further oral or written evidence. They may also take into account, but shall not be bound by, the suggestions of the Standing Academic Committee. In considering the suggestions of the Standing Academic Committee, the
decisions of boards of examiners shall be subject to ratification by the Committee of the Senate.

17.6 RETROSPECTIVE DETECTION

17.6.1 Retrospective detection is defined as the discovery of alleged plagiarism or other academic malpractice in work that has been subject to final moderation, including by a relevant board of examiners.

17.6.2 The University shall reserve the right to review work as defined in 17.6.1 and to apply the appropriate procedures and, where reasonable, the appropriate penalties.

17.6.3 Where there are reasonable grounds to review work, the relevant Academic Officer shall initiate the process and shall have the right to require the student to resubmit work that has been finally assessed, and to refer the matter to the Standing Academic Committee with a recommended sanction.

17.6.4 The Standing Academic Committee shall, in addition, have the right to require retrospective review of any assessed work of candidates referred to it under the above procedures.

17.6.5 Failure by the candidate to produce the required material shall normally be treated by the Standing Academic Committee as leading to the assumption that the material had, in part or in whole, been plagiarised.

17.7 APPEALS AGAINST PENALTIES FOR ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE

17.7.1 Malpractice in UG and PGT examinations

Where the Committee of the Senate or the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate approves the recommendation of a board of examiners that a degree or other University qualification shall not be awarded, and where this recommendation does not include the opportunity for re-assessment, a student may appeal under the Academic Appeals procedures as defined in the chapter on Academic Appeals.

17.7.2 Malpractice in UG and PGT coursework

A student who has been excluded from the University, either permanently or for a stated time, or who has been adjudged by the Standing Academic Committee to have committed academic malpractice, shall have the right of appeal under the Academic Appeals procedures as defined in the chapter on Academic Appeals.

17.8 MALPRACTICE IN RESEARCH DEGREE SUBMISSIONS

Applicability

17.8.1 For the degrees of:

(a) DSc, DLitt, PhD (including by published work), DClinPsy, DMgt, EngD, MPhil, MD; and
(b) for the degrees of MRes, and the degrees of MA, MSc, LLM, MMus if relating to a programme validated for such awards on the basis of research and titled ‘By Research’;

the definition of malpractice is as set out in section 17.1 above and includes: cheating in examinations (if applicable); plagiarism in the thesis or dissertation (including in published works if submitted for award of a PhD by published work); and fabrication of results.

17.8.2 In addition, for the awards listed above, plagiarism shall be deemed to include unacknowledged or unattributed concepts, proposals, interpretations, methodologies or conclusions, which take place beyond the verbatim reproduction of texts or material without explicit identification or the source of the reference.

Submission of material for examination

17.8.3 Candidates shall be required to submit, in addition to the hard copies of the thesis or dissertation, a copy of the text and related data or images, in a recognised electronic format: floppy disk, or CD-ROM in a recognised word-processing format only. Such electronic format, which must be submitted simultaneously with the hard copies, shall be retained securely by the relevant departmental officer, in the event that the examiners might need to refer to such electronic copy for the purposes of textual analysis or other scrutiny, including by the use of software. Such electronic copy shall be returned to the candidate, in acknowledgement of his/her copyright, when the award has been approved by the University.

Departmental code of practice

17.8.4 Each department or equivalent shall prepare guidelines, relevant to the discipline involved, for publication to the candidate on first registration for the award, concerning the appropriate presentation of text and data in a thesis or dissertation.

Guidance to examiners

17.8.5 This regulation shall be issued to all examiners for the awards set out above. In the event that the examiners find evidence of a breach of the University regulations, involving plagiarism as defined above, the examiners shall not make an award but shall instead report on their findings to the Deputy Head of the Student Registry, in the first instance. Such a report shall set out the evidence that plagiarism has taken place and shall normally include a recommendation for outright failure with no opportunity for resubmission or re-examination.

Standing Academic Committee

17.8.6 The report under 17.8.5 above shall be referred to the Standing Academic Committee, who shall set up a hearing, at which the candidate shall be invited to be present in person and to be accompanied by a friend (a member of the University). The Committee shall test the recommendation of the examiners and the evidence of plagiarism presented by them, and receive any other information submitted by the candidate and/or on his/her behalf at its absolute discretion. A written record shall be kept.
17.8.7 In the event of the candidate being unable or unwilling to be present, and one deferment having taken place, the hearing shall take place in the absence of the candidate, who may however submit written information in explanation or mitigation of the allegation(s) presented.

17.8.8 The Committee, having completed the above procedures, shall adopt one of the following conclusions:

(a) the accusation of plagiarism is unfounded, the candidate’s examination is void, and the candidate shall be examined as for the first time by a new panel of examiners, at a date to be determined; or

(b) the accusation is upheld, such that the candidate is deemed to have failed with one opportunity for revision and resubmission at a date to be determined, for re-examination for the award originally sought, by the same examination team; or

(c) the accusation is upheld, such that the candidate is deemed to have failed outright and shall be recommended for exclusion.

17.8.9 A candidate who is deemed to have committed plagiarism, and the procedures above having been applied and conclusion (c) having been reached, shall have a right of appeal against exclusion under the Academic Appeals procedures as defined in the chapter on Academic Appeals.

18. ACADEMIC APPEALS

These Academic Appeals procedures were approved by Senate on 17 June 2015. They will apply with effect from 1 October 2015. Any appeals made prior to this date will be dealt with under the regulations as set out in MARP 2014.

18.1 PRINCIPLES

18.1.1 Matters relating to a mark or grade for any assessment or an overall result shall be subject to the authority of the University, and agents acting on its behalf, in reaching academic judgements. The University, exercising its authority under its Statutes, acting through the decisions of boards of examiners as confirmed by the Committee of the Senate, has sole authority to determine whether or not a degree, certificate or diploma should be awarded to a particular candidate and, if so awarded, the specific class or other description of attainment, appropriate to the level of the award.

18.1.2 However, it is recognised by the University that there are non-academic elements to assessment judgments which might have adversely affected the outcome and that there are occasions where students may wish to appeal against an assessment outcome on such grounds. The procedures set out in this chapter explain how this appeal process will be managed, the responsibilities of all parties, and the opportunity for external scrutiny should students remain dissatisfied with the University’s decisions.

18.1.3 These procedures apply to all current students registered on a Lancaster University programme, with the exception of those students registered on collaborative programmes where an alternative appeals procedure has been formally approved as being procedurally equivalent. Students who want to appeal and feel that they have good reason to do so must appeal within one month of the publication of results.
Exceptions to this timescale will be determined on a case-by-case basis by the Head of the Student Registry.

18.1.4 The University, through its academic staff and assessment mechanisms, ensures that proper academic judgement is used in all assessment and moderation (see the General Assessment Regulations). Academic judgement thus stands outside of these procedures and cannot be subject to appeal.

18.1.5 The right of appeal is available to all students who:

(a) have failed to qualify to proceed from one stage of a degree programme to the next;
(b) have failed to qualify for the award of the degree for which they were registered;
(c) wish to challenge, on procedural grounds, the class of degree to be awarded;
(d) received a lower class of degree than would otherwise have been the case had plagiarism penalties not been applied.

18.1.6 *A prima facie* case for appeal will be deemed to exist if there is evidence of one or more of:

(a) material administrative error or irregularity in the conduct of assessment which adversely affected the student’s performance and results;
(b) significant extenuating circumstances which adversely affected the student’s performance and results;
(c) unfair treatment or discrimination, outwith the exercise of academic judgement;

which, for good reason, could not be brought to the attention of boards of examiners at the relevant time and which could have influenced their recommendations had the information been available at that time.

18.1.7 Students will not be hindered in making a reasonable appeal. All parties will act without bias or prejudice and in a sensitive, fair and prompt manner.

18.1.8 The objective of the procedure is to establish the facts and come to a reasonable and just resolution, which is both relevant and proportionate.

18.1.9 No students will be disadvantaged for making appeals in good faith, and all reasonable appeals will be taken seriously and dealt with according to the agreed procedures. However, if it is established that appeals are frivolous or spurious, then they will not be considered reasonable, and the University may take disciplinary action.

18.1.10 The University will deal with all appeals confidentially so far as it is able, and expects all parties involved to honour this approach.

18.1.11 All reasonable measure will be taken to ensure that no student is disadvantaged within these processes due to location, requirements associated with protected characteristics, etc. Technology will be used, as appropriate, to facilitate these procedures.

18.1.12 Advice on how to use these procedures is available from the Students’ Union Education and Welfare Office or the Student Registry.
18.2. APPLICATIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROCEDURE

18.2.1 The Academic Appeals procedure only applies to appeals initiated and conducted by an individual student or group of students. A group of students wishing to appeal collectively will need to provide reasons as to why they should be considered collectively. These will be subject to consideration and judgement by the Head of the Student Registry whose decision will be final (a decision to not consider an appeal collectively does not preclude students from pursuing individual appeals). Where a collective appeal has been agreed, the group will nominate a spokesperson for communication.

18.2.2 An appellant has the right to be accompanied and supported at any meeting by one person, and may be represented where the appellant expressly authorises a third party in writing to act on their behalf.

18.2.3 The University will make every reasonable effort to complete academic appeal procedures in a timely manner and aims to complete all aspects of the appeals process within ninety calendar days. If the University is unable reasonably to comply (for example, in factually complex matters involving a number of individuals, etc.) it will provide the appellant with an explanation and inform them of the timeframe in which the procedure will be completed.

18.2.4 In this procedure any reference to named members of University staff also includes reference to her/his nominee and named staff may delegate their responsibilities to other appropriate members of staff, including those suitably qualified in partner organisations, without invalidating the procedure. The identity of nominees or members of staff to whom responsibilities are delegated will be notified to the appellant.

18.2.5 The Academic Appeals procedures, as set out, act to fulfil the University’s obligations under Ordinance 7 in relation to appeals against exclusion on academic grounds.

18.2.6 The Head of the Student Registry will oversee this process and provide advice. Any evidence of breaches of the principles as set out in 18.1.4-18.1.11 above should be brought to the attention of the Head of the Student Registry for investigation.

18.2.7 Should a student wish to register a concern about the actions of the Head of the Student Registry it should be sent to the Director of Student Based Services.

18.2.8 The Academic Quality and Standards Committee will receive an annual report on academic appeals and is responsible to both Council and Senate for monitoring academic appeals and agreeing institutional actions as required. UMAG will also receive the report for information.

18.3. THE PROCEDURE

18.3.1 The University uses a two-stage procedure.

18.3.2 Stage 1 – the Formal Appeal
18.3.2.1 In order for an academic appeal to be considered formally, the appellant must put the appeal in writing using the Academic Appeal form (available for online submission and in hard copy) and send it to the Head of the Student Registry.

18.3.2.2 Should the issue be immediately resolvable (for example, a simple recording error), the Head of the Student Registry will draw this to the attention of the relevant Exam Board Chair who will agree amendments by Chair’s action. If this is not the case, the Head of the Student Registry will consider the appeal and decide whether there is a *prima facie* case for appeal against the criteria set out in 18.1.6.

Where there is no *prima facie* case the Head of the Student Registry will either:

(a) refer the appellant to an alternate more appropriate procedure;
(b) enter into a discussion with the appellant, and other parties as appropriate, as to how best to take forward the concerns (e.g. in cases where the concerns involve a number of elements which cross University procedures); or
(c) provide an explanation to the appellant as to why no action can be taken along with a Completion of Procedures letter which sets out their right to refer the matter to the Office for the Independent Adjudicator and describe the means to do so.

18.3.2.3 If it is deemed that a *prima facie* case exists within the scope of this procedure, the appellant will be referred to an appropriate Academic Appeal Panel (i.e. UG Part I, UG Part II, PGT, PGR). It is expected that the student will have provided full information with accompanying evidence as required in their Academic Appeal form. However, in exceptional cases, where appropriate, an investigation to determine the facts of the appeal can be undertaken; an academic member of staff unconnected to the appeal will do this supported by the Student Registry.

18.3.2.4 An Academic Appeal Panel will consist of a minimum of three persons. Membership will vary according to the award level and location of provision (i.e. Lancaster or a collaborative teaching partner). At Lancaster, this will normally consist of at least one of the relevant Associate Deans (UG or PG) as Chair and other senior members of the academic community with the caveat that any Associate Dean previously involved in an Examination Board which considered the student(s) in question will be excluded. Equivalent postholders will be involved in collaborative teaching partners. A note taker will also be in attendance throughout. Dates for Academic Appeals Panels will be formally scheduled into the timetable of meetings, but can also be called on an *ad hoc* basis as necessary. In each case, the Panel shall have the right of access to detailed marks in the candidate’s units of assessment. In addition all details of cases where the board of examiners have permitted a student to be reassessed as first attempt candidates will be available to the Panel. The appellant may attend the event, although it is not required and failure to attend would not stop the proceeding. If present, the appellant will be invited to make a short personal statement to further elucidate the submitted materials. The panel will be allowed, through the Chair, to question the appellant. It will not normally be permissible to call witnesses as part of the panel hearing; however, the Chair may allow it at their discretion. The appellant will be given the opportunity to sum up their position. The burden of proof will be on the appellant, albeit within a recognition of the responsibilities of the University. Following the proceeding, the panel will deliberate in private using the balance of probability as the
standard of proof, and reach a decision. A member of the Student Registry will be available to provide advice on the scope of actions/remedies available to the Panel.

18.3.2.5 Where an appeal involves an element of fitness to practise a professionally qualified person appointed as a member of a panel established for the purpose of assessing fitness to practise shall be invited to attend in an advisory capacity on professional requirements.

18.3.2.6 The potential options for outcomes available to the Academic Appeal Panel will differ depending on the nature of the case, particularly with regard to the level of the award. In general terms the following options apply:

18.3.2.6.1 Undergraduate Part I
   (a) Exclusion
   (b) Confirmation of failure
   (c) Condonation of failure and the granting of permission for external reassessment
   (d) Readmission to Part I

18.3.2.6.2 Undergraduate Part II
   (a) Exclusion.
   (b) Confirmation of failure.
   (c) Confirmation of existing degree classification.
   (d) Reconsideration of candidate in accordance with the regulations relating to incomplete and mitigating circumstances, as detailed in the General Assessment Regulations and the Undergraduate Assessment Regulations.
   (e) Agreement to allow the student to retake the entire year
   (f) Agreement to temporarily exclude the student allowing a reassessment the following year
   (g) Amendment to the awarded degree classification.
   (h) For students who have been adjudged to have committed malpractice in examinations and excluded with no reassessment opportunity, the opportunity for reassessment for a Pass degree only.

18.3.2.6.3 Postgraduate (Taught)
   (a) Confirmation of failure.
   (b) Confirmation of awarded degree.
   (c) Exclude the student from the University without the opportunity to redeem the failure.
   (d) Allow the student the opportunity to resit examinations or to resubmit a dissertation or project which has been failed. (In this case, the department(s) shall recommend to the nominated representative of the officer with delegated authority from Senate the form, timing and content of the re-examination and the timing of any re-submission. Re-examination shall normally take place within one year.)

18.3.2.6.4 Postgraduate (Research) – pre final examination
   (a) Confirm the decision of the transfer panel regarding the student's registration.
(b) Allow the student a final opportunity to go through the transfer process/confirmation process.

In the case of the second option, the Academic Appeal Panel will specify the date by which the student will apply for transfer, and advise the student and department of the reasons why this decision has been taken with recommended steps by which the student and supervisor(s) may prepare for the next transfer/confirmation panel.

The Academic Appeal Panel, following a review of the case regarding exclusion in which the student and members of staff may be interviewed, may either:

(c) confirm the exclusion, terminating the student’s registration; or
(d) allow the student to continue with their registration subject to appropriate academic probationary arrangements.

18.3.2.6.5 Postgraduate (Research) – post final examination

(a) Approve the recommendation of the examiners.
(b) Determine the proper action which may include:
   (i) to recommend to the examiners that, for reasons stated, they should reconsider their action;
   (ii) to give the student permission to revise the thesis and resubmit for re-examination, for the same or lesser degree, within a specified time limit;
   (iii) To declare the examination null and void and to direct that a fresh examination be conducted.

Where fresh examination under (iii) is determined, the following shall apply:

- new examiners will be appointed, in number not fewer than on the original board;
- the examiners will be given no information about the previous examination except the single fact that they are conducting a re-examination on review;
- the examiners will submit independent reports on the thesis before they examine the candidate orally, and a joint report after the oral examination.

18.3.2.7 The appellant will receive a written decision that addresses the points they have made and gives reasons for the conclusion reached. The letter will also advise the appellant of their right to refer the matter to Stage 2 and describe the means to do so.

18.3.3 Stage 2 – the Review Stage

18.3.3.1 If the appellant feels their appeal has not been resolved under Stage 1, they may apply for a formal review to the Head of the Student Registry within two weeks of the date of the Stage 1 written decision. They should explain why they feel dissatisfied with the outcome at Stage 1 and what remedy they seek. Requests for Stage 2 consideration can only be made on the following grounds:

(a) that there exists evidence that could not reasonably have been made available at Stage 1; or
(b) that there exists evidence of a material procedural irregularity in Stage 1; or
(c) that there exists evidence that the judgement at Stage 1 was perverse.
No new ground of appeal may be requested at Stage 2, but the appellant may submit further evidence in support of their case (subject to point (a) above) or suggest a new remedy. For those students facing exclusion this fulfils the University’s obligations under Ordinance 7.

18.3.2 The Head of the Student Registry will consider the application and make a prima facie decision as to whether or not to instigate a review. Where a review is rejected the Head will write to the appellant explaining the reasons for the decision and providing a Completion of Procedures letter that sets out their right to refer the matter to the Office for the Independent Adjudicator and describes the means to do so.

18.3.3 Where a review is deemed within the scope of the procedures a Review Panel will be convened. The panel will consist of either the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) or the Provost for Student Experience, Colleges and the Library (in the chair) and two other members of academic staff (appointed by the Vice-Chancellor). No members of the panel will have been associated with the appeal or the Faculty or equivalent institutional body of the appellant. Dates for Review Panels will be formally scheduled into the timetable of meetings, but can also be arranged ad hoc as required.

18.3.4 The Head of the Student Registry, or nominee, will act as Clerk to the panel and will prepare the documentation. The Chair of the Stage 1 Panel will be invited to submit a statement addressing the appellant’s submission. The appellant may submit additional material only if there are good reasons why they were not submitted at Stage 1 (see 18.3.2 above). Both the appellant and the Chair of the Appeal Panel will be invited to attend; however failure to attend by either party will not invalidate the proceeding, as determination can be made via the submitted documentation.

18.3.5 If present, the appellant will be invited to make an opening statement as to why, in their view, the case should be subject to review. This will be restricted to consideration against the identified review grounds; the Review Panel will not rehear the original appeal. If present, the Chair of the Stage 1 Academic Appeals Panel will then be invited to present an opening statement explaining how the Stage 1 decision was determined and how, in their view, it was reasonable. If the appellant presents either new evidence or alternate remedies the Stage 1 Academic Appeal Panel Chair will also be invited to comment on these. Neither the appellant nor the Stage 1 Chair will be allowed to question the other, but the members of the Review Panel, through the Chair, may question either. Both the Stage 1 Chair and the appellant will be given the opportunity to sum up their position. The burden of proof will be on the appellant, and the standard of proof will be on the balance of probability. Following the proceeding, the panel will deliberate in private and will determine their conclusions, including, as appropriate, any modifications and/or additions to the Stage 1 actions/remedies. Only in exceptional circumstances would a rehearing at Stage 1 be recommended. The Head of the Student Registry will provide advice on the scope of actions/remedies available to the Panel.

18.3.6 The appellant will receive a written decision that addresses the points they have made and gives reasons for the conclusion reached. They will also receive a Completion of Procedures letter which will also advise the appellant of their right to refer the matter to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator and describe the means to do so.

18.4 OFFICE OF THE INDEPENDENT ADJUDICATOR
18.4.1 Once all internal appeals procedures have been exhausted, if the student is still not satisfied they have the right to take the case to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) for Higher Education, for further review. The application to the OIA must be made within 12 months of the issue of the Completion of Procedures letter. Information about OIA and its processes can be found at [www.oiahe.org.uk](http://www.oiahe.org.uk).

19. RECOGNITION OF PRIOR LEARNING

19.1 PURPOSE, DEFINITIONS AND SCOPE

19.1.1 This policy and associated procedures provide guidance on the University’s requirements for the recognition of prior learning (RPL) which has been undertaken elsewhere and (where applicable) on the award of Lancaster credit for this learning. They enable the University to assure itself that credit for such learning is comparable to that achieved through the teaching and learning activities required for specified modules for the Lancaster University programme on which the student will be registered.

19.1.2 These procedures apply to individual students and not to institutional arrangements for the recognition of credit (see 19.1.6). They cover those cases where an individual wishes to receive credit for one or more modules that form part of a programme of study leading to a Lancaster qualification on the grounds that they have already achieved, via the prior learning described in 19.1.3, the required learning outcomes for the Lancaster module(s). For the different types of prior learning the procedural outcome is either:

(a) the recognition of UK credit gained elsewhere, described as ‘credit transfer’;
(b) the award of Lancaster credit for cases of ‘certificated learning’ or ‘experiential learning’; described here as the accreditation of prior learning (APL) for the former and the accreditation of prior experiential learning (APEL) for the latter.

In all cases the credit is counted towards the relevant Lancaster qualification.

19.1.3 The prior learning to be considered will fall into one or more of the following categories.

(a) **Credit transfer**: formal learning which has led to the award of credit or qualifications by a UK higher education degree-awarding body, in accordance with the relevant higher education qualifications framework.\(^3\)

(b) **Certificated learning**: formal learning at a higher education level but which has not led to the award of credit or qualifications positioned on the relevant higher education qualifications framework\(^4\); for example some professional development awards, employment-based awards or non-UK awards.

(c) **Experiential learning**: informal learning achieved through experience and practice (for example through employment or voluntary activities) rather than through a certificated programme of study or training.

---


\(^4\) As above.
19.1.4 Where applicants present evidence of academic attainment that would equip them for direct entry into the second year of a Lancaster undergraduate programme of study; i.e. they have completed 120 credits (or the equivalent) at the appropriate level at another UK higher education institution, they will be considered jointly by the Undergraduate Admissions Office and the relevant Admissions Tutor.

19.1.5 Requests for RPL are normally made at the same time as an application to study on the programme is made. For an undergraduate application the Undergraduate Admissions Office will act as a clearing house for this request, referring on to the department’s Admissions Tutor who will direct this to the relevant personnel in the department (see section 19.3.2). A request from a postgraduate taught applicant will be received by the faculty postgraduate admissions office, who will direct this to the relevant personnel in the department. RPL claims which are made at the same time as an application to study on the programme will be dealt with as described in section 19.4; they will, however, be part of the admissions process and departments’ decisions on these claims will be incorporated into the University’s communications to applicants at the offer stage.

19.1.6 This policy does not cover pre-defined institutional arrangements for the recognition of credit. Examples of such arrangements include:

- exchange agreements between Lancaster and other institutions which may apply to groups of students;
- articulation arrangements leading to a Lancaster award or a dual award;
- progression routes and step-off qualifications predetermined as part of a programme validation.

19.1.7 From time to time the University may approve specific department or partner procedures which may vary from the University’s standard procedures and which apply only to programmes administered by that department or partner (see section 19.5).

19.2 PRINCIPLES

19.2.1 All applicants for RPL must be treated equitably regardless of the sources of the prior learning that is being considered or the age, gender, marital status, ethnicity, disability, religious belief or sexual orientation of the applicant.

19.2.2 Normally (unless there is an approved variation) a maximum of one-third of the credits of an undergraduate programme may be awarded as RPL credits and these are normally only allowable at Level 4 of The Framework for Higher Education Qualifications of Degree-Awarding Bodies in England, Wales and Northern Ireland.

19.2.3 Normally, unless there is an approved variation, a maximum of one-third of the credits of a postgraduate programme may be awarded as RPL credits; however the project/dissertation element would not normally be eligible for inclusion in this.

---

5 An articulation arrangement is a process whereby all students who satisfy academic criteria on a programme delivered by a partner organization are automatically entitled (on academic grounds) to be admitted with advanced standing to a subsequent part or year of a Lancaster programme. Such arrangements are subject to formal agreements between Lancaster University and the partner organization.
19.2.4 Exceptions to the normal maximum limits for RPL may be recommended as part of the course approval process through the faculty teaching committee. Such variations are subject to the approval of the Academic Standards and Quality Committee. Current approved variations are listed in section 19.5.

19.2.5 Credit may only be awarded for learning which has taken place within the five years immediately prior to the start of the course unless the applicant can provide evidence that his/her learning has continued in a professional or similar context. In such cases the department may choose to set an assessment to test an applicant’s current knowledge.

19.2.6 Credit gained from outside of Lancaster University which has already contributed to an award at another institution cannot be used to gain an equivalent or lower level qualification from Lancaster. Credit gained from outside of Lancaster University can be used for a higher level qualification at Lancaster. However, if the applicant has completed an end-of-cycle qualification as defined by The Framework for Higher Education Qualifications of Degree-Awarding Bodies in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FHEQ), these credits cannot be used to contribute to the higher level Lancaster qualification.

19.2.7 Credit gained from outside of Lancaster University which has already contributed to an award at another institution cannot be used to gain an equivalent or lower level qualification from Lancaster. Credit gained from outside of Lancaster University can be used for a higher level qualification at Lancaster. However, if the applicant has completed an end-of-cycle qualification as defined by The Framework for Higher Education Qualifications of Degree-Awarding Bodies in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FHEQ), these credits cannot be used to contribute to the higher level Lancaster qualification.

19.2.8 Students who submit a portfolio to meet specific learning outcomes for the award of credit (see 19.4.6) cannot include learning/evidence for which they have already received credit from Lancaster or another higher education provider.

19.2.9 Credit cannot be awarded against fractions of modules: the minimum threshold will be one module. Credit may be awarded against compulsory or optional modules. Departments may specify that specific modules are not eligible for RPL. This should normally be done at the time of programme or module approval.

19.2.10 RPL credits may only be awarded where the level and standard of the prior learning are judged to be equivalent to the Lancaster module(s) for which credit is sought.

19.2.11 Decisions on RPL are a matter of academic judgement, with the main considerations being: (i) whether the outcomes achieved through the prior learning are equivalent to the learning outcomes defined for the module(s) for which credit is being considered; and (ii) whether the prior learning attained will provide the applicant with the same or similar preparation as intended in the relevant Lancaster module or modules. It is the learning outcomes achieved by the applicant through their prior learning that should be considered, not simply the qualifications or experiences themselves. Decisions on the award of Lancaster credit should be based on clearly defined assessment criteria for the

---

6 This paragraph, and the two paragraphs immediately following, relate to the re-use of credit. Credits can only be used as building blocks towards study for an end-of-cycle qualification (see footnote below) not previously achieved. For example credits from a Master’s qualification gained elsewhere cannot be used towards a Lancaster Master’s; however credits gained from a PGCert gained elsewhere could be used towards a Lancaster Master’s programme. Likewise credits gained from a CertHE gained elsewhere could be used towards a Lancaster Bachelor’s programme.

7 End-of-cycle qualification’ refers to different levels of qualification located in the FHEQ which correspond to the award of Bachelor’s (‘first cycle’), Master’s (‘second cycle’) and Doctoral (‘third cycle’) degrees. Other higher education qualifications are located within these cycles (e.g. the CertHE within the first cycle or the PGCert within the second cycle) but they are not deemed to be end-of-cycle qualifications.
Lancaster module(s) and the standard assessment regulations relevant to the programme.

19.3 RESPONSIBILITIES

19.3.1 Departments are responsible for considering and assessing all claims for RPL and for determining the form of evidence required in support of claims.

19.3.2 Departments are required to nominate an appropriate member of staff, e.g. a Part I Director of Studies, who will be able to: (i) provide initial advice and guidance to applicants; and (ii) (for credit transfer claims) make a recommendation to the department. APL/APEL claims should be referred on to an RPL Assessment Panel (see 19.3.3).

19.3.3 For APL/APEL claims, departments must set up an RPL Assessment Panel to consider the claim, comprising a minimum of two appropriately qualified internal assessors who, together with the Director of Studies for the programme, will be responsible for considering and formally assessing the portfolio of evidence provided in support of the claim and for making a recommendation on the award of credit.

19.3.4 Departments are responsible for ensuring that decisions on the award of credit through APL/APEL are ratified by the external examiners and through the relevant examination board in the normal way (see 19.4.7).

19.3.5 The University Undergraduate Admissions Office is responsible for communicating a department’s decision on the award of credit to undergraduate applicants as part of the communications at the offer stage. Faculty postgraduate taught admissions offices are similarly responsible for postgraduate taught applicants.

19.3.6 Departments are responsible for notifying Student Registry of the outcome of successful claims for RPL and ensuring that the student record in LUSI is correct.

19.3.7 Student Registry is responsible for ensuring that credits obtained RPL are recorded as such on the student transcript.

19.4 PROCEDURES

19.4.1 Any claims for the consideration of RPL should, wherever possible, be made before study on a Lancaster programme commences. However, the University recognizes this may not always be possible; for example where a student gains work experience during their studies which might lead them to wish to seek APEL for a module later on in the programme of study. Where a student does request RPL after they have commenced the Lancaster programme the department must complete the procedure and communicate the decision on this prior to the start of the academic session/term in which the relevant module is delivered.

19.4.2 The University will not normally charge a fee for the consideration or assessment of claims for RPL except in those cases where a department runs a module specifically for the purpose of preparing applicants/students for the submission of APL/APEL claims and assessing these claims. Information on the fee payable for taking such a module should be provided to applicants/students in advance of them registering on the module.
19.4.3 All claims for RPL will be considered on the basis of:

(a) a sufficient match between the prior learning and the relevant Lancaster module(s) in terms of:
   - subject content and knowledge
   - level of learning
   - volume of learning;
(b) sufficient evidence of student achievement;
(c) the student’s preparedness for assessments later in the programme;
(d) any particular restrictions imposed by Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Bodies;
(e) the overall requirements for the programme.

Fulfilment of these criteria should enable the department to judge whether or not the learning outcomes for the Lancaster module(s) have been met.

19.4.4 All enquiries/requests for RPL should be initially considered by the Director of Studies (or appropriate nominated alternative) for the programme, who will invite the applicant for informal discussion to provide guidance on the process and on the amount of credit that might reasonably be sought (this discussion would not necessarily need to be face-to-face if circumstances make it difficult for candidates to attend in person). In the case of APL/APEL, the discussion will also enable the identification of potentially relevant learning and experience to include in the portfolio of evidence (see 19.4.6). However, whilst the department must make every effort to provide information and guidance in support of the application, it remains the responsibility of the applicant to demonstrate the relevance of any prior learning and to produce the supporting evidence.

19.4.5 For credit transfer claims, there is no requirement for the formal assessment of the applicant’s previous work. However in such cases the department must ensure:

(a) that there is a valid transcript providing evidence of the credits awarded by the relevant UK higher education provider; and
(b) that the prior learning is at the same (or higher) level than that for which the credit transfer is being claimed and has not been used for the award of an end-of-cycle qualification gained elsewhere; and
(c) that, having reviewed the course descriptions for the unit(s) for which credit has already been awarded, they are satisfied there is a sufficient match between these and the Lancaster module(s) in regard to learning outcomes and content.

The department will determine procedures for the approval of credit transfer claims. Outcomes from the consideration of individual claims must be auditable through the department’s records of assessment.

19.4.6 For APL/APEL claims, there must be a formal assessment of the applicant’s portfolio of evidence by the appointed assessors. Applications should be submitted in the form of a portfolio consisting of:

---

8 Departments are advised to refer to the learning outcomes of the relevant Lancaster module(s) for levelling purposes. The Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications (see footnote 1) are also useful benchmarks for general statements on student attainment at particular levels.
(a) a written request stating the module(s) for which the student is seeking APL/APEL credits;
(b) documentary evidence of the prior learning; and
(c) a reflective analysis of how this experience/learning demonstrates successful achievement of the learning outcomes of the module(s) for which credit is sought.

Documented evidence may include and/or be drawn from: course or descriptions, certificates of learning/records of achievement, interviews, oral assessments, diagnostic assessments, references/testimonials, learning logs, work reports, work products, records of volunteer learning and experience etc.

In some cases the student may also be invited to complete the summative assessments normally associated with the Lancaster module(s) in order to demonstrate achievement of the learning outcomes, or an alternative assessment or assessments may be set.

Assessment of APL/APEL should be on a pass/fail basis only.

19.4.7 APL/APEL credit is recommended by a department’s RPL Assessment Panel and ratified through external examiner and exam board procedures in the normal way. The decision must be clearly documented in the department’s assessment records and the supporting evidence retained alongside the assessments for the module(s) in question. Work for APL/APEL credit should be moderated by the external examiner(s). For ad hoc cases of APL/APEL it is expected that the external examiner would review the individual portfolio and evidence of the department’s assessment of this. Where assessment is undertaken as part of a specific RPL module (see 19.4.2), a sample of this module’s assessed work should be made available to the external examiner in the normal way.

19.4.8 RPL credits count towards the total number of credits required for the award of the Lancaster qualification aimed for and are clearly indicated as such on the student transcript. However marks for credits achieved elsewhere and for credits awarded by Lancaster on the basis of APL/APEL are not normally carried into the Lancaster programme. They are not normally used in the calculations to determine the class of degree awarded or used to help determine progression from one year to the next. However, where appropriate and possible, it is permitted to allow consideration for grades to be transferred where these have been gained elsewhere as part of a Lancaster programme, or from specific partners, or on a case-by-case basis. This will be at the discretion of the exam board.

19.4.9 Students must be made aware of the outcome of their claim for credit as soon as a formal decision has been taken by the department and at the latest prior to the start of the academic session/term in which the relevant module is delivered.

19.4.10 Where an APL/APEL claim has not been successful, applicants will have the right to one reassessment opportunity, as if they had failed the module.

19.4.11 As applications for RPL are a matter of academic judgement; there will not normally be any right of appeal against the decision reached unless there has been a procedural irregularity.
19.4.12 A student granted credit through RPL will not be allowed to study the module(s) for which credit has been awarded.

19.4.13 Special consideration needs to be given to students who have been granted the maximum permissible amount of credit on their entry to a programme and subsequently fail to obtain the minimum number of credits from Lancaster to complete the programme and have to exit with a lesser qualification (where one is available). In such cases the department is required to ensure that the student has completed sufficient Lancaster credits to exit with the lower qualification. If the student has not completed sufficient Lancaster credits, they may only be eligible to receive a transcript of their results.

19.5 APPROVED VARIATIONS TO UNIVERSITY PROCEDURES

19.5.1 From time to time the University may approve specific department or partner RPL procedures which may vary from the standard University procedures and which apply only to programmes administered by that department or partner.

19.5.2 Centre for Education, Training and Development (CETAD): a maximum of one-half of the available credits for the programme of study may be gained via RPL (ASQC, 9 July 2014).
PART TWO: QUALITY ASSURANCE AND STANDARDS

20. MANAGEMENT OF STANDARDS AND QUALITY

20.1 UNDERLYING PRINCIPLES

20.1.1 The University aims to offer its students:

(a) a diverse choice of flexible programmes which are responsive to student need and demand, based on sound principles of design, and that are explicitly informed by, and benefit from, Lancaster’s strong research culture;
(b) high quality and innovative programmes that enable students to develop knowledge and skills that promote personal development, make a positive contribution to society and are valued by external agencies including other universities and employers;
(c) an environment where the diversity of students’ backgrounds and experiences is considered in curriculum development and the delivery of courses and transparent admissions procedures that do not unfairly discriminate between prospective students;
(d) academic and pastoral support which aids and encourages students to fulfil their academic and personal potential and benefit from University.

20.1.2 The University encourages staff at all levels to take an active responsibility for the quality of its academic offer. Nevertheless, it is the University that has ultimate responsibility for:

(a) the standard of its academic awards and for the quality of all its educational programmes wherever delivered;
(b) the quality of the educational experience given to students;
(c) ensuring that standards and quality are comparable to similar awards and programmes elsewhere in the HE sector and internationally;
(d) ensuring the fair, equitable and consistent treatment of students across all provision, wherever delivered in terms of:
   (i) admissions;
   (ii) learning teaching and assessment opportunities;
   (iii) academic discipline;
   (iv) results and awards.

20.1.3 To this end, the University’s framework for the management of academic standards and quality is designed to foster debate on academic and pedagogical issues within academic peer groups in order to:

(a) appoint appropriately qualified academic staff and support them in the design, delivery and continuous evaluation of learning, teaching and assessment provision;
ensure that programmes leading to Lancaster awards are at an appropriate level and make appropriate demands on students, tested by reference to the educational norms and values of the relevant academic discipline, the department, the Faculty, the University (and its collaborative teaching partners), and the international HE community;

(c) take account of relevant UK HE external reference points, including: knowledge of how the subject is taught in other HEIs; external examiners’ comments; advice from subject-based learning and teaching support networks, the requirements of PSRBs, employers, relevant QAA subject benchmark statements, the QAA Quality Code and the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ) and any credit frameworks to which the University subscribes;

(d) set admissions criteria that will secure a good match between the abilities and aptitudes of applicants and the demands of the programme, enabling the admission of students who can be reasonably expected to attain the required standard for the award;

(e) design assessment processes that can demonstrate that students have attained learning outcomes and levels of achievement appropriate to the award they will receive, and which also facilitate student learning and progression;

(f) ensure that programme proposals and related-developments are consistent with institutional plans and with strategic academic and resource planning criteria;

(g) ensure the availability of the level and types of teaching, learning and support resources and facilities necessary to deliver programmes consistently to the required standard and to support student achievement;

(h) provide for institution-level reviews of the ways in which quality and standards are assured, including quality assurance processes and quality management and enhancement systems, in order to ensure that they are working properly and effectively and are fit for purpose;

(i) ensure that appropriate administrative and professional support is in place to enable learning, teaching and assessment activities to flourish and develop and to be responsive to change.

All University staff have a responsibility to treat all students fairly and equitably on the basis of capacity and potential and to ensure that no students are discriminated against on any grounds irrelevant to academic study.

20.2 ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE

20.2.1 The Senate is the body with overarching responsibility for the academic strategy of the University, and the approval of policies and procedures to promote and ensure the academic quality of teaching and research. Chaired by the Vice-Chancellor, membership includes academic and academic-related staff and student representatives.

20.2.2 Senate is empowered to make binding decisions on matters relating to the direction, regulation and promotion of the teaching of the University, the conduct of examinations, and the award of degrees. In practice Senate delegates responsibility for quality assurance to a range of groups and committees with specific terms of reference and individual officers.
20.2.3 The main sub-committees of Senate responsible for the assurance of quality and standards are the Academic Standards and Quality Committee and the Collaborative Provision Oversight Committee.

20.2.4 The **Academic Standards and Quality Committee** (ASQC) is chaired by the University Dean for Academic Quality, its membership includes central and Faculty staff and student representatives. Its institutional responsibilities include:

(a) ensuring comparable academic standards and equivalent educational experience across the University’s programmes;
(b) providing advice on programme and module approval;
(c) reviewing data on all programme provision;
(d) approving academic regulations governing all taught and research degree programmes;
(e) overseeing the University’s relationship with external bodies with respect to learning and teaching and quality assurance.

20.2.5 The **Collaborative Provision Oversight Committee** is chaired by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (International) and its membership includes central and faculty staff and student representatives. Its institutional responsibilities include:

(a) taking an overview of the University’s development of collaborative provision;
(b) making recommendations on institutional collaborative partnerships;
(c) establishing relevant policies for collaborative provision;
(d) being the reference committee for Partnership Management Groups.

20.2.6 The principal committees in Faculties with responsibility for academic standards and quality are **Faculty Teaching Committees**.

20.2.7 Departmental committee arrangements vary according to the nature and complexity of their provision but in each case there is at least one body with responsibility for learning, teaching and assessment.

**Principal quality assurance processes**

20.2.8 The main quality assurance processes that are covered in this Manual are:

(a) programme and module design and development;
(b) programme and module approval;
(c) annual reviews of teaching (by departments with faculty input);
(d) periodic reviews of departmental provision (by the institution with external input);
(e) the regulation assessment including the use of external examiners;
(f) the collection and use of student feedback.

**Policy and regulatory framework**

20.2.9 The University monitors and manages the standards of its academic provision and discharges its responsibilities in respect of awarding degrees through an institutional framework of regulations, policies, procedures, codes of practice, student charters and contracts and disciplinary rules.
Study and Assessment regulations

20.2.10 The University’s detailed Study and Assessment regulations are contained in Part 1 of this Manual, which includes detailed regulations for the assessment and award of undergraduate, postgraduate taught and postgraduate research degrees. These are implemented through the governance mechanisms referred to above.

Collaborative provision

20.2.11 The University currently has a variety of domestic and international access, exchange and external programme collaborative partnerships, with both public sector and private institutions, which range from single programmes to full-scale inter-institutional relationships. These partnerships are at different stages of development and maturity.

20.2.12 Section 26 of this Manual Collaborative Provision sets out the procedures and responsibilities relating to this area of work.

20.2.13 Senate is the University body with ultimate responsibility for ensuring that the standards and quality of the University’s collaborative provision are equivalent to those of the University’s own internal programmes, and it discharges that responsibility through named officers.

20.2.14 Academic Standards and Quality is responsible for maintaining an overview of the University’s collaborative provision. It ensures that the University’s collaborative provision is conducted in line with agreed policies and procedures, recommends to Senate approval of any new partnerships, and maintains regulations for collaborative provision and quality assurance processes. It also acts in an advisory capacity, and/or as arbiter authority for faculty committees, boards and groups established to manage specific aspects of the University collaborative provision.

20.3 ACADEMIC MANAGEMENT STRUCTURES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

20.3.1 The Vice-Chancellor is the chief administrative and executive officer of the University. He chairs the Senate and is an ex officio member of all of the main committees of the University. He is assisted and supported by a Deputy Vice-Chancellor, three Pro Vice-Chancellors (the PVC (Education), PVC (Research), and PVC (International)), a Provost of Student Experience, Colleges and the Library, a Chief Administrative Officer and a Director of Finance. An organogram is available here.

Faculties

20.3.2 Each of the four Lancaster faculties: the Lancaster University Management School (LUMS), the Faculty of Science and Technology (FST), the Faculty of Health and Medicine (FHM) and the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (FASS) is headed by a full-time Dean, who is responsible for managing the budget, staffing and academic activities of the faculty. Each faculty manages responsibility for the quality of provision in a way most appropriate to its disciplinary mix and academic ethos. The Dean of each faculty has formal responsibility for quality assurance, but in practice this is devolved to undergraduate and postgraduate Associate Deans.
20.3.3 Faculties are responsible for:

(a) approving academic strategies for departments;
(b) formally approving and monitoring the structure and content of programmes and modules (on behalf of the institution);
(c) monitoring, evaluating and enhancing quality and standards across the faculty;
(d) ensuring that appropriate and sufficient resources are available for the delivery of agreed provision.

20.3.4 Each Faculty comprises a number of academic departments (or equivalents).

20.3.5 Departments (or equivalents) are the primary academic and organisational unit in relation to learning, teaching and assessment. For administrative purposes, all postgraduate and undergraduate degree programmes are attributed to individual departments or sections, along with responsibility for the students registered on each degree programme.

20.3.6 Heads of academic departments are senior members of academic staff, are appointed by the Vice-Chancellor for a fixed term, and appointments are reported to Senate. Heads of Department are responsible for the strategic direction of the department in order to achieve Faculty and University objectives, and for the line management of staff, the quality assurance of programmes, and the management of resources (including finances) within their departments. In practice, Heads of Department have flexibility in creating management and administrative structures that are best suited to meet their own and University requirements for the management of learning, teaching and assessment.

20.3.7 Specifically in relation to learning, teaching and assessment, Heads of Department are formally responsible for:

(a) the quality of learning, teaching and assessment provision, including the diffusion of good practice and the supervision of research students;
(b) student welfare and guidance, including dealing with students concerns and complaints;
(c) staff welfare, career development and career progression, including staff induction, mentoring, training, development and appraisal;
(d) staff workloads with regard to teaching, research and administration;
(e) ensuring that departmental staff undertakes assessment activities, including the setting of examination papers and participation in boards of examiners.

20.3.8 Departments are responsible for:

(a) designing the structure and content of courses (degree programmes and contributory modules);
(b) designing and delivering, teaching and assessment;
(c) supporting the student learning experience;
(d) taking all relevant external reference points into account as appropriate;
(e) monitoring and evaluating quality and standards;
(f) engaging with and responding to student feedback;
(g) ensuring that information and guidance is available to students on departmental structures and committee arrangements and on provision for student representation.
Responsibility for the implementation of quality assurance procedures resides with academic departments and Faculties, led by the relevant Associate Deans and the Teaching Quality Support Officer in each Faculty, and monitored by the Faculty Teaching Committees.

The Academic Standards and Quality team in Professional Services is responsible for supporting teaching quality and standards management across all Lancaster’s provision wherever it is delivered, including regional teaching partners and international teaching partners. Working closely with academic departments and other professional and support services, ASQ has specific responsibility for:

(a) keeping the overarching quality management framework and the constituent elements under review;
(b) ensuring that the programme and module approval process is working properly;
(c) organising validation and re-validation events for the University’s RTPs;
(d) appointing and paying External Examiners, External Assessors and Course Consultants;
(e) administering the University’s accreditation of Bellerbys international foundation year programmes delivered at their four UK centres;
(f) drafting legal agreements for collaborative teaching partnerships;
(g) ensuring that the annual teaching review process is happening in line with agreed procedures;
(h) organising and supporting the periodic quality review process;
(i) producing and analysing data annual and periodic quality reviews;
(j) ensuring that agreed procedures for the regulation of assessment are happening;
(k) ensuring that the collection and use of student feedback is happening in line with agreed procedures;
(l) maintaining and promulgating academic regulations for all provisions;
(m) liaising with the QAA and being the primary point of contact within the University for QAA audit activities;
(n) servicing academic approval committees;
(o) servicing ad-hoc working groups and project groups;
(p) providing advice and guidance about all of the foregoing to staff across the University and its collaborative partners.

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT AND REPRESENTATION IN THE AREA OF QUALITY ASSURANCE

Student representation in quality assurance and enhancement

Students play an active role in the University’s quality assurance processes. Formal student representation occurs as follows:

(a) at departmental level through:
   (i) course representatives (who represent particular programmes or year groups in departmental discussions, including serving on staff-student committees);
   (ii) departmental staff-student committees (some departments have separate staff-student committees for undergraduates and postgraduates, others have representatives on departmental committees);
(iii) use of student feedback in course design, Annual Teaching Review (ATR) and PQR processes;
(iv) meeting the panel during a departmental PQR;
(b) at faculty level through student representatives on Faculty Teaching Committees;
(c) at institutional level through:
(i) a comprehensive system of LUSU representation on all significant University committees including the University Court, Council and Senate and their sub-committees, and UMAG;
(ii) inclusion on Periodic Quality Review panels;
(iii) inclusion on panels hearing student complaints;
(iv) student membership of, and input to, Thematic Review panels;
(v) Student and Graduate Ambassadors play key roles in recruitment activities such as outgoing visits to schools and colleges and University Open Days and Visit Days;
(vi) the organisation of incoming and outgoing Summer Schools with the University’s International Teaching Partnerships (ITPs).

20.4.2 Lancaster University Students’ Union is responsible for the co-ordination and training of student representatives who serve on all the University committees involved in teaching, learning and assessment and quality assurance. All departments at Lancaster have a system of student representation on departmental committees or special staff/student committees. LUSU trains and supports student representatives, including working with them to ensure that they know how to access the views of the broader student population in their department or college and how to present collective rather than solely personal views on issues of concern to a wider audience.

Consultation and communication with students

20.4.3 In addition to making provision for student representation in academic and decision-making processes, the University ensures that students are involved as active participants in the learning process through consultation and the collection of feedback that is analysed and acted upon. Consultative and feedback mechanisms must be timely and sufficiently frequent to allow students to make a worthwhile contribution to developing and enhancing their learning experience and the purpose of consultative and feedback mechanisms must be made clear and communicated effectively to all students.

Student feedback

20.4.4 Departments are required to use the on-line Lancaster University Module Evaluation Survey (LUMES) to collect module-level feedback from students. In addition, feedback from students is also available through the NSS, PRES and PTES surveys. Departments can also decide to use additional local procedures for securing feedback from students on their experience at programme level or on other aspects of their educational experience. Departments are responsible for analysing and acting upon student feedback on individual modules and degree programmes and also for communicating the outcome back to students. Student feedback is also analysed, considered and acted upon at faculty and institutional level.
20.4.5 Arrangements for requesting feedback from students on modules and programmes must be clearly co-ordinated and students should be informed of action taken as a result of the feedback provided (or the reasons for taking no action).

21. PORTFOLIO OF DEGREE AWARDS AND OTHER ACADEMIC QUALIFICATIONS

21.1 STRATEGIC APPROACH

21.1.1 The University has increasingly taken a strategic approach to programme design, development and approval in order to ensure that its portfolio of provision reflects institutional strategic priorities and goals. The Academic Planning and Resource Allocation process requires departments to consider their programme provision in terms of the Strategic Plan and Faculty academic strategies. The Library and Professional Services are then required to ensure that their forward planning and priorities can properly support agreed academic priorities.

21.2 ACADEMIC QUALIFICATIONS APPROVED BY SENATE

21.2.1 All academic qualifications: degrees, diplomas, certificates and other credit-bearing awards to which programmes of study leads must be approved by the Senate. The University currently offers the following awards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main higher education awards</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>FTE period of study (normal)</th>
<th>Normal total credit value</th>
<th>Normal minimum credit at level of award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate: PhD; DClinPsy; DMgt; EngD; MD</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters degree: MPhil; LLM; MA; MBA; MMus; MRes; MSc</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma (PGDip)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Up to 1 year</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate (PGCert)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Up to 1 year</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate of Achievement (PGCertA)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Under 1 year</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma⁹</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁹ Although the Graduate Diploma is based on undergraduate material, it is designed for those who are already graduates in another academic discipline. Thus it is ‘postgraduate’ in time, but not in level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main higher education awards</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>FTE period of study (normal)</th>
<th>Normal total credit value</th>
<th>Normal minimum credit at level of award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masters degree (integrated): MArts (Hons); MChem (Hons); M Econ (Hons); MEng (Hons); M Lang (Hons); M Phys (Hons); MPysch (Hons) MSci (Hons); MSocial Wk (Hons); MStat (Hons)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBChB</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors degree with honours: BA (Hons); BBA (Hons); BEng (Hons); BMus (Hons); BSc (Hons); LLB (Hons)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors degree unclassified – Pass degree: BA; BBA; BEng; BMus; BSc; LLB</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors degree as top-up to Foundation degree: BA (Hons); BSc (Hons)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Degree: FdA; FdSc</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma of Higher Education (DipHE)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate of Higher Education (CertHE)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Award</td>
<td>4,5,6,7</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>20-90</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criteria for degree awards and other academic qualifications approved by Senate**

21.2.2 All programmes leading to awards of the University must comply with criteria agreed by the Senate in terms of level of study, duration of programmes, numbers of modules, student learning hours and credit frameworks (see below).

21.2.3 In addition to complying with the criteria agreed by the Senate, all awards and programmes offered by the University must be aligned with the QAA “Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree Awarding Bodies” (FHEQ): [http://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/Publications/Documents/qualifications-frameworks.pdf](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/Publications/Documents/qualifications-frameworks.pdf) as well as the “Higher education credit framework for England”, which aligns UK qualifications with European qualifications: [http://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/Publications/Documents/Academic-Credit-Framework.pdf](http://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/Publications/Documents/Academic-Credit-Framework.pdf).
21.2.4 Reference should be made to the FHEQ and the credit framework to ensure that:

(a) qualifications are positioned at an appropriate level with appropriate credit weightings;
(b) new and revised programmes have an appropriate title for the level and subject content (as set out in the QAA FHEQ – see 21.2.3 above);
(c) an existing approved degree award is assigned as the target qualification;
(d) intended learning outcomes and assessments for programme elements such as modules are appropriate to the level at which the module is specified and for the degree programme to which they contribute.

21.3 AWARD AND PROGRAMME CRITERIA APPROVED BY SENATE

21.3.1 Undergraduate programmes

(a) Foundation Degrees comprise learning across levels 4 and 5, normally with 120 credits of assessment at each level. Learning levels 4 and 5 comprise all credit upon which final classification of awards is determined. All Foundation Degrees are required to offer successful students an opportunity to progress to Honours/Level 6 study and qualification, either through admission to the final Level 6 year of a 360 credit Bachelors degree programme or through admission to a one-year 120 credit Hons Top-up degree.

(b) Bachelors degrees and Integrated Bachelors/Masters degree programmes

Bachelors degrees, comprise learning across levels 4, 5, 6 (normally with 120 credits of assessment at each level) and, in the case of the Integrated Bachelors/Masters degrees, 120 credits at level 7. Level 4 learning is collectively referred to as Part I and is qualificatory, i.e. successful completion is required for progression to further study but obtained credit does not contribute to the final classification of the Lancaster degree awards. Learning levels 5, 6 and, as appropriate, 7, are collectively referred to as Part II and comprise all credit upon which final classification of Lancaster degree awards is determined.

Undergraduate degree programmes and assessment arrangements for Part II are based on the principle that the study load on students in terms of total teaching, learning and assessment activities should be equally distributed between each academic year i.e. normally four modules or equivalent (totalling 120 credits at Level 5) in the second year and four modules or equivalent (totalling 120 credits at Level 6) in the third and/or final year. A commensurate arrangement applies to students undertaking programmes of study (mostly in FST) that are divided into Part IIA (level 5) and Part IIB (Level 6) – the study of the latter commencing during the second year.

The equal distribution of study load across academic years does not preclude the attribution of a differential assessment weighting between Level 5 modules and Level 6 modules.
21.3.1 Postgraduate taught programmes

**Diplomas, certificates and taught Masters degrees (leading to the award of LLM, MA, MBA, MMus, MSc and MRes)**

(a) Taught Masters degrees, diplomas and certificates have a variety of objectives. Some are designed to advance the knowledge and the professional competencies within a discipline or multidisciplinary area of students who already have an appropriate background in the subject; others enable students to change the focus of their undergraduate specialisations by means of an advanced course. In each individual case the department or group responsible for a scheme of study or course shall provide a statement of its aims and objectives, specifying the areas upon which advanced study is concentrated.

(b) Masters of Research degrees (MRes) give greater emphasis to training in research methods; and the dissertation or research project element takes a greater role in final assessment. These degrees are covered by the same regulations as taught Masters degrees, except that the contact hours specified may, with approval, be modified.

(c) All taught Masters degrees, postgraduate diplomas and postgraduate certificates shall conform to the following common credit framework for taught postgraduate awards:

(i) for a taught Masters degree, a total of at least 180 credits, with no more than 30 credits having been defined as being undergraduate in level;
(ii) for a postgraduate diploma, a total of at least 120 credits, with no more than 30 credits having been defined as being undergraduate in level;
(iii) for a postgraduate certificate, a total of at least 60 credits, with no more than 20 credits having been defined as being undergraduate in level.

(d) All taught Masters degree programmes, with the exception of the MRes, will automatically have the PGCert and PGDip as defined exit awards for the appropriate credit achieved, unless, at the time of approval, a rationale for this not to be the case is proposed and approved.

(e) The normal duration of taught Masters degrees, postgraduate diplomas and postgraduate certificates shall be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme type</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taught Masters</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>24 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate diploma</td>
<td>9-12 months</td>
<td>12-24 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate certificate</td>
<td>6-12 months</td>
<td>9-24 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(f) Other periods of study may be prescribed in exceptional circumstances with the approval of the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate acting on the recommendation of the faculty or equivalent concerned.

(g) All Masters programmes (except those offered on a part-time only basis or those that end at other times of the year) should finish by the Friday nearest to 15 September in any one year.
(h) All Masters programmes shall include a substantial dissertation or project work, of a form or length that is appropriate for the significant weight that it will carry in final assessment. Programmes shall make explicit statements concerning the nature of the dissertation or project required and the weight that it will carry in the final assessment.

21.3.3 Postgraduate research degree programmes

(a) Degrees of MA/MSc by Research

(i) The degree shall be awarded on the examination of a dissertation embodying the results of the candidate's research. An oral examination will also be required. The work for the degree shall consist mainly of research and directed study; the candidate may in addition be required to undertake coursework, and the award of the degree may be conditional on satisfactory performance in this coursework.

(ii) A successful candidate for the degree of MA/MSc by Research shall display a convincing grasp of the techniques of research appropriate to the field of study on a scale which can be completed during one year, or at most two years, of full-time study or equivalent. The dissertation embodying the results of the research shall demonstrate evidence of originality, at least in the exercise of an independent critical faculty, and shall achieve a good standard of competence in argument and presentation. The dissertation shall comply with the requirements for the form, submission and deposit of MPhil theses except that the dissertation should not normally exceed 35,000 words (including any footnotes and appendices but excluding the bibliography).

(b) Degree of MPhil

(i) The degree shall be awarded on the examination of a thesis embodying the results of the candidate's research, and on an oral examination. The work for the degree shall consist mainly of research and directed study; the candidate may in addition be required to undertake coursework, and the award of the degree may be conditional on satisfactory performance in this coursework.
A successful candidate for the degree of MPhil shall display a convincing grasp of the techniques of research appropriate to the field of study on a scale which can be completed during two years, or at most three years, of full-time study or equivalent. The thesis embodying the results of the research shall demonstrate evidence of originality, at least in the exercise of an independent critical faculty, and shall achieve a high standard of competence in argument and presentation. The thesis shall comply with the requirements for the form, submission and deposit of theses.

(c) Degree of PhD

(i) The degree shall be awarded on the examination of a thesis embodying the results of a candidate’s research, and on an oral examination. The nature of the student’s research programme should be on a scale which should be completed during three years, or at most four years, of full-time study or equivalent. In addition the candidate may be required to undertake such other tests as the examiners may decide.

(ii) A successful candidate for the degree of PhD shall show convincing evidence of the capacity to pursue scholarly research or scholarship in his or her field of study on a scale which should be completed during three years of full-time research. The results of this research shall then be embodied in a thesis which makes an original contribution to knowledge and the completed thesis must contain material of a standard appropriate for scholarly publication. The thesis shall comply with the requirements for the form, submission and deposit of theses.

(d) PhD by Published Work

(i) To be awarded a PhD by Published Work a candidate must show that his or her work makes a significant contribution to knowledge in a particular field. The publications must also provide evidence of the capacity of the candidate to pursue further research, representing a coherent contribution to research in a given field and demonstrating a depth of scholarship and originality comparable with that required in a PhD thesis. The material submitted shall be sufficiently extensive as to provide convincing evidence that the research constitutes a substantial contribution to knowledge or scholarship.

21.3.4 All programmes leading to Lancaster University qualifications, wherever delivered should be aligned with the criteria set out above. Where there is good reason for variation from these criteria this must be approve by Senate or the relevant body or officer with delegated authority from Senate.
22. COURSE DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT

22.1 OVERVIEW

22.1.1 Course design and development is primarily undertaken by staff within academic departments (with external input) because it is recognised that this is where expert knowledge about academic provision in specific subject areas resides.

22.1.2 However, staff in academic departments are encouraged to discuss any issues of principle or concern, or any particularly innovative or complex proposals, with Faculty Associate Deans, Faculty TQSOs and/or members of the Academic Standards and Quality (ASQ) team as early as possible in the design and development process.

22.1.3 If necessary, for example where a proposed degree programme is outwith the award/programme criteria approved by Senate (see 21.3 above), approval in principle for a programme can be sought from the appropriate committee(s) early in the process, before the proposal is fully worked up for consideration by departmental or Faculty Teaching Committees. This will avoid staff spending time developing proposals that might not be granted approval. ASQ will consult the University Dean for Academic Quality and/or the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) as appropriate. Proposals may be modified or developed further following such discussions. Advice about seeking approval in principle is available from ASQ.

22.2 DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

22.2.1 Where a new degree award (or other academic qualification) is proposed, Senate approval for this must be obtained. ASQ can advise departments on whether Senate approval is needed and also on the process, sequence and timing.

22.2.2 Departments are required to engage with external advisors (such as External Examiners, PSRBs and employers) in the design and development of new and revised programmes and, where appropriate (if significant change is involved), individual modules. Where a proposed new or revised programme is intended for accreditation by a PSRB, early engagement must be made with the relevant body to meet its requirements.

22.2.3 Inputs are also required from a range of other individuals not directly involved with delivering the proposed programme in order to secure academic standards and the quality of learning opportunities. These include:

(a) academic staff from other departments in the Faculty, including via the Faculty Teaching Committee;
(b) student representatives;
(c) the Library and Information Systems Services;
(d) staff in Communications and Marketing, Recruitment, Admissions and International Development, ASQ, the Student Registry, the Finance Office, Facilities.

22.2.4 Departments are expected to consider proposals for new or revised programmes and modules against the criteria approved by Senate (see 21.3 above). They should also consider the following specific areas at the design and development stage taking account of a potentially diverse student body:
(a) the viability of the proposed new/revised programme or module;
(b) the programme aims, intended learning outcomes and their assessment;
(c) appropriate departmental, faculty, institutional and external reference points;
(d) requirements around level and naming of awards, credit allocation, use of reference points;
(e) whether the proposed structure, content and learning and teaching methods can deliver the educational aims and learning outcomes and are appropriate for the stage and level of the programme;
(f) whether the assessment scheme and individual tasks are capable of measuring student achievement against the learning outcomes;
(g) for a programme, whether there are any modules where failure should not be condoned because otherwise programme learning outcomes would not be met;
(h) how the achievement of learning outcomes can best be facilitated, through for example, learning and teaching methods, student workload, the volume and nature of assessment, progression through the different stages of programme;
(i) the coherency of programmes, including assessment and the extent to which any proposed new or revised module(s) is/are complementary to and consistent with other elements of the programme;
(j) the content and structure of individual contributory modules to ensure they are appropriate for the place they occupy in the programme structure (i.e. that they are appropriate for Part I, Part II first term of Masters etc.) and that students are being assessed according to appropriate criteria;
(k) employability and any PSRB requirements;
(l) whether entry standards set are at an appropriate level to ensure applicants have an appropriate academic background (e.g. subject knowledge, language competence, study skills) and will be able to cope with the demands of the degree programme to which they are being admitted;
(m) whether the learning outcomes and threshold standards set at the end of each stage of a programme define the minimum threshold of achievement to ensure that students will be able to continue onto the next level of study and to identify those students who may be at risk and who may need additional/different support at the next level;
(n) the need to have positively defined intended learning outcomes for exit qualifications, e.g. PGDip/PGCert in relation to taught Masters programmes.
Module approval follows a slightly shorter process than for programme approval. The Departmental process is the same, following which the proposal goes straight to Stage 2 of the faculty process and the module is formally approved at faculty level. However, if there are significant resource issues or design complexities, then the Faculty Teaching Committee may consult the Faculty Policy and Resources Committee (PRC), Academic Standards and Quality (ASQ) and/or the University Dean for Academic Quality before taking a decision on approval.

All proposals for new awards, new programmes and modules, and revisions to existing programmes or modules must be considered and formally approved through procedures, agreed by the Senate, that involve appropriately constituted committees or designated officers at departmental, faculty and institutional levels. At all stages of the approval process, committees should consider whether the key areas set out in 22.2.4 have been addressed in the design and development process.

If a proposal for a new or revised programme of study will lead to a proposed new academic qualification (i.e. degree, diploma, certificate or other credit-bearing award) not already approved by Senate (see 21.2 above), then Senate approval must be obtained for the new qualification as part of the programme approval process.
23.1.4 All proposed new and amended programmes (and contributory modules) leading to degrees, diplomas, certificates and other awards of the University have to be approved at departmental and faculty level. However, the following must, in addition, be finally approved at institutional level (by the University body or officer with delegated authority from Senate):

- proposals for new programmes;
- the laying down of existing programmes;
- Major changes (as defined in the University’s Guidance on revisions to programmes and modules) to existing programmes.

Proposals for Minor changes to existing programmes, and for new or revised modules, can be finally approved at Faculty Teaching Committee level (on the recommendation of relevant departmental teaching committees) save that where any proposed change to a module takes it outside the University’s standard assessment regulations, this requires institutional-level approval from the University body of officer with delegated authority from Senate in addition.

23.1.5 In order to ensure that proposals can be considered, discussed and approved in a timely and orderly manner an annual timetable of meetings (including deadlines for receipt of agenda papers) for faculty and institutional level committees involved in the course validation process will be agreed, published and observed.

23.1.6 All proposals must be submitted in the approved format using the appropriate template available from ASQ or from the relevant Faculty Teaching Quality Support Officer.

23.2 APPROVAL PROCESS

Departmental approval process

23.2.1 Departments are expected to have committee(s) (either teaching committees that include student representatives or separate staff-student committees) at which proposals for new and substantially revised programmes/modules are formally discussed. It is expected that students will be encouraged to engage fully in this process and that their views are taken into account. The outcome of departmental meetings will be formally recorded and communicated to the Faculty Teaching Committee when the proposal documentation goes forward for approval.

23.2.2 Where a new programme involves collaboration between more than one department, the proposal must be considered by all relevant departmental committees.

Faculty approval

23.2.3 The membership of Faculty Teaching Committees shall be in accordance with the relevant Faculty constitution but should include student representative(s).

23.2.4 At the initial approval stage for new programmes (i.e. Stage 1) Faculty Policy and Resources Committees or officers designated by the Faculty Dean must assess the viability of the proposed programme before the proposal moves on to the academic approval stage (i.e. Stage 2) of the process.
23.2.5 Once proposals have been approved by the originating department(s), they should be considered by the relevant Faculty Teaching Committee which will take account of comparable provision in other departments within the faculty, and of faculty strategic priorities and academic development plans as well as ensuring that the proposed programme and/or modules meet University requirements and criteria.

23.2.6 Where a new programme involves collaboration between departments from more than one faculty, the proposal must be considered by all relevant faculty teaching committees.

23.2.7 Faculties and departments have the authority to review and make minor revisions to individual modules within programmes, using agreed criteria and institutional procedures.

23.2.8 With the exception of the Regional Teaching Partners (RTPs) institutional approval of a new programme is for an indefinite period, but is reviewed through ATR and PQR. For the RTPs, programmes are validated for a specific number of years (usually 5-6 years), before they must be formally revalidated.

**Institutional approval**

23.2.9 Detailed consideration at institutional level of programme and module proposals already approved at departmental and faculty level is only necessary where there are issues of principle, major concerns about academic standards and quality, or if commendable innovative practice is identified for possible dissemination across the University.

23.2.10 A report shall be made to Senate of all/new awards, programmes and modules that have been approved.

**Approval of non-standard programmes**

23.2.11 Proposals for non-standard programmes that are tailored for individual students must be considered and approved in accordance with agreed procedures. Advice about the procedures is available from the relevant Faculty Teaching Quality Support Officer and/or ASQ.

**23.3 INFORMATION SPECIFIC TO THE APPROVAL PROCESS FOR REVISIONS TO EXISTING PROGRAMMES AND MODULES**

**Definitions**

23.3.1 A revision is defined as a change or changes made to a particular programme or programmes or to a particular module or modules. For procedural purposes, revisions to programmes and modules are categorised as ‘minor’ or ‘major’. Revisions may be made for a variety of reasons, including:

(a) in response to student or external examiner feedback;
(b) in response to developments in the subject area;
(c) in response to a non-negotiable requirement of a PSRB;
(d) in response to practical issues, such as staff changes or changes to student numbers.
A major revision involves material changes that affect a programme. A major revision may be either a direct change to a programme and/or significant changes to a module or modules which significantly alter a programme and its delivery, for example, substantive revisions to educational aims, intended learning outcomes, teaching, learning and assessment strategies, academic level, changes to programme structure. The University’s Guidance on revisions to programmes and modules contains examples of major revisions.

A minor revision to a programme or module involves a change to the subject matter, method of delivery, or learning, teaching and assessment strategy that: (i) does not affect the programme learning outcomes; (ii) has no significant resources implications; and (iii) is limited to change involving no more than 25% of the programme credits. Some apparently minor revisions may raise broader questions which require further information, fuller discussion or consideration as a major revision. A series of incremental minor revisions should also be considered as a major revision so that consideration is given as to whether or not the volume and nature of these changes significantly alters the programme and its delivery. The University’s Guidance on revisions to programmes and modules contains examples of minor revisions.

Process

There are three different groups potentially affected by planned revisions to programmes and modules.

(a) All year groups of students who have already begun the course and are currently registered – current cohorts.

(b) Prospective students within the current admissions cycle between the time the offer of a place is made and registration is completed – current applicants.

(c) Prospective students who may be interested in applying to Lancaster and who may look at public information, in particular publicity material – potential applicants.

In making revisions, the University has a responsibility to take into consideration the impact on the first two of the three groups as defined above, and a responsibility to ensure the accuracy of information provided to the third group. The level of consultation and action required is different for each group.

Current cohorts

The University has a responsibility to ensure current cohorts of students are not adversely affected by changes to its programmes and modules. Revisions affecting current cohorts of students require careful consideration and consultation because: (i) it could be seen to compromise the student experience and serve as grounds for a student to complain, appeal or take legal action against the University; and, (ii) by nature of the definition of current cohorts, these revisions could impact more than one individual cohort (year group) of students. For example, a change to a core level 6 module will affect current level 4 and level 5 cohorts; a change to a level 5 optional module made after module enrolment will affect students within the current level 4 cohort who have selected this module.
It may be necessary to amend assessment regulations, modules or programmes over the course of a student’s registration in order to meet the requirements of a PSRB for professional accreditation or registration. Such changes will be notified in advance to current cohorts of students.

**Major revisions** should not normally apply to current cohorts of students. In exceptional circumstances, they may be made where the revisions are considered to be beneficial to students or are due to circumstances outside the University’s control that it could not plan for. They should be dealt with as outlined below. Major revisions require consultation with all current cohorts (year groups) potentially affected by the revision, and should be agreed by a departmental meeting or other suitable discussion forum involving student representatives. If 10% or more of all the students submit in writing, within agreed timescales, reasonable objections then the revision can only apply to the next intake of students. The date of planned implementation and therefore the current cohorts (year groups) affected should be made clear in the proposal documentation.

**Minor revisions** affecting current cohorts of students may only be made where they are: (i) non-material; or (ii) beneficial to students; or (iii) necessary due to circumstances outside the University’s control that it could not plan for. They should be dealt with as outlined below. Minor revisions should be considered and agreed by a departmental meeting or other suitable discussion forum involving student representatives. Regardless of their nature all such changes should be reported to faculty committees. The date of planned implementation and therefore the current cohorts (year groups) affected should be made clear in the proposal documentation.

**Current applicants**

When making major revisions once the admissions cycle has begun, applicants must also be carefully considered. Individuals apply to the University on the basis of the information available to them at the time of application e.g. in prospectus and website entries, on the UCAS website, and during visits to the University. Current applicants must be informed, at the earliest opportunity, of certain specified major revisions to a programme and/or its modules made after the point of application (including changes made in order to meet the requirements of a PSRB for professional accreditation or registration which are the equivalent of a major revision). For information on the types of revisions which applicants must be informed of, see the separate guidance on definitions and processes for programme and module revisions, available here. Where applicable, applicants should be advised of the options available in the circumstances (including the chance for individuals to change their minds about a place on the programme). Once the admissions cycle is underway admissions should be consulted about planned revisions to programmes as part of the approval process (e.g. re-naming a programme mid-recruitment cycle is problematic).

**Potential applicants**

When preparing any public information, the University’s responsibility towards potential applicants should be borne in mind, in particular for publicity material such as the prospectus and website entries. Attention should be paid to the accuracy of this information, particularly where related to: (i) module choice (for example, it is advised to focus on the range and likely areas of option modules, rather than on specific
offerings, especially those dependent on a single member of staff); and (ii) methods of assessment (e.g. the balance between open and closed assessments). Appropriate disclaimers can be used in publicity material however, the use of disclaimers does not, in itself, provide protection against complaints, appeals or legal action.

23.3.12 Following any revisions to programmes or modules and in particular following major revisions, public information, including all publicity material, should be reviewed by departments, in liaison where necessary with Marketing and Communications.

Approval procedures for major and minor revisions

23.3.14 All major revisions to programmes must be considered and approved by departmental and faculty committees. In addition, some major revisions must be approved at institutional level by the officer or body with delegated authority from the Senate. The University’s Guidance on revisions to programmes and modules indicates those revisions which must be approved at institutional level.

23.3.15 All minor revisions to programmes and modules must be approved by departmental committees. Some minor revisions should be reported to faculty committees. The University’s Guidance on revisions to programmes and modules indicates those revisions which must be reported to faculty committees.

23.3.16 The process for the annual monitoring of teaching (Annual Teaching Review) provides an opportunity for departments to systematically review the overall coherence of past and planned revisions to modules and programmes.

23.4 OUTCOME OF THE APPROVAL PROCESS

23.4.1 After each stage of the approval process it is expected that committee decisions will be recorded in the relevant committee minutes and communicated to staff and students. It will be the responsibility of the appropriate committee secretary for ensuring that this happens. Committee minutes should, wherever possible, be posted on appropriate web pages.

23.4.2 Once the approval process for new or revised programmes or modules has been completed, details must be recorded in the LUSI course database and become part of the University’s definitive programme record. This record is then used for a variety of academic and student administration purposes. The Faculty TQSOs have formal responsibility for keeping the programme record up to date in LUSI as new and revised programmes and modules are approved. ASQ is responsible for monitoring the accuracy of the record in LUSI. The programme information in LUSI can then be accessed via a variety of reports and views, one of which is the up-to-date Programme Specification which must incorporate all approved revisions.

23.4.3 The LUSI course database is the University’s definitive programme record and includes key information about every approved qualification, programme and module (and details of any subsequent changes). It must be kept up to date given that all students registered with Lancaster are assigned to a programme of study in LUSI, and all programmes recorded in LUSI are assigned to a “home” academic department, and this record underpins programme delivery and many associated administrative processes.
23.5 PROGRAMME CLOSURE

23.5.1 From time to time, departments may propose the closure of programmes for a variety of different reasons. Programme closure requires formal faculty and institutional approval (from the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate to approve the laying down of programmes). Where programme closure is agreed, appropriate arrangements must be put in place to protect the needs of any students who remain registered on the programme as it is taught out, to ensure that they can complete their programme with minimum possible disruption or adverse impact. Consideration must also be given to any applicants to whom an offer of admission has been made before closure was proposed.

23.5.2 For collaborative programmes at the ITPs and RTPs, the Memoranda of Agreements include sections on closure and arrangements for the teaching out of programmes.

24. TEACHING STANDARDS AND QUALITY

24.1 All learning and teaching activities and all assignments must be approved, overseen and supported by a member of the University’s current academic staff. Where other people are teaching (beyond the occasional guest contribution) or marking, their use must be approved in advance by the department and reported to the faculty teaching committee, taking account of their experience, expertise and (where relevant) English language ability.

24.2 All staff new to teaching must undertake appropriate training and development provided by the University’s Organisation and Educational Development section, or equivalent, if they have not already engaged in equivalent development activity, except that other forms of support may be more appropriate for specific types of contributor, e.g. professional practitioners such as clinicians.

24.3 Academic contact time for Part I students will be at least nine hours per week on average over the teaching period.

24.4 Seminar groups for which the main focus is whole group discussion will not normally contain more than fifteen students per tutor.

25. COURSE EVALUATION AND REVIEW

25.1 OVERVIEW

25.1.1 The University is committed to an ethos of continuous improvement in all of its activities, including the delivery of academic programmes. Therefore it has adopted a policy of regular and systematic in-depth monitoring and review of its academic provision in order to assure itself of standards and to seek ways of enhancing the quality of the learning opportunities for its students.

25.1.2 The principal mechanisms are departmental Annual Teaching Review (ATR) and Periodic Quality Review (PQR). While ATR is an internal process, PQR panels involve external experts as well as internal reviewers and a student, to ensure that the provision meets UK quality standards and to facilitate the spread of good practice.
25.1.3 The ATR and/or PQR processes may lead to proposals for new programme or changes to existing programmes, and where necessary closure of programmes.

25.1.4 Both the ATR and PQR processes encompass collaborative arrangements.

25.2 ANNUAL TEACHING REVIEW (ATR)

Process

25.2.1 Departments must carry out an ATR process for all undergraduate and postgraduate programmes following procedures approved by the Senate.

25.2.2 Each department is required to carry out ATRs separately for their undergraduate and postgraduate provision as applicable. The UG ATRs take place between the end of June and the end of September and the PG reviews between the end of September and the end of January. Corresponding academic units in the University’s collaborative teaching partners are also required to carry out ATRs.

25.2.3 The purpose is to ensure that programmes remain current, learning outcomes are being achieved by the students, and appropriate actions are taken as a result of the review.

25.2.4 ATR is a departmental process but it is steered and coordinated by the University via the Faculty Teaching Quality Officers, with input and oversight from the University Dean for Academic Quality and Academic Standards and Quality (ASQ).

25.2.5 There is provision for student input into the preparation of ATRs through the consideration of student feedback, and students are represented at committees which consider and discuss ATRs.

25.2.6 The evidence base for ATR includes:

- quantitative data on student demographics, student achievement and graduate destinations;
- detailed module feedback analyses, and summaries of analyses of module evaluation forms;
- student survey data (NSS, PTES, PRES and any other student survey data);
- DLHE employment statistics;
- External Examiners’ reports;
- PSRB and other external accreditation reports.

25.2.7 Data sets are provided by the Planning Support Unit. The evidence base also includes departmental action plans in response to points raised by External Examiners, student feedback provided through staff/student or departmental committees, departmental data on the promptness of return of assessed coursework and issues raised during the previous year’s ATR process.
Departments use this evidence to reflect upon their teaching provision under the following headings:

(a) programme portfolio attractiveness and appropriateness;
(b) programme quality and standards;
(c) assessment outcomes;
(d) progression, retention and student achievement (including issues relating to equality and diversity);
(e) employability and employment;
(f) student support and guidance;
(g) feedback from students;
(h) external comment/input (external examiners, employers, PSRBs).

Departments are also asked to:

(a) identify effective practice and successful innovations for wider dissemination;
(b) identify any changes that need to be made to degree programmes or modules;
(c) ensure that programme records and module outlines are updated for any programmes and modules revised during the year under review;
(d) comment on the previous year’s action plan and progress achieved, before presenting an action plan for the next academic year which links directly to earlier sections of the document.

In addition departments may be asked to comment on special issues relating to the year under review, for example in response to a change in University policy or procedures.

For each programme where most of the modules involved are delivered by another department (for example, in combined majors and consortial programmes), the lead department takes an overview of the learning experience of students on its programmes, in order to make a holistic assessment. In addition, each department reports on modules it delivers but which contribute to programmes managed elsewhere (for instance collaborative teaching provision).

Review outcomes

At the end of the ATR process, departments are required to produce a report which includes commentary on the evidence base. The template for departmental ATR reports can be found here.

Departmental ATR reports are presented to departmental committees for discussion and approval before being referred to the appropriate Faculty Teaching Committee for discussion. Amongst other things, the Faculty checks progress on the previous year’s action plan and notes areas of good practice. Subsequently the Faculty Associate Dean and the Teaching Quality Support Officer (TQSO) write a summary of all their departmental ATR reports for discussion at the Academic Standards and Quality Committee. Discussion of these reports at institutional level ensures that issues (particularly those with strategic and institution-wide implications) are addressed and areas of good practice are identified. The template for faculty ATR summary reports can be found here.
25.2.14 Associate Deans (who are members of ASQC) report back to Faculties on follow-up at institutional level and this is cascaded back to departmental staff and students as appropriate.

25.2.15 The ATR procedure and the report templates are reviewed regularly.

25.3 **PERIODIC QUALITY REVIEW (PQR)**

**Process**

25.3.1 The University undertakes periodic reviews of departmental provision in accordance with procedures approved by Senate. Departments undergo PQR every four to five years and the process is steered and coordinated by ASQ and informed by centrally provided data, with interpretation, from the Planning Support Unit. Guidance is given to departments in preparation for their review, detailing the precise requirements and arrangements. As detailed in the University’s PQR guidance document, the purpose of the PQR process is to:

(a) review all programmes and modules offered by the department including provision for postgraduate research students and, where there is a positive outcome, recommend programmes and modules to the Faculties for re-approval;

(b) review the department’s management of quality assurance and standards (including the quality of information about its provision) and its approach to the enhancement of the student learning experience.

25.3.2 The PQR covers all taught programmes (undergraduate and postgraduate) and support for research students. A comparable and equivalent process is carried out at the University’s Regional Teaching Partners (RTPs) and in the major International Teaching Partners (ITPs) as determined by the maturity of the partnership and the stage of development.

25.3.3 The evidence base for PQR includes: previous years’ ATR reports and follow-up reports; outcomes of any PSRB reviews; data on student demographics, student achievement and student destinations; student survey data (NSS, PTE5, PRES and any other student survey data); module evaluation analyses and DLHE employment statistics.

**Panel composition and appointment**

25.3.4 PQR is conducted by a panel which undertakes a desk-based exercise and then makes in a one-day visit to the department under review. Panels are chaired by a senior academic member of the University, and comprise two external assessors (one of whom is usually a former External Examiner for the department under review), two University academics (one from a department in a cognate subject area and one from a non-cognate area) and one student representative from a department other than the one being reviewed. A member of ASQ acts as review secretary.

25.3.5 One of the external assessors is selected from a shortlist nominated by the department and the other is drawn from the list of recent former External Examiners (someone who has acted within the last five years). ASQ will check to ensure there are no conflicts of interests. As well as being subject experts, external assessors are expected to have
knowledge and experience of quality assurance and enhancement issues (for example, involvement in QAA subject reviews or internal institutional reviews, or experience as an external examiner or a member of a professional body). The main role of the external assessors is to provide confirmation that academic standards and the quality of the educational experience offered by the department under review are appropriate and comparable with other UK HE institutions and to provide a national perspective and context for the subject area under review.

25.3.6 Internal reviewers must have a good understanding of teaching and learning and quality assurance processes. Their primary remit is to ensure that standards and quality accords with University expectations and are comparable to corresponding provision elsewhere in the University.

25.3.7 The student representative is nominated by LUSU from amongst those who have undergone LUSU training and have experience of student representation.

25.3.8 The panel members are approved by the University Dean for Academic Quality and, formally appointed by the University through ASQ. Once appointed, they are given guidance, contained in the PQR guidance document, to ensure that they are fully prepared to conduct the review.

Panel role and responsibilities

25.3.9 The Review Panel is asked to:

(a) review the continuing validity and relevance of programmes in terms of content and structure, educational aims and associated student learning and achievement;

(b) assess the quality of the student learning experience by evaluating the effectiveness of teaching, the quality of learning opportunities and of academic support and guidance;

(c) review the effectiveness of departmental quality assurance processes.

25.3.10 The lines of inquiry cover the following themes:

(a) the curriculum;

(b) learning and teaching;

(c) assessment;

(d) quality assurance and enhancement;

(e) the student learning experience;

(f) public information.

Review outcomes

25.3.11 The desk-based exercise leads to the production of a briefing paper structured around these themes which is sent to the department two weeks before the event. The review event includes meetings with students of the department (undergraduates and postgraduates, taught and research), and with academic and other departmental staff.
25.3.12 There are four substantive judgements available to the Review Panel:

(a) Full Confidence
(b) Qualified Confidence
(c) Limited Confidence
(d) No Confidence

25.3.13 A Full Confidence judgement will be made where the Review Panel is confident in all aspects of departmental provision, and will be reported to Senate at the earliest opportunity.

25.3.14 A Qualified Confidence judgement will be made where there are issues that are of sufficient concern as to require immediate action but are not so serious as to threaten academic standards; in this situation the Review Panel will require a number of actions to be completed within a short time-scale. The Review Secretary will draw an action plan in consultation with the Review Panel and the department, which will include a timetable for completion. The plan will be monitored by the appropriate faculty teaching committees. During this period a provisional judgement of Qualified Confidence will apply, but will not be reported to the Senate. At the appropriate time, the Chair of the Review Panel will be asked to confirm (consulting other members of the panel as appropriate) that the required actions have been completed and the overall judgement confirmed (and reported) as Full Confidence. If the required actions have not been completed by that stage, the overall judgement will be confirmed as Limited Confidence and reported to Senate and the PQR report published.

25.3.15 A Limited Confidence judgement will be made where there are a number of issues and concerns that are thought to be serious enough to threaten academic standards, the resolution of which will be required of the department in accordance with a timescale set by the Review Panel. The Review Panel will decide whether a further physical review meeting is required. This judgement will be reported to Senate and the PQR report, including this judgement, will be published.

25.3.16 A No Confidence judgement will only be made if there are so many issues and concerns that are required to be addressed that the Review Panel considers that academic standards and/or the quality of academic provision are already at risk. This judgement will be reported to Senate and the PQR report, including this judgement, will be published.

25.3.17 Each overall judgement will be accompanied, as appropriate, by a combination of specific judgements: commendations, recommendations and requirements according to the findings of the Review Panel.

(a) Commendations relate to features, approaches or processes that are offered for dissemination to the rest of the University as examples of good practice.

(b) Recommendations are advisory actions that the department is expected to take during its ongoing process of reflection on learning, teaching and assessment.
Requirements are compulsory actions relating to issues that are considered by the Review Panel to undermine the department’s ability to assure the academic standards and quality of its provision and which must be put right within an agreed time-scale.

25.3.18 Requirements (i.e. compulsory action) are associated with the judgements of Limited Confidence or No Confidence and will be addressed through development of an action plan by ASQ in consultation with the department and the faculty within three months of publication of the review report. The action plan will be monitored by the appropriate Faculty Teaching Committee. A one day review within one year of publication of the report and involving members of the original Review Panel will be convened to consider whether the overall judgement can be changed to Full Confidence.

25.3.19 If at any point during the review visit the Review Panel considers that there are issues and concerns serious enough to lead to Requirements and a judgement less than Full Confidence, then the chair must ensure that the Head of Department is alerted to these concerns and the department given an opportunity to discuss the specific issues and concerns with the Review Panel, if necessary through an additional meeting with staff.

25.3.20 The Review Panel will convey the overall judgement to the department at the end of the Review meeting. If the department believes that the review was not conducted in accordance with the published procedures or that there were any serious irregularities then they must notify the Head of ASQ (or nominated alternate if the Head of ASQ was a member of the panel) within 48 hours of the end of the review. The Head of ASQ (or nominated alternate) will then investigate in consultation with the chair of the panel, (and with the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) if appropriate), and decide whether action is required.

25.3.21 On being awarded a judgement of Full Confidence, all existing degree programmes offered by the department under review are deemed to be revalidated. Where a judgement of Full Confidence cannot be awarded then a plan of action and timetable for further review shall be agreed with the department and faculty concerned.

25.3.22 At the end of the PQR process, once a Full Confidence judgement has been reached, a report detailing the findings of the Panel is drafted by the review secretary for approval by the Panel. The department is given an opportunity to correct factual errors in the draft report before the final report is published. The department is then required to respond formally to the Panel report, normally within one month of publication of the report, and provide this response to ASQ. The departmental response should describe how it plans to meet any recommendations, including an action plan and timescale.

25.3.23 The PQR report and formal departmental response must then be submitted by the ASQC Unit to the next available Faculty Teaching Committees (UG and/or PG) for discussion. It is expected that the Faculty Teaching Committee(s) will consider any implications, both for the individual department or for the faculty as a whole, and also consider how any good practice identified should be disseminated across the faculty. Following discussion at the Faculty Teaching Committee(s), the ASQC will discuss individual departmental PQR reports together with the departmental response and the relevant Faculty Teaching Committee comments. In addition, items with institutional implications should be discussed and any commendations considered for wider dissemination across the institution.
25.3.24 Departmental follow-up actions will be monitored by Faculty Associate Deans and TQSOs and reported to Faculty Teaching Committees and included in subsequent ATR reports.

25.3.25 An annual summary of PQR findings for the previous year is discussed at ASQC and reported to Senate. The summary report should highlight any standards and quality issues, and any good practice, identified in PQRs, and any procedural or process issues identified during the year.

25.3.26 The PQR procedure is reviewed in two ways.

(a) Continuous evaluation takes place at the end of each academic year when participants are asked for comments on the process and a summary is reported to ASQC.

(b) The methodology and timing should be reviewed in the penultimate year of each cycle unless there is need for earlier review in response to internal or external considerations.

26. EXTERNAL EXAMINERS (TAUGHT PROGRAMMES)

26.1 OVERVIEW

Key principles

26.1.1 The University is responsible for the standards of its awards, irrespective of whether all or part of the programme is delivered by a collaborative partner (or partners).

26.1.2 Lancaster University views the work of its external examiners as central to its quality assurance and enhancement processes, both in the maintenance of the academic standards and quality of its programmes and in the enhancement of provision. In its use of external examiners the University adheres to section B7 of the Quality Assurance Agency’s UK Quality Code for Higher Education, which has the following Expectation of institutions:

*Higher education providers make scrupulous use of external examiners.*

Standards and enhancement

26.1.3 External examiners are appointed to provide the University and its partner institutions with impartial and independent advice incorporating informative comment on the institution’s standards and on student achievement in relation to those standards. External examiners help to ensure that the standard of awards (with reference to the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications, applicable subject benchmark statements, and relevant professional, statutory and regulatory body requirements) is maintained at the appropriate level; and that the standards of student performance are properly judged against these reference points and are comparable with standards in other UK Higher Education Institutions of which the external examiners have experience.
External examiners also provide comment and recommendations on good practice and innovation in relation to learning, teaching and assessment in order to highlight potential to enhance the quality of the learning opportunities provided to students. Consultation with external examiners on draft coursework assignments and examination questions allows the external examiner to inform practice as it occurs.

External examiner role

External examiners are asked to consider and comment upon:

(a) the content, balance and structure of programmes;
(b) the scope and appropriateness of learning opportunities available to students;
(c) the quality and fairness of assessment strategies and procedures;
(d) the organisation and arrangements for student assessment;
(e) academic achievements by individual students;
(f) academic standards within a cohort of students;
(g) the comparability of standards of programmes within the national context.

External examiner appointments

All programmes have external examiners who are appointed and remunerated by the University as the degree awarding body, irrespective of the delivering institution. External examiner appointments follow a standard University procedure using defined criteria. Approval of appointments is given at institutional level by the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate (see section below on Selection, appointment and employment of external examiners).

External examiner reports

External examiner reports form an essential component of the University’s annual monitoring process and procedures (Annual Teaching Review) and its periodic review of programmes (Periodic Quality Review). This enables the University to systematically take into account external comment and judgement on its provision. External examiners’ comments on assessment policies and processes and the regulatory framework also inform the University’s continuous review of these areas. External examiners are asked to submit their reports by specified deadlines in order to ensure that any changes arising from the reports can be considered and implemented within the following academic year.

Student engagement

External examiner reports relate to quality management within the institution. Reports, and departmental responses to the reports, are made available to students through the department’s published information to students. This forms part of the University’s arrangements for students to participate, alongside staff, in evidence-based discussions on quality assurance and enhancement.
26.2 SELECTION, APPOINTMENT AND EMPLOYMENT OF EXTERNAL EXAMINERS

Person specification

26.2.1 The following criteria will apply for the appointment of external examiners for undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes validated by Lancaster University and leading to Lancaster University awards.

26.2.2 External examiners will hold an academic or professional post of an appropriate level of seniority and/or have extensive practitioner experience where appropriate and be able to show appropriate evidence of the following:

(a) knowledge and understanding of UK sector agreed reference points for the maintenance of academic standards and assurance and enhancement of quality;
(b) competence and experience in the fields covered by the programme of study, or parts thereof;
(c) relevant academic and/or professional qualifications to at least the level of the qualification being externally examined, and/or extensive practitioner experience where appropriate;
(d) competence and experience relating to designing and operating a variety of assessment tasks appropriate to the subject and operating assessment procedures;
(e) sufficient standing, credibility and breadth of experience within the discipline to be able to command the respect of academic peers and, where appropriate, professional peers;
(f) familiarity with the standard to be expected of students to achieve the award that is to be assessed;
(g) fluency in English, and where programmes are delivered and assessed in languages other than English, fluency in the relevant language(s) (unless other secure arrangements are in place to ensure that external examiners are provided with the information to make their judgements);
(h) meeting applicable criteria set by professional, statutory or regulatory bodies;
(i) awareness of current developments in the design and delivery of relevant curricula;
(j) competence and experience relating to the enhancement of the student learning experience.

26.2.3 External examiners must inform the University if their circumstances change (e.g. academic position or institution).

Restrictions on appointment

26.2.4 The University will not appoint as external examiners anyone in the following categories or circumstances:

(a) a member of a governing body or committee of the University or one of its collaborative partners, or a current employee of the University or one of its collaborative partners;
(b) anyone with a close professional, contractual or personal relationship with a member of staff or student involved with the programme of study;
(c) anyone required to assess colleagues who are recruited as students to the programme of study;
(d) anyone who is, or knows they will be, in a position to influence significantly the future of students on the programme of study;
(e) anyone significantly involved in recent or current substantive collaborative research activities with a member of staff closely involved in the delivery, management or assessment of the programme(s) or modules in question;
(f) former staff or students of the University or one of its collaborative partners unless a period of five years has elapsed and all students taught by or with the external examiner have completed their programme(s);
(g) a reciprocal arrangement involving cognate programmes at another institution;
(h) the succession of an external examiner by a colleague from the examiner’s home department and institution;
(i) the appointment of more than one external examiner from the same department of the same institution.

26.2.5 External examiners normally hold no more than two external examiner appointments for taught programmes/modules at any point in time.

26.2.6 The appointment of retired academics is permissible within a maximum of three years after the date of retirement. Sufficient evidence should be provided of continuing involvement in the academic area in question.

Terms of office

26.2.7 The duration of an external examiner’s appointment will normally be for four years, with an exceptional extension of one year to ensure continuity.

26.2.8 An external examiner may be reappointed in exceptional circumstances but only after a period of five years or more has elapsed since their last appointment.*

* Note: This also applies where previously separate departments have been combined.

Approval process and additional considerations

26.2.9 The University will appoint external examiners who meet the above criteria on the nomination of heads of departments (or of the equivalent academic unit in partner institutions), on the recommendation of the relevant faculty teaching committee(s) and subject to the approval, on behalf of the Committee of Senate, by the body or office with delegated authority from Senate. When an external examiner is nominated who lacks sufficient prior external examining experience, wherever possible there should be at least one experienced external examiner also appointed for the same programme. A more experienced external examiner will be nominated to act as a mentor to offer support and guidance during the first year of appointment. The mentor will normally be an existing or recent external examiner for the University and should have been in an external examiner post for at least one full academic year. Where possible a mentor will be from the same or a cognate discipline and should have current or recent experience of working in Higher Education. The mentor should also be examining at the same level as the proposed external examiner. The University has approved guidance for mentoring arrangement.
26.2.10 There shall be at least one external examiner for each degree programme but the number of external examiners appointed for each programme should be appropriate for the workload in order that the work each is asked to undertake is manageable, within the required timescales, for the various examining activities.

Additional requirements for the selection and appointment of external examiners for International Teaching Partnerships (ITPs)

26.2.11 Wherever possible and practicable, external examiners for Lancaster University programmes offered at different sites with different partners should be involved with more than one site; either:

(a) an external examiner appointed to examine the corresponding programme at Lancaster shall be appointed as the external examiner for programmes delivered at the ITP; or:

(b) an external examiner previously appointed to examine programmes delivered at Lancaster, may, at the end of the contract, be reappointed to act as external examiner at one or more partner institutions for a minimum of two years/maximum three years.

26.2.12 If neither (a) nor (b) above is possible and, as a result, any ITP programmes have a dedicated external examiner appointed only for these programmes, then one of the external examiners for the corresponding programmes at Lancaster shall be appointed to take an overview and review outcomes from across the programmes delivered at the ITPs to ensure consistency of practice and comparability of standards. For each cohort the external examiner will review assessment outputs (average marks, the distribution of marks and other summary statistics) and, if considered necessary, scrutinise sample student work.

26.2.13 Instructions and guidance for external examiners shall be given by Lancaster University and the appropriate Lancaster department and not by the partner institution.

Approval procedures for appointments

26.2.14 Proposals for the appointment of external examiners shall be submitted by the department to the faculty teaching committee for consideration. The faculty Teaching Quality Support Officer is responsible for ensuring that proposals are submitted on the approved form (Proposal form for appointing an external examiner to undergraduate and postgraduate taught courses) and that they are accompanied by a curriculum vitae. Recommendations from the faculty teaching committee must be forwarded promptly to the Academic Standards and Quality (ASQ) unit for approval by the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate.

26.2.15 For Regional Teaching Partner (RTP) appointments, the college’s internal procedures for consideration of external examiner proposals will be followed prior to submission to the University. Proposals shall be endorsed by the relevant college senior manager and submitted to ASQ via the college’s central quality unit.
For ITP appointments, designated Lancaster University staff (Directors of International Partnerships) are responsible for ensuring that there is a sufficient number of appropriately qualified external examiners appointed for each degree programme. They should also ensure that appointments are made at least six months in advance of the commencement of the term of appointment. Lancaster staff will, in discussion with relevant colleagues in partner institutions, identify eligible individuals and submit the names, together with required supporting information, to the relevant faculty teaching committee(s). External examiners must be given explicit guidance as to what material will be made available to enable them to fulfil their role. Faculty Directors of International Partnerships will decide how this guidance will be communicated to external examiners and by whom.

ASQ will liaise with the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate over the proposal and, following approval, will provide an appointment letter to the external examiner. The appointment letter will include information on:

(a) departmental contacts;
(b) the period of appointment;
(c) the programme(s)/modules which are the responsibility of the external examiner;
(d) assessment regulations;
(e) reporting and fees;
(f) links to relevant University web pages.

Following the appointment of an external examiner, departments are responsible for liaising with the appointee and providing him or her with the information necessary to carry out their duties. This information is detailed below (see section on Information and evidence base for external examiners).

External examiners must be appointed in advance of the commencement of the term of office.

External examiners are responsible to Lancaster University through the Committee of Senate. The University will be responsible for contracts and payment.

A summary report of all external examiner appointments will be made available to Senate and/or its appropriate sub-committee(s).

Student information on external examiner appointments

Students shall be made aware of the identity and current position of the external examiners appointed to their modules/programmes and awards. Departments are required to publish these details as part of their departmental information for students, together with a contextual statement on the role which external examiners play in the maintenance of the academic standards and quality of Lancaster University programmes and in the enhancement of provision. It is made clear to students that it is inappropriate for students to make direct contact with external examiners, in particular regarding their individual performance in assessment, and that if they do so the external examiners will have been told by the University not to enter into communication with them and to refer the matter to the University.
Early termination of appointment

26.2.23 The importance of the role of the external examiner in contributing to the management of standards and quality means that any failure to fulfil the role is viewed seriously. The University reserves the right to terminate an appointment if an external examiner fails to fulfil their obligation at the end of any single year of appointment.

26.2.24 Early termination may occur in the following instances:

(a) serious illness;
(b) resignation of the external examiner concerned (it is expected that, other than in cases of serious illness, the external examiner will fulfil all remaining commitments relating to the current academic assessment cycle, in order to allow adequate time to find a suitable replacement);
(c) changes in programme structure which render the appointment no longer applicable;
(d) non-fulfilment of external examiner duties (in particular, the failure to attend examination boards where attendance is required without making alternative arrangements, the failure to submit reports, or the provision of incomplete reports);
(e) unprofessional conduct;
(f) irretrievable breakdown of the relationship with the departmental teaching team such as to disadvantage students on the course.

26.2.25 Where a conflict of interest arises during a term of office and cannot be resolved, normal practice would be for the external examiner to resign.

26.2.26 Except in cases of serious illness or resignation, the following procedures for the early termination of an appointment shall be followed:

(a) the head of department shall make a recommendation to the faculty teaching committee. In the case of RTP appointments the recommendation shall be endorsed by the relevant college senior manager and made, via the College’s quality unit, to the Collaborative Provision Teaching Committee (CPTC);
(b) following review by the faculty teaching committee (or CPTC) the recommendation shall be forwarded to the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate for approval;
(c) the Head of Academic Standards and Quality will notify the external examiner of the termination, specifying the reasons;
(d) any resignation or termination of appointment will be included in the summary reports of appointments made to Senate by ASQ.

26.2.27 Where necessary the University reserves the right to terminate the appointment immediately, but where appropriate, for example where changes in programme structure apply, it will give the external examiner reasonable notice.

26.2.28 A resignation by an external examiner before completion of their period of office shall be reported by the head of department or senior college manager to the relevant faculty teaching committee or CPTC, as appropriate, and to ASQ in order to include in the summary report to Senate and/or its appropriate sub-committee(s).
26.3 EXTERNAL EXAMINER DUTIES

Duties

26.3.1 Departments will explicitly define the programmes and modules for which a specific external examiner is responsible. External examiners will be informed of these programmes and modules on appointment, and also whenever a department wishes to change these details, for example when a new module is introduced or an existing one discontinued.

26.3.2 Every programme will have at least one external examiner. The precise number is at the department’s discretion, but should depend upon both the breadth of subject material and the overall volume of work required.

26.3.3 Each module at Level 5 or above should normally be the responsibility of one and only one external examiner, though other examiners may take a legitimate interest in its progress, for example where a module is shared between programmes. However, in some cases it will be appropriate for more than one external examiner to scrutinise work from the same module, for example if the module involves dissertations across a wide range of topics. In such cases the department should make it clear to all examiners concerned which pieces of work are the responsibility of which examiner.

26.3.4 External examiners for the Regional Teaching Partners will be required to scrutinise Level 4 modules for the Foundation Degree as Level 4 will contribute to the classification of the Foundation Degree award.

26.3.5 The department will provide the external examiner with the necessary material (see section below on Departmental Induction and Information) and identify what specific activities they will be asked to undertake, which should always include the following:

(a) commenting on draft examination papers and other assessment tasks that count towards the award;
(b) reviewing an agreed sample of work;
(c) attending the examination board(s) for the programme(s);
(d) providing an annual report on the modules/programme(s);
(e) when necessary, commenting on any proposed new programmes in the subject area and any proposed changes to existing modules/programmes.

26.3.6 The University’s External examiner report form provides details of the specific questions which external examiners are asked to address in their report.

Membership of examination boards

26.3.7 The University’s arrangements for its examination boards, and the external examiner’s role as a member of these boards are detailed in the Undergraduate Assessment Regulations and the Postgraduate Taught Assessment Regulations.

26.3.8 External examiners will be expected to attend meetings of boards of examiners for the degree programmes for which they are acting. If, in exceptional circumstances, an external examiner is unable to attend the scheduled examination board then this should be reported to Student Registry for approval. In such circumstances external examiners
will still be expected to participate in all other duties prior to the examination board and to the decision making process by making themselves available for consultation in the period immediately before and during the scheduled meeting of the board of examiners.

26.3.9 External examiners for International Teaching Partnerships are expected to participate in scheduled meetings of examination boards for the degree programmes for which they are acting, either by physical attendance or via video conference. If, in exceptional circumstances, an external examiner is unable to participate in the scheduled examination board, then this must be notified in advance to the meeting and alternative arrangements made for the external examiner to participate in the process.

26.3.10 For combined degree programmes, the examination board will include at least one external examiner from the administering department for the combined programme. The external examiner(s) from the contributing department(s) will not be required to attend the examination board but should be available for consultation by telephone; however, if they wish to attend they may do so. The attending external examiner will take overall responsibility for commenting on the overall standards and coherence of the degree programme.

26.3.11 External examiners are expected to comment informally at the end of the meeting on matters listed on the external examiners’ report form once the detailed discussion of cases has been completed.

26.3.12 Prior to the confirmation of pass lists external examiners are required to endorse the outcomes of the assessment processes they have been appointed to scrutinise.

Mitigating Circumstances Committee

26.3.13 External examiners are entitled to attend the departmental Mitigating Circumstances Committee.

26.3.14 If they do not attend they will be briefed on the decisions prior to the examination board. Details of the operation of the Mitigating Circumstances Committee can be found in the General Assessment Regulations for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught Programmes and the Undergraduate Assessment Regulations and the Postgraduate Taught Assessment Regulations).

International Teaching Partnerships (ITPs): Additional requirements in respect of external examiners’ duties

26.3.15 For students registered on an ITP programme at least one external examiner should:

(a) for each cohort, approve all the assessment tasks that would be approved for students studying at Lancaster on the equivalent programme and Lancaster University staff should also approve assessment tasks before they are sent to the external examiner for final approval;
(b) for each cohort, scrutinise assessment outputs (mark averages, distribution and summary statistics) and, if it is considered necessary, scrutinise samples of student work;
(c) for at least one cohort in any single academic year, see samples of marked examinations scripts and coursework;
(d) provide a judgement on the comparability of the quality and standards of provision and performance across all relevant locations.

26.3.16 Where there are several external examiners for a programme and the Lancaster University department decides that more than one cohort should be sampled, then each individual external examiner should be asked to look at a different cohort.

26.4 INDUCTION AND INFORMATION FOR EXTERNAL EXAMINERS

Institutional information

26.4.1 External examiners are provided with the following institutional-level information via the website information for external examiners.

26.4.2 General Assessment Regulations for Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate Programmes, including:

(a) University policy and procedures on marking and moderation of assessment;
(b) operation of exam boards;
(c) operation of Mitigating Circumstances Committees.

26.4.3 Undergraduate Assessment Regulations, including:

(a) rules for progression and classification of award for undergraduate programmes;
(b) additional requirements for professional awards;
(c) generic grading criteria ('Grading table');
(d) guidance for scaling of marks.

26.4.4 Postgraduate Taught Assessment Regulations, including:

(a) rules for progression and classification of award for postgraduate taught programmes;
(b) additional requirements for professional awards;
(c) generic grading criteria ('Percentage table');
(d) guidance for scaling of marks.

26.4.5 Assessment Regulations for the MBChB degree

26.4.6 Plagiarism and Malpractice Regulations and Procedures

26.4.7 Regulations and procedures for academic appeals

Departmental induction and information

26.4.8 Departments will ensure that a programme of briefing is put in place to support both new and inexperienced external examiners. New external examiners are encouraged to make arrangements with the academic contact to pay a preliminary visit to the institution in order to meet the staff concerned, see the work in progress and familiarize themselves with the programme(s). Mid-year visits may be required for programmes with a performance element or with cohorts completing at various times throughout the academic year.
26.4.9 Departments are required to provide external examiners with the necessary information and evidence base to enable them to carry out their duties effectively. This includes information on programmes and modules, marking and moderation procedures, assessment criteria, and student performance. The Assessment Officer for the department has responsibility for ensuring that external examiners are provided with this information and material.

Information to be provided to the external examiner on or soon after appointment

26.4.10 As well as briefing on the programme and its assessment regulations, departments shall provide the following information to the external examiner on, or soon after, their appointment.

(a) Details of departmental contacts, channels of communication, and timings for receipt of assessment material.

(b) All relevant programme specification(s), together with full details of the modules and syllabi for the programme(s) for which the external examiner is responsible.

(c) Details of the overall programme assessment scheme, the scheme of assessment for each module (including the balance between examined coursework, dissertations, practicals, formal examinations, etc.), and the grading and marking criteria for different types of assessment.

(d) Copies of the most recent external examiner’s reports for the programme and the head of department’s responses.

Information to be provided annually

26.4.11 Departments shall provide the following information and material to the external examiner on an annual basis.

(a) Information on changes to programmes and modules which have taken place since the external examiner last reviewed assessment for the programme(s).

(b) Timely and accurate information about the arrangements for the examination board(s) which the external examiner is expected to attend, together with the due date for submission of the external examiner’s annual report (normally four weeks after the meeting of the examination board).

(c) Draft examination scripts and other assessment tasks for the external examiner to comment on, and information on departmental guidance provided to students undertaking revision classes and other preparatory work for examinations as to the areas of a subject which may be examined.

(d) Following the internal marking and moderation of assessed work, departments should make as much as possible of the assessed work for every module available to the appropriate external examiner. Ideally this would consist of
material from all assessed assignments (exams and coursework), but it is recognized that in some cases this may be impractical; in such cases the material made available must cover enough assessed assignments such that between them they represent at least 50% of the assessment by weight for the module.

**Work provided for scrutiny**

26.4.12 It is at the examiner’s discretion which pieces of work are scrutinised, subject to the following minimum requirements:

(a) the examiner should scrutinise samples of work from assignments making up at least 50% of the module assessment by weight;

(b) a sample from a collection of n scripts should involve a minimum of five scripts or the square root of n scripts, whichever is the greater, covering a range of performances including at least one fail (if there are any).

26.4.13 Normally it would not be expected that an examiner would go significantly beyond these minimum requirements, as long as he/she is satisfied that the material scrutinised enables him/her to judge whether:

(a) the types of assessment are appropriate for the subject;

(b) the marking scheme/grading criteria have been properly and consistently applied;

(c) the assessment processes are carried out in accordance with the University’s regulations and procedures, and;

(d) the standard of assessed work is comparable with other programmes of which the examiner has experience.

26.4.14 Departments should make their own arrangements with external examiners as to whether samples are selected by the Department or by the Examiner, and as to the way in which the scripts are made available to the examiner.

26.4.15 The work made available to the examiner for a module should be accompanied by a commentary which informs the external examiner of the marks awarded for all items of assessment and the basis on which they are awarded, together with internal examiners’ feedback and comments.

26.4.16 Immediately prior to the examination board, the department should send all examiners a report of the mean and standard deviation marks for all modules for which the board is responsible.

26.4.17 Following receipt of the external examiner’s report to the University, the department should send to the examiner a formal response to this report from the Head of Department, a copy of which should be made available to all co-external examiners.

**26.5 EXTERNAL EXAMINER REPORTS**

**Submission and circulation of reports**

26.5.1 Reports are submitted annually by external examiners direct to Academic Standards and Quality. Examiners are asked to submit these within four weeks of the final examination
board meeting. If a report is not submitted within the relevant time period, external
examiners will be reminded by Academic Standards and Quality to submit a report.
Subsequent failure to do so will lead to the University considering terminating an
external examiner appointment prematurely.

26.5.2 For Lancaster-delivered provision, copies of external examiner reports are circulated by
ASQ as follows:

Heads of department
Faculty teaching quality support officers
The officers with delegated authority from Senate for the review of such reports.

26.5.3 For collaborative provision (Regional Teaching Partners and International Teaching
Partners), copies of external examiner reports are circulated by ASQ to the equivalent
academic heads and quality officers within the partner institution. In addition, the
reports are circulated to the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate and to
the head of the associated department at Lancaster.

Content of reports

Areas for comment

26.5.4 External examiners are expected to comment on the following areas in their report:

(a) comparability of programme standards;
(b) curriculum design and delivery;
(c) assessment methods and procedures;
(d) student achievement;
(e) organisation and arrangements for external examiner involvement;
(f) good practice and enhancement opportunities;
(g) specific issues which require action.

26.5.5 The external examiner report form provides the specific questions which external
examiners are expected to address. Of particular importance is the external examiner’s
judgement on the comparability of standards of the provision with UK national
standards; this includes provision delivered through an International Teaching
Partnership (ITP) (see the guidance below on Collaborative Provision). Where an
external examiner is in his or her final year of the appointment, they are asked to
review their experience of the programmes(s)/module(s) over the period of
appointment and provide additional comment on:

(a) evidence of the students’ progression from year to year;
(b) the progressive development and enhancement of the learning and teaching
provision;
(c) the standards achieved;
(d) marking and assessment;
(e) the appropriateness of the assessment procedure;
(f) student feedback.
Confidential reports

26.5.6 If an external examiner feels there are particular issues of a sensitive nature on which they wish to comment in confidence they have the right to submit a confidential report to the Vice-Chancellor.

26.5.7 Such a report should be made in addition to the normal annual report. Reports submitted to the Vice-Chancellor in confidence will be dealt with as appropriate.

Consideration of reports by the institution

26.5.8 External examiner reports are an important source of external comment on the quality and standards of the University’s provision and on the potential for quality enhancement. The University gives consideration to the reports at a number of different levels within the institution.

26.5.9 Reports are reviewed in detail at departmental level and the Head of Department is required to make a formal response to the report to the external examiner. The report and the department’s response are considered as part of the departmental Annual Teaching Review (ATR).

Annual Teaching Review (ATR)

26.5.10 As part of the ATR, departments are asked to discuss any issues raised by external examiner(s) together with the Head of Department’s formal response. The department’s ATR report should include an account of this discussion and the ways in which the department intends to respond, and any differences in views should be described. Specific actions should be included in the departmental action plan, which is an integral part of the department’s ATR report.

26.5.11 Faculties give consideration to the departmental ATR reports in their faculty teaching committees, following which the Faculty Associate Dean is required to make a summative faculty ATR report, which both confirms that ATR procedures have been followed correctly in the faculty and identifies any issues arising from the process. Issues which the faculty considers should be addressed are summarised in the faculty action plan included in the Associate Dean’s report.

26.5.12 Faculty reports of ATRs are considered at institutional level by the appropriate committees, and the Undergraduate and Postgraduate Deans will ensure that actions arising from the ATR process and from the institutional summary of external examiner reports (see below) are addressed at the relevant level of the University through the most appropriate means and that follow-up actions are monitored.

26.5.13 External examiner reports are separately analysed annually by Academic Standards and Quality and a summary report on the cross-institutional issues and themes arising from this analysis is provided for institutional consideration.
Periodic Quality Review (PQR)

26.5.14 External examiner reports form part of the evidence base for the periodic quality review of departmental provision and programmes, and would also be consulted at any point if a concern was raised about the quality and standards of a programme.

Collaborative provision

26.5.15 External examiner reports for collaborative provision are submitted in the same way as for Lancaster-based provision. A copy of the report is sent as soon as possible to the head of the institution concerned.

26.5.16 Reports for International Teaching Partnership (ITP) provision follow the same procedures as for Lancaster-based provision via the link department for that provision. In all cases Lancaster departments are required to apply the same criteria and judgements to the consideration of these reports and to act upon them in the same way as they do for their Lancaster-based provision. An ITP external examiner must report on the comparability of the partnership provision with UK national standards, and where the examiner has responsibility for both ITP and Lancaster-based provision the comparison must also be made with the related Lancaster-based provision.

26.5.17 Reports for Regional Teaching Partnership (RTP) provision are reviewed by the Associate Colleges as part of their Annual Programme Review (APR). The colleges are required to incorporate the reports, together with their response, into the APR report. In addition, a review of external examiner reports is undertaken by a senior member of the central quality unit at the colleges, and a summary of the resulting issues and actions incorporated into the college Annual Programme Review Overview report presented to the Collaborative Provision Teaching Committee (CPTC). An action plan is included in this report, and the plan is monitored throughout the year through the CPTC. A separate analysis of RTP external examiner reports is undertaken by Academic Standards and Quality and a briefing on the general issues and themes arising from these reports is submitted to CPTC and to UMAG.

Availability of reports to students

26.5.18 External examiner reports relate to quality management within the institution and are to be seen in this context. Reports and departmental responses to the reports are made available to students through departments’ published information for students. Departments must inform students how these reports will be made available.

26.5.19 This forms part of the University’s arrangements for students to participate, alongside staff, in evidence-based discussions on quality assurance and enhancement.

27. COLLABORATIVE TEACHING PROVISION

27.1 DEFINITIONS

27.7.1 Collaborative provision is defined by the University as any formal arrangement whereby the University engages in partnership with another organisation (or organisations) in order to:
enable access to programmes leading to the award of Lancaster University credit or Lancaster University qualifications through:
(i) Access programmes (1+3 at UG level, 1+1 at PGT level);
(ii) Articulation arrangements (2+2 and 2+3 at UG level);

enable students to study at another HE institution or organisation and transfer back credit that will count towards a Lancaster award through Study Abroad/Exchange arrangements;

deliver or validate whole programmes, or parts of programmes, leading to the award of Lancaster University credit or Lancaster University qualifications through External Delivery/Validation arrangements;

to allow for split-site PhDs leading to Dual Degree awards.

27.1.2 More detailed information about the different types of partnership arrangements is available from Academic Standards and Quality (ASQ).

Full details of individual partnerships can be found in the University’s Register of Collaborative Agreements which is maintained by ASQ. A list of current live partnerships can be found here.

27.1.3 Lancaster University is able to award the following types of qualifications through collaborative teaching partnerships.

(a) A Single Degree is a degree awarded by Lancaster University only. Single degree awards are typically made where the collaborative partner, which delivers the programme, does not have its own degree awarding powers (for example UK FE colleges or overseas institutions which are comparatively recently established and have not yet been given degree awarding powers by their respective governments). The curriculum delivered by the partner may be (i) Lancaster University’s curriculum, or (ii) the partner’s curriculum.

(b) Double Degrees are two degrees awarded on successful completion of a programme of study which involves a period of study at a partner institution, followed by a period of study at Lancaster (or vice-versa), with credit from the Lancaster study being recognised by the partner institution towards the award of its own degree. On successful completion of the standard Lancaster degree programme, the student will receive the Lancaster degree award but will also receive a degree from the partner institution on the basis of the credit awarded for the Lancaster programme and credit gained at the partner institution. The two awards are normally awarded on the basis of different bodies of work studied over a different period of time.

(c) Dual (or Triple) Degrees are two (or three) degrees, one awarded by each partner institution with degree- awarding powers, on successful completion of programmes delivered through the collaborative teaching partnership. The programmes may be designed (wholly or in part) and delivered (wholly or in part) by staff at the partner institution(s). However, in order to ensure it can properly discharge its responsibility both for the quality of the educational experience given to students and also for the standard of the Lancaster degree award, Lancaster University expects to have significant input into programme design (including assessment strategies and methods) and also to be involved in assessment procedures (including participation in examination boards) and
through the appointment and deployment of External Examiners. At the end of
the prescribed programme of study two (or three) separate degree awards are
made to students who have succeeded in meeting the academic criteria
stipulated. One degree is awarded by Lancaster University and one awarded by
each partner institution. Each award is granted on the basis of the same body of
work, studied over the same period of time, and the same assessment regime
and on the recommendation of a joint examination board in which both or all
partners participate. Separate degree certificates are issued by each partner
institution but there is a single joint transcript which makes explicit the nature of
the collaboration and the location of delivery.

(d) Joint Degrees are awards made under an arrangement whereby Lancaster and
another awarding body (or bodies) jointly develop and deliver a single
programme leading to a single qualification awarded jointly by both (or all)
participants. There is a single joint degree certificate and a single joint
transcript. In June 2011 Lancaster University revised its Charter and Statutes to
include a specific and explicit power to award joint degrees in partnership with
other organisations.

27.2 OVERVIEW OF PRINCIPLES AND OF GOVERNANCE, OVERSIGHT AND MANAGEMENT
ARRANGEMENTS FOR COLLABORATIVE PROVISION

Principles

27.2.1 The University gives consideration to entering into a collaborative teaching partnership
with another organisation where the partnership is in the strategic interests of both
parties and where the partnership will be to the demonstrable mutual benefit of both
the University and the partner institution(s).

27.2.2 The University’s formal procedures for the establishment and management of
collaborative teaching partnerships (including the various stages of the formal due
diligence and partnership approval process (see 27.4 below), management oversight,
and arrangements for operational management, monitoring and review) are agreed at
institutional level by the Collaborative Provision Oversight Committee (CPOC) and
Senate, and are subject to regular review and updating in the light of experience and
changing circumstances.

27.2.3 Procedures are designed to ensure that there are adequate safeguards in place against
financial impropriety or conflicts of interest that might compromise academic standards
or the quality of learning opportunities. For example, in both the partnership approval
process and in the periodic partnership review process, consideration of strategic
alignment, finances and the business case must be conducted separately from
consideration of the academic proposal, approval of academic provision and scrutiny of
processes for the management of quality and standards.

Risk evaluation

27.2.4 The degree of risk determines the level and detail of scrutiny undertaken before a
formal partnership agreement can be signed; the level of approval needed for the
partner and the partnership, the process for approving academic provision leading to
the award of Lancaster qualifications and/or credit; and the nature and structure of the
management, oversight, monitoring and review arrangements for the partnership once it is established.

27.2.5 **Access, Articulation, Study Abroad/Exchange** partnerships are normally considered to be low risk (although they might be assessed as medium risk depending on the location or the particular circumstances of the proposed partner).

27.2.6 Small-scale **External Delivery/Validation** partnerships, i.e. those limited to one or two programmes, are generally considered to be medium risk and are managed and operated at departmental/faculty level. These arrangements are then monitored at faculty level but reviewed periodically by the University. Occasionally the nature or the location of the partner might mean that a small-scale partnership is judged to be high-risk and that it therefore needs to be managed, monitored and reviewed at institutional level.

27.2.7 Partnerships involving large-scale **External Delivery/Validation** delivery of provision leading to Lancaster degree awards, i.e. institutional-level, multi-faculty partnerships where the partner delivers a range of programmes leading to the award of Lancaster University qualifications, are normally considered to be intrinsically higher risk because of the scale, nature and/or location of the partnership. For this reason these major partnerships are managed, monitored and reviewed at institutional level although they are operated on a day-to-day basis primarily at departmental/faculty level.

27.2.8 Some partnerships include elements of more than one of the above collaborative teaching arrangements. These are managed at the level appropriate for the highest risk element.

27.2.9 In summary, the assessment of risk is informed by the extent to which the University has direct control over factors with the potential to affect:

- (a) the quality of educational provision and the student experience;
- (b) the standards of the academic awards made by the University;
- (c) the University’s reputation and standing;
- (d) the University’s financial sustainability; and
- (e) the governmental, legal and regulatory framework and environment in the partner country and the extent to which this will influence the partnership and might change the standing of the partnership.

27.2.10 More information about the levels of risk associated with different types of partnership arrangement is available from ASQ.

**Oversight and management**

27.2.11 Structures and processes for the oversight and management of collaborative provision and the level of devolved responsibility are determined in negotiation with partner organisations during the initial approval process, on the basis of risk evaluation and risk management, and as appropriate for the strengths and circumstances of each partner. Arrangements are open to re-negotiation and revision as an individual partnership develops and matures and/or the partnership environment changes.
27.2.12 Whatever the arrangements, and regardless of what specific responsibilities and authority have been devolved to a partner, the University recognises that:

(a) it has ultimate responsibility for Lancaster University awards or credit;
(b) collaborative provision is the responsibility of the University, and not any constituent part(s);
(c) every effort must be made to ensure that all teaching, learning and assessment undertaken through collaborative provision, and the degrees awarded, are academically equivalent to the University’s internal provision.

Formal Partnership Agreements

27.2.13 The University requires a formal, legally-binding partnership agreement, called a Memorandum of Agreement (MoA), to be signed before the commencement of any of the collaborative partnership arrangements described above. MoAs are designed to protect the students enrolled on programmes delivered under the partnership agreement and also to protect the University’s position in terms of its obligations and liabilities and to protect its name and reputation. MoAs clarify the terms of the agreement, the rights, responsibilities and obligations, constraints, financial arrangements, and set out the terms on which the agreement can be terminated. MoAs are institutional-level agreements, signed by an officer with delegated authority from Senate. The Director of Strategic Planning and Governance (or nominee) must approve the form and content of all such agreements before they can be signed.

27.2.14 For other types of collaboration, for example those which do not lead to a Lancaster University award or granting of credit and which incur no legal or financial liability for the University, a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), or Letter of Intent, both non-legally binding agreements, may be sufficient. An MoU or Letter of Intent is also likely to be required at an early point in negotiations relating to a medium or high risk partnership, to be superseded by an MoA at the conclusion of the approval process. MoUs and Letters of Intent still have to be signed at institutional level and the Director of Strategic Planning and Governance (or nominee) must approve the form and content of all such agreements before they can be signed.

27.2.15 Templates for different types of agreement are available from ASQ or from Governance. These teams will advise on the completion of MoAs/MoUs.

Collaborative Agreements Register

27.2.16 Once formal approval for a collaborative teaching partnership has been granted, and the agreement signed by both/all parties, collaborative teaching agreements (MoA and MoU), together with headline information about each partnership, are uploaded onto the University’s Collaborative Agreements Register. The Register is managed by the ASQ team in Student Based Services and is accessible by staff of the University on request.

Provision for disengagement and termination

27.2.17 In case any party to an agreement decides to withdraw from the arrangement or terminate the agreement, the standard MoA template used by the University includes clauses setting out the grounds for termination and the consequences of termination for each partner. These clauses specify the respective obligations of each partner in order
to ensure that students enrolled on programmes delivered under the partnership arrangement are able to complete their programmes of study if they wish to do so.

27.2.18 Upon termination of a collaborative teaching agreement, no new students will normally be admitted to any programme covered by the agreement. The University will also negotiate a separate “teaching out” agreement with the partner(s) to protect the interests of students already registered on programmes and to ensure that every effort will be made by all partners to ensure that students are able to complete their programme. A template teaching out agreement is available on request from ASQ.

27.3 GOVERNANCE AND INSTITUTIONAL OVERSIGHT

Committees

27.3.1 **Senate** is the University body with ultimate responsibility for ensuring that the standards and quality of the University’s collaborative provision are equivalent to those of the University’s own internal programmes. Senate discharges its responsibility in accordance with the approved Schedule of Senate Delegation and agreed procedures for the management and oversight of collaborative provision.

27.3.2 The main sub-committees of Senate involved with collaborative provision are:

(a) the Collaborative Provision Oversight Committee (CPOC) with responsibility, on behalf of Senate, for developing and monitoring policies and procedures relating to collaborative provision and for ensuring that these are implemented, and for ensuring that collaborative partnerships are established and managed in line with agreed policies and procedures, identifying issues which may have strategic, policy or operational implications for the University;

(b) the Education Committee. A sub-committee of the Education Committee is the Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC) with responsibility for ensuring that there are comparable academic standards and equivalent educational experience across the University’s programmes and also for approving academic regulations of all taught and research degree programmes.

27.3.3 The International Strategy Implementation Group (ISIG) is responsible to the Vice-Chancellor for co-ordinating the operational elements of the University’s existing international partnerships and for identifying new opportunities.

27.3.4 **Faculty Teaching Committees** approve proposals for programmes to be delivered in the University’s International Teaching Partnerships (ITPs) and in considering any such proposals, ensure that proposed programmes and contributory modules leading to Lancaster University qualifications, wherever delivered, are equivalent to corresponding programmes delivered at Lancaster, are aligned with the criteria set out in section 27.1.3 above, with other Lancaster University requirements contained in this Manual and also with UK HE sector benchmarks and requirements. Where there is good reason for variation this must be approved by Senate or the relevant body or officer with delegated authority from Senate.

27.3.5 The Collaborative Provision Teaching Committee (CPTC), has an equivalent role to the University’s in-house Faculty Teaching Committees to oversee the quality assurance dimensions of the University’s major Regional Teaching Partnerships (RTPs).
Officers and organisational units

27.3.6 The Vice-Chancellor has nominated specific senior officers to be responsible for different areas of collaborative provision. For example:

(a) the Deputy Vice-Chancellor is responsible for overseeing the University’s regional collaborative strategy and for exploring possible new developments, and exercises oversight of the Head of ASQ in terms of the operational management of the University’s major Regional Teaching Partnerships (RTPs) and other collaborative teaching arrangements;

(b) the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (International), in conjunction with the Director of Recruitment, Admissions and International Development (RAID), is responsible for overseeing the University’s international collaborative strategy and for exploring possible new developments, and they work with the Head of ASQ and the Strategic Planning and Governance team to ensure that effective operational management of the University’s ITPs is deployed.

27.3.7 ASQ is responsible for maintaining oversight of the University’s management of collaborative provision. It ensures that:

(a) the agreed quality assurance framework for collaborative teaching provision is implemented;

(b) new partnerships are subject to the relevant approval procedures;

(c) each partnership has an appropriate agreement (MoA or MoU);

(d) the University’s Register of Collaborative Provision Agreements is maintained;

(e) different types of partnerships are conducted and managed in line with agreed procedures and the terms of the individual agreements;

(f) an annual review of each major External Delivery partnership MoA is undertaken to check that the partnership is being conducted in accordance with the agreement;

(g) agreed quality assurance procedures for individual partnerships are applied and followed;

(h) reviews of partnerships are conducted at appropriate intervals and that appropriate support for such reviews is provided.

Operational Oversight and Management

27.3.8 Responsibilities for partnership management vary according to the type, nature and maturity of individual partnerships. The University ensures that MoAs specify its responsibilities and authority as the Degree Awarding Body and, where appropriate, include Schedules which detail the division of responsibility and authority. See 27.2.13 above for further information about MoAs and other types of agreement.

27.3.9 Access, Articulation, Study Abroad/Exchange partnerships, normally considered to be low risk (although they might be assessed as medium risk depending on the location or the particular circumstances of the proposed partner), are managed and monitored at departmental and faculty level with support and review provided by the International Office.
27.3.10 Partnerships involving smaller scale External Delivery/Validation, i.e. those limited to one or two programmes, are considered to be medium risk and are managed at departmental level (or at faculty level where more than one department is involved), monitored at faculty level and reviewed periodically at institutional level. If the nature or the location of the partner means that a small-scale partnership is judged to be high-risk it will be managed, monitored and reviewed at institutional level.

27.3.11 Partnerships involving External Delivery/Validation involving the large-scale external delivery of provision leading to Lancaster degree awards are considered to be high risk and are managed, monitored and reviewed at institutional level although they may operate primarily at departmental/faculty level. Each of the University’s major External Delivery ITPs and RTPs is overseen by a Partnership Management Group (PMG).

27.3.12 Partnerships which include more than one of the above are managed at the level appropriate for the highest risk element.

Quality assurance procedures

27.3.13 The University has integrated its quality assurance procedures for collaborative teaching provision with its procedures for in-house provision to ensure consistency of approach. These procedures are designed to ensure that programmes leading to the award of Lancaster qualifications, wherever they are delivered:

(a) are positioned at an appropriate level and take account of The Framework for Higher Education Qualifications Degree-Awarding Bodies in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FHEQ), and relevant UK credit frameworks, Subject Benchmark statements and any other nationally agreed relevant external benchmarks and guidance, including Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) requirements;

(b) take account of the context within which the partner institution is operating and, in the case of ITPs, any government and legal requirements in the partner country and local credit frameworks and other benchmarks and of national HE regulatory or quality assurance body requirements;

(c) offer academic standards and quality of educational experience equivalent to corresponding programmes at Lancaster;

(d) align with Lancaster University expectations and requirements, involve appropriate external input and meet UK HE sector benchmarks and expectations.

27.3.14 The main quality assurance procedures for collaborative provision are:

(a) the initial investigation and approval of partners and partnerships (academic and legal/governance issues);

(b) the approval and quality assurance of provision giving access to/articulating with programmes leading to Lancaster awards;

(c) the approval and quality assurance of provision leading to Lancaster awards, including:
   (i) programme and module design, development and approval;
   (ii) evaluation and review of provision leading to Lancaster awards;

(d) the regulation of assessment including the use of external examiners.
27.4 INVESTIGATION AND APPROVAL PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES

Overview

27.4.1 Approval procedures are designed to accommodate the differing degrees of complexity, difficulty and risk inherent in different types of collaborative arrangement and also partner-specific circumstances.

27.4.2 The level of scrutiny and investigation will vary according to the type of partnership arrangement, and also the nature and location of the partner, but the approval process for any type of collaborative teaching provision, whether access, articulation, study abroad/exchange or remote delivery, should involve an assessment of the following:

(a) whether the proposed partnership aligns with the University’s strategic interests and with faculty and departmental strategies;
(b) whether the partnership model and specific arrangements are viable, appropriate and manageable;
(c) the partner’s reputation and academic standing;
(d) the partner’s financial standing;
(e) the partner’s governmental, legal and jurisdictional environment and Higher Education regulatory environment, framework and structures including its degree awarding powers, where relevant;
(f) whether there is market demand and an appropriate recruitment pool of potential students with the necessary qualifications and sources of funding;
(g) the marketing and recruitment capability of the partner;
(h) whether relevant provision is at the appropriate level, whether there is a good curriculum match with Lancaster provision, and whether assessment and moderation arrangements are appropriate;
(i) whether academic staff in the proposed partner are appropriately qualified and experienced;
(j) whether teaching and learning facilities and resources (including library and IT) are of the required standard;
(k) whether the proposed partner deploys appropriate quality assurance procedures for:
   (i) programme design, development and approval;
   (ii) the monitoring and review of teaching;
   (iii) the regulation of assessment;
   (iv) the granting of awards;
(l) the proposed arrangements for the day-to-day operational management of the partnership;
(m) the proposed arrangements for institutional oversight and management at Lancaster and the partner;
(n) the proposed arrangements for periodic review of the partner and partnership.
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An evaluation of the level of risk inherent in any proposed partnership must be made during this initial evaluation as this will determine the appropriate process to be followed. Each stage of the process may lead to re-evaluation of the risk level of the proposed partnership. Details of the criteria for assessing risk and the due diligence procedures are available from ASQ.

Approval process

The initial idea/proposal for a new collaborative teaching partnership arrangement can emanate from a variety of different sources within the University. Wherever the idea originates, all relevant parties who will be involved in the proposed partnership must be consulted in the preliminary stages of consideration, during which an evaluation of the proposed partner institution and partnership must be conducted to establish:

(a) alignment with the University’s overall Strategic Plan and any relevant strategies at departmental and faculty level;
(b) that the partner is in good standing academically, legally, financially, and politically;
(c) that the partnership does not present a significant risk to Lancaster University nor conflict with existing Lancaster University partnerships;
(d) whether there is any significant financial investment or risk for the University.

If, following this initial evaluation, a decision is taken to go ahead with the proposed partnership, depending on the associated complexity and risk, the appropriate approvals procedure will commence.

Where the partnership proposal is commercially sensitive in nature and/or a non-disclosure agreement is required prior to commencement of the approval process, an alternative to the initial review process outlined above, using a sub-group of Senate, may be determined by the Chair of Senate. Any alternative review process will use the same principles of evaluation as for the standard review process. Final approval, however, can only be given once all stages have been completed and all parties duly consulted.

Low/medium risk partnerships

For Access, Articulation and Study Abroad/Exchange arrangements and also for minor External Delivery Partnerships, the initial evaluation and investigation process might be conflated into one single exercise following which the proposal will go before relevant University committees: the relevant Faculty Policy and Resources Committee(s), the relevant Faculty Teaching Committees and then the Collaborative Provision Oversight Committee (for approval on behalf of Senate). The MoA can only be signed once institutional approval has been given by CPOC. In summary:

- all departments involved must agree
  
  and

- Faculty PRCs and Faculty TCs must approve
  
  before

- CPOC can give final approval on behalf of the University (although approval in principal might be sought from CPOC prior to consideration by faculty TCs/PRCs)
only then

- can the MoA be signed (although drafting work should have started during the investigation process).

High risk partnerships

27.4.8 For major External Delivery ITPS and RTPs, a Project Group is established to oversee the investigation and approvals process, usually chaired by a Pro-Vice-Chancellor or other senior officer. Approval in principle is required from Senate and Council after the initial evaluation. The University Management Advisory Group (which advises the Vice-Chancellor) will also be consulted prior to Senate and Council.

27.4.9 Once approval in principle has been given, the Project Group must carry out a full investigation which must include a formal financial and legal due diligence assessment. At this stage, it might be necessary to sign an agreement (usually MoU but a Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA) might also be needed) to govern the relationship during the investigation stage. During this investigation process the University must establish that it has the legal powers to carry out what it undertakes to do under the partnership agreement and, likewise, that the proposed partner has the legal powers to do what it undertakes to do. It is particularly important that in respect of any partnerships which deliver programmes leading to the award of more than one degree by different degree awarding bodies, every effort must be made to ascertain at the outset that the intended partner(s) has/have the legal and regulatory capacity to grant degree awards alongside any degree(s) awarded by Lancaster.

27.4.10 The University must also ascertain:

(a) what the national general legal framework and national or regional qualifications frameworks of the intended partner(s) are and whether these could have implications for the standards and standing of Lancaster awards;

(b) that the proposed arrangements will allow Lancaster to exercise its responsibility for ensuring that its academic standards are maintained, irrespective of the requirements of the partner;

(c) that the proposed partner has appropriately qualified staff to teach to the level of the programme;

(d) that the proposed partner has sufficient facilities and learning resources to enable students to achieve the learning outcomes and required achievement levels on the proposed programme(s).

27.4.11 The full set of questions which form the basis of investigations is available from ASQ.

27.4.12 In practice, the investigation might take the form of a series of iterations with interim evaluations. However all questions must be answered satisfactorily before final approval for the proposed partnership can be given, before the MoA can be signed and before the partnership can commence. In summary:

approval in principle

- departments involved must agree

and
• Faculty Policy and Resource Committees (PRCs) must agree and
• approval in principle required from CPOC/Senate/Council (with input from UMAG) before completion of full investigation

• overseen by Project Group with progress reports to UMAG/CPOC/Senate/Council as required before final approval

• approval of provision by department, Faculty Teaching Committees and
• approval by Faculty PRCs and
• approval by CPOC/Senate/Council (with input from UMAG) before
• MoA can be signed (although drafting work should have started during the investigation process).

27.4.12 Occasionally, depending upon timing and other circumstances, the order in which different University bodies consider proposals for approval may vary but final approval can only be given once all stages have been completed and all parties have given their approval: relevant department(s), Faculty Teaching Committee(s) (for all provision); CPOC, Senate and Council (for institutional approval of the partner and partnership). Only then can MoA be signed.

27.4.13 Advice on aspects of any proposed partnership is available as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Advice available from:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partner reputation and academic standing, fit with Lancaster strategy</td>
<td>International Office (and British Council), Deputy V-C, PVC International,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner legal status and degree awarding powers</td>
<td>ASQ/Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner financial standing</td>
<td>Finance Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student body: recruitment pool, qualifications, funding sources</td>
<td>Recruitment, Admissions and International Development (RAID)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing and recruitment capability and arrangements</td>
<td>RAID, Communications and Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmes: level, curriculum match, assessment and moderation</td>
<td>ASQ, Student Registry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>International Office, HR/OED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance mechanisms</td>
<td>ASQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning resources</td>
<td>Library, ISS, OED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27.5  PARTNERSHIP AND PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT

Major International Teaching Partnerships (ITPs)

27.5.1 Each Lancaster-validated programme which leads to the award of a Lancaster University degree and which is delivered by an ITP at the partner’s site (whether wholly by ITP staff or jointly by ITP and Lancaster staff) is linked to the appropriate academic department at Lancaster with designated staff at module, programme and faculty level, managed alongside in-house provision. ASQ can advise on the appropriate contacts.

27.5.2 There is a Partnership Management Group (PMG) for each ITP that meets every six to eight weeks. Each PMG is chaired by the PVC (International) and membership includes senior University officers and key staff from academic departments, Faculties and professional services who are involved with managing the partnership.

27.5.3 PMGs consider:

(a) planning and strategy for the short to medium term;
(b) reports from the Partnership Director and Faculty ITP Directors;
(c) marketing and recruitment including progress against targets;
(d) quality and standards issues;
(e) IT, Library and infrastructure issues;
(f) staff development activities and funding;
(g) student number updates and financial analyses.

Major Regional Teaching Partnerships (RTPs)

27.5.4 There is a Partnership Management Group for each major RTP which meets at least four times a year to discuss emerging issues and priorities and to agree 3-5 year business plans for validation and re-validation events. Other issues discussed include curriculum strategies, student recruitment, staffing issues, policies and procedures. The PMGs are chaired by the Head of ASQ. The University’s Collaborative Provision Teaching Committee (CPTC) is responsible for monitoring all partnership and programme management issues. Any systemic quality and standards issues identified through annual monitoring and periodic review are dealt with at the PMG and referred to the CPTC as required. The ASQ team work closely with staff at the colleges in respect of all quality and standard and partnership issues and the day to day operation of the partnership.

27.5.5 ASQ is responsible for day-to-day liaison with the RTPs over policy, procedural and operational matters, functioning as a partnership office, with a nominated member of staff assigned to each RTP. The University appoints a Programme Consultant to each RTP programme or suite of linked programmes. Members of ASQ and Programme Consultants regularly visit partner sites and represent the University on College quality assurance committees and assessment boards.

Minor External Delivery partnerships and Access and Articulation partnerships.

27.5.6 Minor External Delivery Partnerships and Access and Articulation partnerships are managed by the academic department or relevant International Office (central or faculty) which initiated the relationship.
Study Abroad/Exchange

27.5.7 Study Abroad/Exchange partnerships are managed by the relevant International Office (central or faculty) working with key academic and administrative contacts at the partner institution.

27.6 QUALITY ASSURANCE

27.6.1 For the large regional partnerships (Blackpool & The Fylde College and Blackburn College) quality handbooks and guidance documents are available [here]. These are intended for use by college staff and relate to policies and procedures for partner college programmes validated by the University.

27.6.2 Partnership handbooks for each major External Delivery partnership are reviewed and published annually by ASQ.

27.6.3 The guidance documents and the handbooks over the processes set out below.

Course design and approval process

International Teaching Partnership (ITPs)

27.6.4 Proposals for new or modified programmes, and for new or modified contributory modules, are first considered by the relevant PMG. The PMG considers whether the proposed provision is in line with the agreed academic strategy for the partnership, whether Lancaster has the subject expertise to validate the proposed programmes, whether the partner has the capacity to deliver them to the required standard and whether there is a recruitment pool of qualified applicants. Subject to PMG approval in principle, the partner is invited to submit detailed proposals. These are considered by the relevant Lancaster Faculty ITP Director in consultation with departmental Link Tutors and then routed through the University’s standard in-house course approvals process at departmental, faculty and institutional level. This ensures that provision is scrutinised by the same bodies and individuals that consider and approve proposals for in-house provision, against similar criteria. Where programmes delivered by, and at, ITPs lead to Dual or Double Degree awards, the Lancaster programme and module approval process has to be co-ordinated with the partner’s internal course approval processes. The University agrees the sequence and timing on a partner by partner basis.

Regional Teaching Partnerships

27.6.5 Proposals for new programmes are first considered by the relevant PMG as set out above for ITPs. The PMG will consult with academic staff at Lancaster as appropriate. Once approval in principle has been given, programme proposals are taken through the respective College’s internal validation procedures which include an initial academic approval stage involving the University, followed by close scrutiny of detailed proposals through the respective College committees and culminating in a validation event. These internal processes have been strengthened and refined over the years, with the full support of the University, as both Colleges have worked to develop their capacity for managing standards and quality.
27.6.6 The University appoints the validation (and re-validation) panels, which are chaired by a University academic and include other University staff and (from the start of 2015-16) at least one external advisor. Details of the process are contained in the documentation produced by ASQ.

Minor External Delivery ITPs and RTPs

27.6.7 Programmes and modules leading to Lancaster awards to be delivered elsewhere are approved through the University’s standard course approval procedures via the relevant Lancaster department(s) and Faculties.

Articulation, Access and Study Abroad/Exchange

27.6.8 Curriculum matching is carried out during the partnership approval process by relevant academic departments, with input from the relevant International Office (central or faculty), in order to ensure that:

(a) students admitted to Lancaster from Access and Articulation partners will be appropriately prepared academically when they join their chosen Lancaster degree programme;

(b) outgoing Study Abroad/Exchange students will be appropriately prepared academically when they join their chosen degree programme in the partner institution and also when they return to Lancaster after their period of study elsewhere to re-join the Lancaster degree programme.

27.6.9 The alignment of curricula in partner institutions is reviewed as part of the Annual Teaching Review (ATR) and Periodic Quality Review (PQR) processes in the light of student performance and feedback.

PSRB accreditation

27.6.10 When making arrangements to deliver a programme with others, the University discusses the relevance and implications of professional, statutory and regulatory body (PSRB) accreditation for programmes to be validated by Lancaster and leading to Lancaster University degree awards. For programmes not yet accredited that might be eligible for accreditation by a PSRB (in the UK or elsewhere), the University discusses the procedure and timing for seeking accreditation, where this is agreed by all parties to be desirable. Where an existing programme is already accredited by a PSRB, Lancaster discusses the implications for curriculum content, delivery and assessment. The University makes every effort to ensure that the status of the programme or award in respect of PSRB recognition is made clear to prospective students.

Recruitment and Admissions

Major External Delivery ITPs and RTPs

27.6.11 The University ensures that the partnership agreement (MoA) and agreed quality assurance procedures set out the arrangements for the admission and registration of students, including the division of responsibilities between the partners. The partner’s recruitment and admissions processes are required to comply with the University’s
admissions policy, practices and procedures – although they may differ as appropriate for local circumstances, they must meet with the University’s underlying principles. The relevant PMG is responsible for monitoring recruitment and admissions activities for partnership programmes.

Minor External Delivery ITPs and RTPs, Study Abroad/Exchange, Articulation and Access

27.6.12 Admissions criteria (and progression criteria in the case of outgoing Study Abroad/Exchange students) are discussed and agreed by departments with advice from Admissions and/or the International Office during the partnership approval process and kept under review in the light of student performance.

Assessment

27.6.13 The University agrees assessment regulations with each partner (RTPs and ITPs) and ensures that they are comparable with those that apply at Lancaster. Any differences have to be justified by the partner and agreed by the University. Because the ITPs do not operate within the UK HE environment, the University has also developed additional policies, procedures and guidance in the following areas:

(a) to facilitate assessment moderation, a mechanism for submitting and tracking assessment tasks for scrutiny by Lancaster staff and marked work for moderation by Lancaster staff is available together with guidance;
(b) the appointment and role of External Examiners (with the same approval process as for External Examiners for in-house programmes);
(c) the composition and conduct of Exam Boards (aligned to in-house arrangements and procedures).

27.6.14 The University appoints, inducts, briefs and pays External Examiners for partnership provision and determines their role and functions.

Regional Teaching Partnerships (RTPs)

27.6.15 The University agrees assessment policies and procedures with its RTPs which are in line with the University’s in-house arrangements (and which are set out in the approved study and assessment regulations for each College) in relation to:

(a) assessment moderation (scrutiny of assessment tasks and moderation of assessed work);
(b) the composition and conduct of Exam Boards (with University staff participating).

27.6.16 Nominations for External Examiner appointments for RTPs are considered in the same way as nominations for in-house programmes, through the Faculty Teaching Committee equivalent (the CPTC) followed by institutional approval by the University Dean for Academic Quality. The University’s standard guidelines apply.

27.6.17 The University agrees with its partners assessment requirements for the components or programmes being assessed in order to maintain its academic standards. Lancaster determines with the partner the division of assessment responsibilities and the
assessment regulations and requirements which apply. These will necessarily differ from partnership to partnership. Where the assessment regulations differ from Lancaster University regulations, these are separately approved by ASQC.

27.6.18 Procedures for setting assessments and the marking and moderation of these vary from partnership to partnership. Detailed information is set out in the quality assurance handbooks.

27.6.19 All partners, UK and international, are responsible for administering award boards. The University has representation on award boards for all external delivery partnerships and approves the outcomes leading to an award of the University.

Programme monitoring and review

International Teaching Partners (ITPs)

27.6.20 The University requires its ITPs to carry out ATRs and the resulting reports are considered by the relevant Lancaster link department as part of their ATR process. This allows ITP provision to be considered by link departments, Faculty committees and ASQC alongside in-house provision. Additionally a summary of issues raised in the ITP reports is produced for consideration by ASQC and CPOC. The University requires its ITPs to carry out ATRs at the same time as at Lancaster (between July and October for UG programmes). Sunway University conducts its ATRs on a slightly different cycle as their academic year is a calendar year. The University’s ATR report template is adapted for each individual ITP to take account of local terminology, the relevant academic cycle and any additional local requirements.

27.6.21 ITP activities and provision are also considered when Lancaster link departments undergo PQR. Again, this allows ITP provision to be considered alongside in-house provision.

Regional Teaching Partnerships (RTPs)

27.6.22 The two major RTPs conduct their own Annual Programme Review (APR) process. The procedure is agreed by the University and there is input from University staff. A summary of all APRs in each College is considered by the CPTC every year and also by the ASQC.

27.6.23 The two major RTPs have also implemented their own respective PQR processes which have been approved by the University.

Minor External Delivery, Study Abroad/Exchange, Access and Articulation

27.6.24 These arrangements are included in the ATRs of the relevant Lancaster department(s).

Other QA processes and procedures

27.6.25 In addition, Lancaster requires its five major ITPs and two major RTPs to have in place processes and procedures which are aligned to those at Lancaster in the following areas:
(a) the selection, appointment, induction, support and development of academic staff involved in the delivery and assessment of Lancaster-vali
(b) the practice of peer evaluation;
(c) the collection and evaluation of student feedback;
(d) student engagement in QA processes.

27.6.26 **Access and Articulation** partnerships are monitored as follows.

(a) Annual monitoring by department(s) must be undertaken, with regard to the performance on a Lancaster University degree programme of those students admitted from the access and articulation programme(s) concerned. Performance monitoring must be benchmarked against all students in a degree programme cohort and also against appropriate peer groups. Such annual monitoring should be reported as part of the regular Annual Teaching Review (ATR) process. Faculty Teaching Committee(s) and Policy and Resources Committee(s) should maintain a watching brief as part of the Annual Teaching Review (ATR) process.

(b) Access and articulation programmes should be included within the relevant departmental Periodic Quality Review process.

27.6.27 **Study Abroad/Exchange partnerships** will be monitored as follows.

(a) Annual monitoring by department(s) must be undertaken, with regard to the performance of students admitted to the programme(s) concerned. Performance monitoring should be benchmarked against all students in a degree programme cohort and such annual monitoring should be reported as part of the regular Annual Teaching Review (ATR) process. Faculty Teaching Committee(s) and Policy and Resources Committee(s) should maintain a watching brief as part of the Annual Teaching Review (ATR) process. Any issues should be communicated to the Head of Study Abroad within the International Office.

(b) An Annual Report by the International Office on the performance of Study Abroad/Exchange students is submitted in the Michaelmas Term to the University’s Academic Standards and Quality Committee.

(c) Exchange programmes should be included within the relevant departmental ATR and PQR processes.

(d) New partnerships are typically reviewed by the International Office after the first two years of operation and, thereafter, shortly before the partnership agreement is due for renewal. Existing partnerships are also reviewed before the agreement is due for renewal.
PARTNERSHIP REVIEW

Major ITPs and RTPs

27.7.1 The University should undertake periodic reviews (usually every five to six years) of its major RTPs and ITPs which determine whether or not the partnerships will continue and on what basis. This is a two stage process.

27.7.2 Stage 1 considers strategic issues and relationship development including:

(a) the partnership vision and future plans;
(b) the implications of any significant developments since last review and/or any known/possible imminent developments;
(c) the potential impact on the partnership of the partner’s relationship with other organisations;
(d) the desired portfolio of degree programmes;
(e) marketing and recruitment strategies and processes.

27.7.3 Stage 2 considers quality management and enhancement arrangements including:

(a) institutional framework/academic governance;
(b) quality assurance processes;
(c) institutional management of teaching and learning;
(d) the quality and availability of published information.

27.7.4 An outline partnership review grid developed by ASQ can be found here.

Minor External Delivery ITPs and RTPs, Study Abroad/Exchange, Articulation and Access

27.7.5 Minor ITPs and RTPs and Study Abroad/Exchange partnerships will be reviewed on a regular basis in order to ensure that:

(a) the arrangements are still meeting their original objectives in terms of the University’s international strategy and/or opportunities for students;
(b) partners are still appropriate in terms of quality and reputation and offer students an equivalent high-quality experience;
(c) viable numbers of students are still interested in participating in the partnership arrangements;
(d) the standard and quality of the provision leading to Lancaster University awards is appropriate.

Where it is determined that any of the above may not be happening, reference should be made to 27.8.

27.7.6 Study Abroad/Exchange arrangements should be reviewed periodically by the relevant International Office (central or faculty) to ensure continuing curriculum alignment with Lancaster provision and the performance of students when they return to Lancaster following a period of study elsewhere.
27.7.7 **Access and Articulation** arrangements are reviewed by departments and Faculties to ensure that the partners are still appropriate and still attracting students wanting to progress to study at Lancaster. Consideration is given to curriculum alignment with Lancaster provision and to the performance of students when they arrive in Lancaster after completing the feeder programme at the partner institution.

27.7.8 In all cases where the frequency of the partnership review is not stipulated in the MoA, the timing of reviews will be determined by the maturity and circumstances of the partnership. Any concerns raised by external examiners, PSRBs, students or by Lancaster link departments may trigger a review as might any significant changes in the partner’s ownership, governance, management, organisational structure, academic mission or reputation and standing.

27.8 **TERMINATION OF PARTNERSHIPS**

27.8.1 The standard MoA template used by the University includes clauses setting out the consequences of termination for the partners. It specifies the respective obligations to ensure that students enrolled on programmes delivered under the partnership arrangement are able to complete their studies if they wish to do so in the event that any party to the agreement withdraws from an arrangement or that the degree-awarding body decides to terminate an arrangement. If such a circumstance arises, then upon termination of the agreement:

(a) no new students should be admitted to any programme covered by the agreement;

(b) the University must negotiate a detailed “teaching out” agreement with the partner(s) to protect the interests of students already registered on programmes and to ensure that every effort is made by all partners for students to complete their programmes and gain their degree awards. Wherever possible, this agreement should be in writing, signed by both partners, and should be attached to the MoA.

27.9 **INFORMATION FOR STUDENTS AND DELIVERY ORGANISATIONS, SUPPORT PROVIDERS OR PARTNERS**

27.9.1 The University must ensure that the division of responsibility for the provision of public information, and the production of publicity and promotional materials relating to learning opportunities that lead to Lancaster University awards is discussed and agreed with the partner(s). The relevant body (PMGs for major ITPs and RTPs, link departments for minor ITPs and RTPs, the relevant International Office for Access/Articulation and Study Abroad/Exchange) is responsible for reviewing such information annually and for continuous monitoring of material produced by the partner.

27.10 **CERTIFICATES AND RECORDS OF STUDY**

27.10.1 Responsibility and authority for awarding certificates relating to Lancaster University awards rests with the University. Where it is agreed that the partners can produce and issue transcripts relating to programmes leading to Lancaster awards, the University must approve the format and content of the transcript which must always record the name and location of the partner and the language of instruction and assessment if this...
is not English. Whenever possible (i.e. where it is not proscribed by the relevant regulatory authorities in the partner country), the certificate should record the name and location of the partner. When this is not possible the University must ensure that the degree certificate refers to the existence of the transcript.
APPENDICES TO THE ASSESSMENT REGULATIONS

GENERAL ASSESSMENT REGULATIONS FOR UNDERGRADUATE AND POSTGRADUATE TAUGHT PROGRAMMES

APPENDIX 1: ADMINISTRATION OF UNIVERSITY EXAMINATIONS (UNDERGRADUATE)

1. University examinations are held at times agreed by Senate.

2. The Student Registry shall be responsible for communicating information about examination schedules and deadlines to departments and students.

3. Heads of departments shall be responsible for providing the Student Registry, on request and by specified dates, details of the modules for which there is to be a University examination. The number of written and practical papers to be taken by categories of students shall be specified, as shall the title and duration of each paper, the sequence in which papers are to be taken (if relevant), and any special requirements (e.g. the provision of graph paper, calculators, statistical tables). The Student Registry is responsible for drawing up examination timetables which take account of student module enrolments and examination registrations and departmental requirements.

4. The Student Registry shall be responsible for consulting departments over any discrepancies or examination clashes and for resolving them. Once finalised, the exam timetable will be widely publicised throughout the University via notice boards and the Student Registry website.

5. Departments wishing to hold University examinations at any time other than the normal examination periods shall so inform the Head of the Student Registry at least three months in advance. Class examinations which can be held in hours allocated to lectures in that subject are excluded from this requirement.

6. The Student Registry shall request the head of each examining department to provide the required number of persons to act as invigilators on specified dates and to provide names to the Student Registry.

7. Departments whose subject is being assessed and which have not been asked to provide an invigilator shall arrange for one or more members of their academic staff (normally the person(s) responsible for the course which is being examined) to be present for ten minutes before and after the start of each examination and for ten minutes before the end to undertake academic advisor duties. The names of the members of the academic staff shall be reported, in advance, to the Student Registry.
8. There shall be at least one invigilator for every fifty students but always at least two in each examination venue and, where practicable, at least one for each subject area to be examined. The invigilators and members of the Student Registry staff shall arrive at the examination room not less than twenty minutes before the start of the examination. These persons shall be responsible for the preparation of the examination room and for posting outside the examination room details of the seating arrangements for candidates. They shall also ensure that notices covering conduct in the examination venue shall be displayed both inside and outside each examination room. Prior to the examination the invigilators shall ensure candidates deposit their belongings in a designated place.

9. The Student Registry shall be responsible for arranging venues, making the necessary physical arrangements for University examinations, and providing examination stationery and for administering all examinations.

Regulations for the use of electronic devices in University examinations

10. The use in examinations of electronic calculators and other portable micro-computing and electronic devices (hereafter shortened to ‘electronic devices’) will only be allowed when permission has been granted by the appropriate department, subject (where appropriate) to the approval of the external examiner(s) and prior consultation with those students taking the course. Any change in a department’s regulations for the use of electronic devices in examinations shall be announced not later than the beginning of the Lent term.

11. Carrying a mobile phone, or similar electronic device such as a pager, in an examination is an academic offence. If a candidate has such a device, it should be switched off and placed at the perimeter of the room with the candidate’s other belongings, or handed to an invigilator.

12. Electronic devices, where permitted, must be of the hand-held type, quiet in operation, compact and having their own power supply. External or user-written programs, or storage media, and/or instruction manuals may not normally be taken into the examination room and students must be able to demonstrate that internal user storage has been cleared before the start of the examination. Candidates shall be entirely responsible for ensuring that their electronic devices are in good working order (e.g. fully charged), and for making alternative provision (e.g. slide rule) in case the instrument should fail.

13. Where required by a department, and so indicated on the examination question paper, candidates shall state the make and model of their electronic device on the examination script.

14. In setting questions for examinations in which candidates may use their own electronic devices examiners should take careful account of the different potentialities of such devices, and require candidates to show sufficient intermediate calculations to demonstrate that they understand what they are calculating.

15. Candidates shall not be allowed to borrow electronic devices from each other during examinations.
16. Departments, with the agreement of external examiners (where relevant), and after consultation with the students concerned, may introduce supplementary regulations (additional to these general regulations) for particular examinations. Such regulations may specify or limit the types and facilities of electronic calculators or other electronic devices which can be used in particular examinations.

**Security and confidentiality of examination papers and scripts**

17. The Student Registry will request examination papers from academic departments at due times and will give guidance as to layout and submission deadlines.

18. The manuscripts of examination papers (agreed by the external examiners and in a form ready for printing) shall be delivered to the Student Registry in a secure manner by dates to be specified annually. (For the purpose of this regulation, ‘sealing’ means a procedure involving signature across the flap of the envelope and sealing of the envelope with transparent adhesive tape across the signature.) The Student Registry shall arrange for any necessary checking of the paper and for its safe-keeping until the date of the examination.

19. The content of questions in examination papers is both restricted and reserved material (i.e. not to be disclosed to or discussed with students or to be discussed until after the examinations have been held). Only the express approval of the Senate may waive this rule for a particular department or for a particular course (e.g. for open book or advance notice papers).

20. Since revision classes and other preparatory work for examinations will inevitably provide some guidance as to the areas of a subject which may be examined, departments are required to prescribe the extent of such guidance and so inform external examiners. Departments must then ensure that no disclosures beyond the prescribed boundaries are made. Where guidance is provided to candidates, departments must ensure that it is provided consistently for all those to be examined on the course concerned.

21. Examination papers for University examinations shall be published on the University website once the examination session to which they relate is over.

22. Reassessment and late registration fees shall be payable at rates which shall be determined from time to time by the University.

23. All examination scripts, and other assessed work not returned by departments to the originating student, should be retained by the department(s) in which the student is registered for a period of three years (36 months) after the mark has been confirmed.

24. Scripts and other assessed material should be held securely and clearly labelled, and disposal should be in accordance with the University’s procedures for the disposal of confidential waste.

25. In the case of an academic appeal or complaint by the candidate, any examination scripts or other assessed work relevant to the case should be sent to the Student Registry to be held on an indefinite basis with the student’s central file.
Alternative examination arrangements for students with disabilities

26. Adapted examination arrangements shall be provided where necessary for students with physical and sensory disabilities, with specific learning difficulties (including dyslexia), with psychological problems or with chronic medical conditions (such as asthma or M.E.).

27. In cases where there is no clear physical or sensory disability, the candidate shall provide a doctor’s letter or psychologist’s report to support his or her request for adapted arrangements.

28. Students are required to make early requests for alternative examination arrangements. The University cannot guarantee to process requests unless made before the end of the term preceding the examinations.

29. Details of the arrangements for any individual shall be agreed between the Head of Department (or his or her representative) and Student Based Services after discussion with the student. Existing University practice and experience shall be taken into account, as shall the individual’s requirements and precedents in previous public examinations.
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APPENDIX 1: LATE PENALTIES FOR ASSESSED WORK

For undergraduate work assessed using percentages, marks between 50% and 69% will be reduced by ten percentage points. Other marks will be reduced according to the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Mark</th>
<th>Mark after penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87-100</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74-86</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-73</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-39</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 2: GRADING TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Broad descriptor</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Aggregation score</th>
<th>Primary level descriptors for attainment of intended learning outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Exemplary range and depth of attainment of intended learning outcomes, secured by discriminating command of a comprehensive range of relevant materials and analyses, and by deployment of considered judgement relating to key issues, concepts and procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Conclusive attainment of virtually all intended learning outcomes, clearly grounded on a close familiarity with a wide range of supporting evidence, constructively utilised to reveal appreciable depth of understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Clear attainment of most of the intended learning outcomes, some more securely grasped than others, resting on a circumscribed range of evidence and displaying a variable depth of understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Acceptable attainment of intended learning outcomes, displaying a qualified familiarity with a minimally sufficient range of relevant materials, and a grasp of the analytical issues and concepts which is generally reasonable, albeit insecure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D+</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Marginal fail</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Attainment deficient in respect of specific intended learning outcomes, with mixed evidence as to the depth of knowledge and weak deployment of arguments or deficient manipulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Attainment of intended learning outcomes appreciably deficient in critical respects, lacking secure basis in relevant factual and analytical dimensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Poor fail</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Attainment of intended learning outcomes appreciably deficient in respect of nearly all intended learning outcomes, with irrelevant use of materials and incomplete and flawed explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Very poor fail</td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No convincing evidence of attainment of any intended learning outcomes, such treatment of the subject as is in evidence being directionless and fragmentary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other transcript indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flag</th>
<th>Broad descriptor</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Malpractice</td>
<td>Failure to comply, in the absence of good cause, with the published requirements of the course or programme; and/or a serious breach of regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Non-submission</td>
<td>Failure to submit assignment for assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Penalty</td>
<td>Failure to submit within regulation requirements (late submission, improper format, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Resit</td>
<td>Attainment of a passing grade through reassessment processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>Decision Pending</td>
<td>The grade is subject to investigation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX 3: PERCENTAGE CONVERSION TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(% to aggregation score)</th>
<th>1 = 0.225</th>
<th>2 = 0.450</th>
<th>3 = 0.675</th>
<th>4 = 0.900</th>
<th>5 = 1.125</th>
<th>6 = 1.350</th>
<th>7 = 1.575</th>
<th>8 = 1.800</th>
<th>9 = 2.025</th>
<th>10 = 2.250</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 = 2.475</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 = 15.300</td>
<td>62 = 15.600</td>
<td>63 = 15.900</td>
<td>64 = 16.200</td>
<td>65 = 16.500</td>
<td>66 = 16.800</td>
<td>67 = 17.100</td>
<td>68 = 17.400</td>
<td>69 = 17.700</td>
<td>70 = 18.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 = 22.650</td>
<td>92 = 22.800</td>
<td>93 = 22.950</td>
<td>94 = 23.100</td>
<td>95 = 23.250</td>
<td>96 = 23.400</td>
<td>97 = 23.550</td>
<td>98 = 23.700</td>
<td>99 = 23.850</td>
<td>100 = 24.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4: GUIDANCE FOR SCALING OF MARKS

1. All assessments and marking schemes should be created with the aim of ensuring that the resulting grades/marks give a good indication of the ability and application of the students. However, it is inevitable that on occasion this will not work as planned.

2. Reasons may include a misprinted examination paper, the interruption of an examination or, in a science laboratory, an instrumental malfunction not obvious at the time of the experiment; or it may simply be that examiners agree, using their academic judgment and with the benefit of hindsight, that an assessment, or part of an assessment, proved to be significantly harder or easier than expected.

3. In such cases it is appropriate to consider whether the marks should be scaled. Scaling may be of the overall mark for the module or of any assessment therein.

4. Although an unusual distribution of grades/marks is not of itself a sufficient reason for scaling to be applied, it may be an indication that something has gone wrong. For this reason, if the overall mean aggregation score for any module lies outside the range 14.5-17.5 (or 58% to 68% for percentage marks) then examiners must consider whether or not there is a case for the marks to be scaled. **Note:** For International and Regional Teaching Partnership provision the range outside which scaling must be considered is 13.5-17.0 (or 55% to 66.7%)

5. Where the possibility of scaling is being discussed, the precise method should also be discussed and should reflect both the nature of the assessment and the size of the cohort. Both the reason for scaling and the method used must be justified within the minutes of the examining body. If scaling is discussed and not used, the reason for not scaling must be recorded in the minutes. In all cases both the original and the scaled marks must be permanently recorded.

6. Where scaling is applied for the same module for at least part of its assessment on more than one occasion, the assessment practices of the module must be reviewed as appropriate.

7. Scaling may take any form as long as it preserves the ordering of students’ marks; thus, for example, if Student A has a higher unscaled mark than Student B, then Student A’s scaled mark must not be lower than that of Student B. Common examples of scaling methods are given below, but other methods are possible.

   (a) For work marked in letter grades, all grades may be raised or lowered by a constant amount.

   (b) For work marked in percentages, every mark may be multiplied by a constant factor, or have a constant value added to or subtracted from it, or a combination of the two.
(c) As in (a) or (b) above, except that where marks are being reduced no pass is turned into a fail (thus, for example, where marks are in general being reduced by 10%, for an undergraduate module or assessment, all unscaled marks between 40% and 49% become scaled marks of 40%), or no condonable mark is turned into an uncondonable mark.

(d) For work marked in percentages, piecewise linear interpolation may be used, where each mark is plotted for each student against his or her average mark on other assessments, as in the graphs below.
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APPENDIX 5: TRANSLATION OF GRADES FROM EXCHANGE PROGRAMMES

1. Departments will not attempt to re-examine work undertaken on exchange. Exchange grades will, in general, be taken as they stand as the basis of conversion. Exceptions may be made where there is some particular reason to think that an exchange grade is unsuitable for direct conversion; for example, in cases where Lancaster undergraduates take exchange postgraduate units.

2. Departments will ensure that all students returning from a year on exchange, and before they begin their final year at Lancaster, are given guidance on the standard of their exchange performance and the likely consequences for their overall degree classification.

3. Overseas grades will not be confirmed as Lancaster grades before the full results of the students’ Lancaster-assessed units are available. For each student the Examination board will be presented with:

   (a) the grades for all exchange units;
   (b) preliminary recommendations as to the appropriate conversions of these grades into Lancaster marks where required;
   (c) any other evidence relating to the student’s work in exchange which may be relevant to the final assessment decision?

4. It is the role of the Examination board either to confirm or to amend the conversions in the light of the evidence available.

5. Where students take more than the equivalent of four Lancaster units during the year on exchange, the first units to be set aside will be any which are in areas not directly related to the students’ major or minor subject. After that procedure, the best units will be used. Where it is necessary to combine units, this will be done in whichever way is to the student’s best advantage.

6. Where exchange partners mark using the same grading scale as Lancaster (A+ to F) marks will usually be used as is and not be translated. This includes most exchange arrangements with North America, Hong Kong, Singapore and New Zealand.

7. Where exchange partners do not mark using the same grading scale as Lancaster the grades will normally be translated using the tables contained in the Grade Translation Booklet, available from the International Office.

   For BBA International Business Management

   Each BBA International Business Management partner marks on a points-based system. For each programme said points will be multiplied by such factors (including taking account of those partners which use a scale where lower points represent higher achievement) so as to give a Lancaster aggregation score out of twenty-four, taking due consideration of pass marks. This will then be recorded as the aggregation score for the course.

8. For new partner institutions which use a grading system different from Lancaster’s the means for translating the grades will be determined as an element of institutional approval.
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APPENDIX 6: ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR PROFESSIONAL AWARDS

1. Certain awards within Lancaster University carry alongside the academic award professional accreditation from the Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body (PSRB) associated with the academic discipline. In certain cases these PSRBs have the authority to set requirements above and beyond those required by Lancaster’s regulations. These additional requirements are set out below.

PART I

2. LLB, LLB (Study Abroad), LLB Law with Criminology, LLB Law with Politics

2.1 Law majors are required to take all 120 Part I credits in their prescribed programme. There is no route out of Part I Law for LLB and LLB (Study Abroad) into an alternative Part II programme if they are unsuccessful at Part I. In order to comply with PSRB regulations (and qualify for accreditation) the pass mark for all Part I modules is 9.0 and students have to achieve a pass or condonation in all courses in order to progress to Law Part II.

2.2 Part I Condonation. When the results of all reassessments relating to Part I are available, the overall profile will be reviewed by the Part I Exam Board and up to 30 credits may be condoned where the aggregation score is between 8.1 and 9. No module may be condoned with an aggregation score of less than 8.1, nor may any module be condoned if a student has not attempted reassessment.

3. BA (Hons) Social Work, MSocial Work (Hons) Social Work, Ethics and Religion

3.1 Students cannot progress to Part II if they fail the preparation for practice assessment elements in SWK115.

PART II

4. BEng and MEng (Integrated)

Paragraphs 4.1 through to 4.4 apply to the following degree programmes:

- BEng (Honours) Chemical Engineering
- MEng (Honours) Chemical Engineering
- BEng (Honours) Electronic and Electrical Engineering
- MEng (Honours) Electronic and Electrical Engineering
- BEng (Honours) Mechanical Engineering
- MEng (Honours) Mechanical Engineering
- BEng (Honours) Mechatronic Engineering
- MEng (Honours) Mechatronic Engineering
- BEng (Honours) Nuclear Engineering
- MEng (Honours) Nuclear Engineering
4.1 For the award of honours BEng or the award of an honours MEng degree, the major project modules (individual and group) must not be condoned.

4.2 For the award of an honours BEng or the award of an honours MEng degree, no Part II module may be condoned with an aggregation score of less than 7.0.

4.3 This paragraph applies to students entering full-time degrees in 2016-17 onwards.

For the award of an honours BEng or the award of an honours MEng degree, no more than 20 credits may be condoned in any level of study. In addition, where modules include two assessment modes (coursework and examination) that assess different learning outcomes, a pass threshold of 7.0 will be adopted for each mode that contributes more than 30% to the overall module mark.

4.4 Students who do not fulfil the requirements of paragraphs 4.1 to 4.3 but who nevertheless fulfil the University requirements for an undergraduate award will be awarded a BSc (Hons) Engineering Science. The BSc (Hons) Engineering Science is not accredited by any of the engineering institutions with which the Engineering department holds accreditation (IMechE, IET or IChemE).

5. BA/BSc (Hons) Psychology

5.1 The classification will be calculated in accordance with standard regulations except that where a candidate fails the final year project, a degree in Psychology will not be awarded. Instead a degree in Psychological Studies will be awarded which, unlike the degree in Psychology, will not be accredited by the British Psychological Society.

6. BSc (Hons) Psychology in Education

6.1 The classification will be calculated in accordance with standard regulations except in two conditions where a degree in Psychology in Education will not be awarded. These conditions are:

(a) where a candidate fails the final year project, no resit will be permitted; and
(b) where a candidate fails to achieve a lower second class honours degree.

6.2 In these cases a degree in Psychological Studies in Education will be awarded which, unlike the degree in Psychology in Education, will not be accredited by the British Psychological Society. Students who fail to achieve a lower second class honours degree will not be permitted to resit modules to improve the degree class for accreditation purposes.

7. BSc (Hons) Biomedical Science

7.1 The classification will be calculated in accordance with standard regulations except that where a candidate fails the final year project, a degree in Biomedical Science will not be awarded. Instead a degree in Biological Science with Biomedicine will be awarded which, unlike the degree in Biomedical Science, will not be accredited by the Institute of Biomedical Science.
8. **BA (Hons) Social Work, MSocial Work (Hons) Social Work, Ethics and Religion**

8.1 In addition to satisfying the conditions for the award of a degree, candidates must satisfy all the professional requirements of the scheme as laid down by the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) in order to be eligible to register with the HCPC. If they fail to do so, their transfer to registration for a BA in Applied Social Studies (from the BA in Social Work) or for a BA in Social Care, Ethics and Religion (from the MSocial Work Social Work, Ethics and Religion) may be approved by the Department of Sociology. In order to satisfy the HCPC requirements candidates must, on the basis of pass/fail, pass each of the two placements in Part II. In addition candidates must obtain a pass mark in examinations in the areas of Social Work with Children & Families and Mental Distress & Health. In order to meet this examination requirement, students are eligible to undertake up to two resits of the examination and the module mark will be capped at either 9 or the first attempt module mark if higher than 9.

**Condonation**

8.2 There is no condonation of the direct practice element of the placement modules or of Social Work with Children & Families and Mental Distress & Health where the examination is failed. 15 credits awarded to the essay assignment in Placement 1 and 30 credits awarded to the essay assignment in Placement 2 may be condoned, and likewise examinations for Social Work with Children & Families and Mental Distress & Health modules, for a degree in Applied Social Studies or Social Care, Ethics and Religion where the University criteria for condonation are met.

8.3 Where condonation is being considered for a Social Work student, a special re-sit assessment panel made up of all markers will consider if the student has satisfactorily met the HCPC’s Standards of Proficiency and The College of Social Work’s Professional Capabilities Framework in other work. If a student has not done so, they may not be condoned for a degree in Social Work. Students may have failed units condoned for a degree in Applied Social Studies or Social Care, Ethics and Religion where the University criteria for condonation are met.

**Fitness to practice**

8.4 Examination boards will be held at five points in the programme:

- (a) the end of Part I;
- (b) the end of the first placement;
- (c) the end of Part II, year 1;
- (d) the end of the second placement; and
- (e) the end of the final year.

8.5 Failure at any of these five stages may be the subject of an appeal to a panel on fitness to practice, consisting of members of the University, a service user and an agency programme partner.
Aegrotat degree

8.6 An Aegrotat degree cannot be awarded for the BA (Hons) Social Work or MSocial Work (Hons) Social Work, Ethics and Religion, but may, if the candidate fulfils the University’s criteria for the award of Aegrotat, be made for the award of BA (Hons) Applied Social Studies or BA (Hons) Social Care, Ethics and Religion.

9. Degrees in the School of Computing and Communications (Students must have studied at the Lancaster campus, as detailed on the transcript of study):

BSc (Hons) Computer Science
BSc (Hons) Computer Science (Study Abroad)
BSc (Hons) Computer Science Innovation
BSc (Hons) Software Engineering
BSc (Hons) IT for Creative Industries
BEng (Hons) Communication Systems and Digital Electronics
MSci (Hons) Computer Science (with Industrial Experience)
MSci (Hons) Computer Science Innovation
MSci (Hons) Software Engineering (with Industrial Experience)
MSci (Hons) IT for Creative Industries (with Industrial Experience)

9.1 BCS, The Chartered Institute for IT accredited degrees

9.1.1 For the award of honours BSc (Hons) Computer Science/MSci (Hons) Computer Science (with Industrial Experience), BSc (Hons) Computer Science (Study Abroad), BSc (Hons) IT for Creative Industries/MSci (Hons) IT for Creative Industries (with Industrial Experience), BSc (Hons) Computer Science Innovation /MSci (Hons) Computer Science Innovation, the final year project must be passed without condonation. Where a candidate fails the final year project, the degree of BSc/MSci Computer Systems will be awarded where the candidate fulfils the requirements of the award, which is not BCS accredited.

9.1.2 For the award of honours BSc (Hons) Software Engineering/MSci (Hons) Software Engineering (with Industrial Experience), the final year project must be passed without condonation. Where a candidate fails the final year project, the degree of BSc/MSci Software Systems will be awarded where the candidate fulfils the requirements of the award, which is not BCS accredited. Note that the new scheme MSci (Hons) Software Engineering (with Industrial Experience) has received initial accreditation, with the application to confirm it due in June 2016.

9.2 The Institution of Engineering and Technology (IET)*

9.2.1 For the IET accredited degrees: BSc (Hons) Computer Science, BSc (Hons) Computer Science (Study Abroad), and BSc (Hons) Computer Science Innovation, the final year project must be passed without condonation and no more than 20 credits may be condoned in any year of study. Candidates who fail to meet these criteria will be awarded the degree of BSc in Computer Systems where they fulfil the requirements of the award, which is not IET accredited.
9.2.2 For the IET accredited degree: BSc (Hons) Software Engineering, the final year project must be passed without condonation and no more than 20 credits may be condoned in any year of study. Candidates who fail to meet these criteria will be awarded the degree of BSc in Software Systems where they fulfil the requirements of the award, which is not IET accredited.

9.2.3 For the IET accredited degree: BEng (Hons) Communications Systems and Digital Electronics, the final year project must be passed without condonation and no more than 20 credits may be condoned in any year of study. Candidates who fail to meet these criteria will be awarded the degree of BSc Communications Systems and Digital Electronics where they fulfil the requirements of the award, which is not IET accredited.

* Students admitted in the academic years 2012-13 and 2013-14 to any one of the following programmes:
  - BSc (Hons) Computer Science
  - BSc (Hons) Computer Science (Study Abroad)
  - BSc (Hons) Computer Science Innovation
  - BSc (Hons) Software Engineering
  - BEng (Hons) Communications Systems and Electronics

who fulfil the requirements of IET accreditation will be awarded a degree with this title and their degree certificate will be endorsed to show the degree is accredited by the IET. Students who do not fulfil the requirements of IET accreditation but who nevertheless fulfil the University requirements for an undergraduate award will be awarded a degree with this degree title and their degree certificate will be endorsed to show the degree is not accredited by the IET.

10. LLB Study Abroad

10.1 For progression on the LLB (Study Abroad) degree programme students must achieve a pass, at the first attempt, of all MODULES in Year 2. If they do not pass at the first attempt they will be transferred to the standard LLB Programme.
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APPENDIX 7: MODULE COMBINATIONS FOR CONDONATION PURPOSES

Where a programme separately assesses modules with a credit value of 15 or less, for specified undergraduate programmes these may be combined to a maximum size of 30 credits for the consideration of condonation. Departments must propose such combinations to their faculty teaching committee for approval. Faculty teaching committees must notify the Academic Standards and Quality Committee of any approved combinations and any changes to these combinations.

Approved combinations are as follows:

**Department of Mathematics and Statistics**
[awaiting approval]

**Department of Physics**
[awaiting approval]
## APPENDIX 1: PERCENTAGE TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Broad Descriptor</th>
<th>Percentage range</th>
<th>Primary verbal descriptors for attainment of Intended Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>70-100</td>
<td>Exemplary range and depth of attainment of intended learning outcomes, secured by discriminating command of a comprehensive range of relevant materials and analyses, and by deployment of considered judgement relating to key issues, concepts and procedures</td>
<td>Distinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>Conclusive attainment of virtually all intended learning outcomes, clearly grounded on a close familiarity with a wide range of supporting evidence, constructively utilised to reveal appreciable depth of understanding</td>
<td>Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>Clear attainment of most of the intended learning outcomes, some more securely grasped than others, resting on a circumscribed range of evidence and displaying a variable depth of understanding</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Marginal fail</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>Attainment deficient in respect of specific intended learning outcomes, with mixed evidence as to the depth of knowledge and weak deployment of arguments or deficient manipulations</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>Attainment of intended learning outcomes appreciably deficient in critical respects, lacking secure basis in relevant factual and analytical dimensions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Poor fail</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>Attainment of intended learning outcomes appreciably deficient in respect of nearly all intended learning outcomes, with irrelevant use of materials and incomplete and flawed explanation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other transcript indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flag</th>
<th>Broad Descriptor</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Aggregation Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Malpractice</td>
<td>Failure to comply, in the absence of good cause, with the published requirements of the course or programme; and/or a serious breach of regulations</td>
<td>0M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Non-submission</td>
<td>Failure to submit assignment for assessment</td>
<td>0N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Penalty</td>
<td>Failure to submit within regulation requirements (late submission, improper format, etc.)</td>
<td>varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Resit</td>
<td>Attainment of a passing grade through reassessment processes</td>
<td>50R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>Decision Pending</td>
<td>The grade is subject to investigation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX 2: GUIDANCE FOR SCALING OF MARKS

1. All assessments and marking schemes should be created with the aim of ensuring that the resulting grades/marks give a good indication of the ability and application of the students. However, it is inevitable that on occasion this will not work as planned.

2. Reasons may include a misprinted examination paper, the interruption of an examination or, in a science laboratory, an instrumental malfunction not obvious at the time of the experiment; or it may simply be that examiners agree, using their academic judgment and with the benefit of hindsight, that an assessment, or part of an assessment, proved to be significantly harder or easier than expected.

3. In such cases it is appropriate to consider whether the marks should be scaled. Scaling may be of the overall mark for the module or of any assessment therein.

4. Although an unusual distribution of grades/marks is not of itself a sufficient reason for scaling to be applied, it may be an indication that something has gone wrong. For this reason, if the overall mean aggregation score for any module lies outside the range 14.5-17.5 (or 58% to 68% for percentage marks) then examiners must consider whether or not there is a case for the marks to be scaled. Note: For International and Regional Teaching Partnership provision the range outside which scaling must be considered is 13.5-17.0 (or 55% to 66.7%)

5. Where the possibility of scaling is being discussed, the precise method should also be discussed and should reflect both the nature of the assessment and the size of the cohort. Both the reason for scaling and the method used must be justified within the minutes of the examining body. If scaling is discussed and not used, the reason for not scaling must be recorded in the minutes. In all cases both the original and the scaled marks must be permanently recorded.

6. Where scaling is applied for the same module for at least part of its assessment on more than one occasion, the assessment practices of the module must be reviewed as appropriate.

7. Scaling may take any form as long as it preserves the ordering of students’ marks; thus, for example, if Student A has a higher unscaled mark than Student B, then Student A’s scaled mark must not be lower than that of Student B. Common examples of scaling methods are given below, but other methods are possible.

   (a) For work marked in letter grades, all grades may be raised or lowered by a constant amount.

   (b) For work marked in percentages, every mark may be multiplied by a constant factor, or have a constant value added to or subtracted from it, or a combination of the two.
(c) As in (a) or (b) above, except that where marks are being reduced no pass is turned into a fail (thus, for example, where marks are in general being reduced by 10%, for an undergraduate module or assessment, all unscaled marks between 40% and 49% become scaled marks of 40%), or no condonable mark is turned into an uncondonable mark.

(d) For work marked in percentages, piecewise linear interpolation may be used, where each mark is plotted for each student against his or her average mark on other assessments, as in the graphs below.
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APPENDIX 3: ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR PROFESSIONAL AWARDS

1. Certain awards within Lancaster University carry alongside the academic award professional accreditation from the Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body (PSRB) associated with the academic discipline. In certain cases these PSRBs have the authority to set requirements above and beyond those required by Lancaster’s regulations. These additional requirements are set out below.

MA/PGDip Social Work

2. Practice elements

H level assessments (i.e. Practice Portfolios) are marked pass or fail. Students failing the H level elements, but passing the M level elements will be eligible for the award of the MA or PGDip Applied Social Studies.

3. Examinations which assess the students’ knowledge of the Law

Students must obtain a pass mark in examinations in the areas of Social Work with Children & Families, Mental Distress & Health and Social Work in Adult Social Care. In order to meet this examination requirement, students are eligible to undertake up to two resits of the examination and the module mark will be capped at either 50% or the first attempt module mark if higher than 50%.

4. Condonation

There is no condonation of the direct practice element of the placement modules or of Social Work with Children & Families, Mental Distress & Health and Social Work in Adult Social Care where the examination is failed.

Where condonation is being considered for a Social Work student, a special re-sit assessment panel made up of all markers will consider if the student has satisfactorily met the Health and Care Professions Council Standards of Proficiency and The College of Social Work's Professional Capabilities Framework in other work. If a student has not done so they may not be condoned for a degree in Social Work. Students may have failed units condoned for a degree in Applied Social Studies where the University criteria for condonation are met.

5. Fitness to practice

Examination boards will be held at four points in the programme:

(a) the end of year 1;
(b) the end of the first placement;
(c) the end of the second placement; and
(d) the end of the final year.

Failure at any of these four stages may be the subject of an appeal to a panel on fitness to practice, consisting of members of the University, a service user and an agency programme partner.

6. **Progression requirements between years one and two**

In order to progress between years one and two of the degree, the student cannot carry any more than 30 credits or two modules with condonable failed marks.
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APPENDIX 1: DEFINITIONS OF POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH AWARDS

1. **Doctor of Science or Letters (DSc/DLitt)**
   
   An award available to Lancaster members of staff already in receipt of a doctorate award and who have demonstrated an outstanding contribution to the creation of knowledge.

2. **Doctoral level awards**

   (a) **Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)**
   
   A doctoral-level award, normally assessed through a research thesis and oral defence. There are agreed variants to the body of work to be assessed:

   *Alternative format PhD*

   A doctoral programme where the body of work to be assessed is in a format other than the traditional single volume format. Each department is required to publish guidelines on what constitutes an appropriate alternative format (or formats) for the discipline concerned. One example of an alternative format is a series (minimum three) of related articles suitable for journal publication.

   *European Doctorate*

   A doctoral programme involving an element of study in another European Union country and study in another European language.

   *Integrated PhD*

   A doctorate comprising a mixture of taught elements and a dissertation.

   *Professional PhD*

   A doctoral-level qualification involving a thesis with formal professional engagement through placement or other arrangement.

   *PhD by Publication*

   A doctoral-level award comprising an assessment of a candidate’s published works within a related field of study.
Specific assessment regulations for these awards are detailed in Appendix 3 of the Postgraduate Assessment Regulations.

(b) Named doctorates

*Doctor of Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy)*

A professional doctorate offered in collaboration with the NHS which comprises taught elements with a dissertation and integrated supervised practical experience.

*Doctor of Engineering (EngD)*

A professional doctorate offered in nuclear engineering comprising a thesis with formal industrial placements.

*Doctor of Management (DMgt)*

A professional doctorate offered in management comprising a thesis with formal industrial placements.

*Doctor of Medicine (MD)*

A professional research doctoral programme taken within the medical profession.

3. Masters level awards

*Master of Philosophy (MPhil)*

A Masters-level qualification undertaken entirely by research and assessed on the production of a thesis. The thesis will constitute a less substantial body of work than for the PhD in terms of either range, depth, originality of concept, or a mixture thereof. Work will be considered as to whether it has achieved a minimum Level 7 standard (Masters level) in the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications, although aspects will likely achieve the standard for doctoral work.

*Master of Arts or Science by Research (MA/MSc by Research)*

A Masters-level qualification in either an arts or science-based discipline undertaken entirely by research.

*Master of Research (MRes)*

A Masters-level qualification involving taught elements, a dissertation and formal research training.
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APPENDIX 2: THE FORM, SUBMISSION AND DEPOSIT OF THESES

1. The following rules shall apply to theses submitted for the degrees of PhD, DClinPsy, DMgt, EngD, MD, MPhil and LLM/MA/MSc by Research. Departmental requirements for the binding of dissertations submitted as part of the requirements for taught Masters awards may vary in detail and candidates are advised to seek early advice.

Submission and deposit: Doctoral theses

2. Candidates shall submit to the Student Registry:

   For candidates registered prior to October 2011
   (a) copies of the thesis (one per examiner) in a secure adhesive binding;
   (b) if necessary, an application to restrict access to the thesis (see (d) below).

   For candidates registered after October 2011
   (c) copies of the thesis (one per examiner) in a secure adhesive binding;
   (d) a Thesis Access Declaration form.

3. After the viva voce examination has taken place and any necessary amendments have been approved, two copies of the thesis must be hard bound according to the specifications in paragraphs 7-10 below and deposited with the Student Registry. For students registered during or after 2011 one copy of the final version of the thesis must be deposited electronically in the institutional repository, one copy of the thesis must be hard bound according to the specifications in paragraph 7-10 below and deposited with the Student Registry to be forwarded to the Library.

4. A thesis for which approval has been granted for submission in an Alternative Format shall include:

   (a) an introductory chapter covering the whole of the background and context of the research and demonstrating the overall unity of approach(es) and theme(s);
   (b) a final chapter summarising the achievements and conclusions of the whole of the research;
   (c) a full statement of authorship for each multi-authored publication, accompanied by written certification by the other authors of each publication of the proportion for which credit is due the candidate for carrying out the research and preparing the publication; and
   (d) a consolidated bibliography, in addition to these elements as they appear in individual paper-format chapters.
Note: a candidate may be advised to include a comprehensive methodology chapter, in addition to these elements as they appear in individual paper-format chapters. Further advice may be found in the guidelines published by the department of registration.

5. All items submitted for the degree of PhD by Published Work with the exception of books, shall be submitted for examination in a secure binding, with each of the three sets of publications being fixed securely between covers, together with the covering paper. A frontispiece, giving the author’s name, the name of the degree and year of submission, shall be included. If the degree is awarded, one print copy of the submission is required for deposition in the University Library. For students registered during or after 2011 unpublished material contained in the thesis must be submitted as an ‘edited thesis’ as an electronic deposit.

Submission and deposit: MPhil theses

6. Candidates shall submit to the Student Registry copies of the thesis (one per examiner) in a secure adhesive binding. After the examiners’ recommendations have been made known to the student and any necessary amendments have been approved two copies of the thesis must be hard bound according to the specifications below and deposited with the Student Registry. For students registered during or after 2011 one copy must be deposited electronically in the institutional repository, one copy of the thesis must be hard bound according to the specifications in paragraphs 7-10 below and deposited with the Student Registry to be forwarded to the Library.

General information

7. For students registered prior to October 2011 one copy of a thesis shall normally be retained for public use in the University Library, save as provided in 9 below, and a second copy shall be retained by the department principally responsible for the candidate’s work. These copies shall be submitted to the Student Registry, which will then distribute them to the University Library and the student’s administering department.

8. For students registered during or after 2011, one electronic copy of the thesis will normally be deposited in the institutional repository; an additional bound copy of a thesis shall normally be retained for public use in the University Library, save as provided in 9 below.

9. The candidate, in consultation with the supervisor and head of department, shall instruct the Library if the thesis is not to be made available immediately for general public use. No thesis normally shall be withheld from public use for more than five years.

10. A candidate who is required by the examiners to make corrections to the thesis shall complete the corrections within three months of receiving, from the internal examiner, notice of the corrections to be made. A candidate who is required by the examiners to make minor amendments to the thesis shall complete the
amendments within six months of receiving, from the internal examiner, notice of
the amendments to be made. The degree shall not be awarded until the thesis has
been corrected or amended to the satisfaction of the examiners and the revised
hardbound copies have been submitted to the Student Registry.

Length, style, layout and presentation

11. A thesis for the degree of LLM/MA/MSc by Research shall not normally exceed
35,000 words. A thesis for the degree of MPhil shall not normally exceed 60,000
words (including any footnotes and appendices but excluding the bibliography); a
thesis for the degree of PhD shall not normally exceed 80,000 words (including any
footnotes and appendices but excluding the bibliography), without prior approval
from the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate. Candidates shall
make a declaration of the word length of the thesis and confirm that it does not
exceed the permitted maximum. If it does exceed the permitted maximum, the
declaration shall include confirmation that this has been formally approved by the
body or officer with delegated authority from Senate. Theses shall be written in
English save where, in exceptional circumstances, the Head of Department has given
prior permission to present the thesis in another language and reported this
approval to Student Registry.

12. Theses for the degrees of MPhil and PhD, submitted as part of the doctoral
programme in Educational Research or Linguistics, or for creative writing or theatre
studies, or within the Division of Health Research, vary from these word lengths.

13. Candidates must avoid typographical, spelling and other minor
errors. If any such
errors are made, the candidate must correct them to the examiners' satisfaction
before a degree is awarded.

14. The author's full names and degrees, the title of the thesis, the degree for which the
thesis is submitted and the month and year of submission shall appear on the first
leaf of the thesis and at the top of the abstract. Each thesis shall be preceded by an
abstract not exceeding 300 words typed as specified below in a form suitable for use
in major abstract indices.

15. The text of the thesis shall be word processed on good quality A4 paper (210 mm x
297 mm), leaving a left hand margin of 38 mm, and a margin of 25 mm on the other
three sides. Diagrams and illustrations shall be reproduced or mounted on similar
paper; any which cannot be folded on A4 size must be submitted in a suitable
portfolio which shall bear the particulars listed in 2.4 above.

16. The author shall provide as an integral part of the thesis a comprehensive list of
contents, including diagrams, illustrative matter and any appendices; bibliography
comprehending all materials cited or referred to in the whole submission; and must
indicate if any part of the thesis is bound separately.
17. Pagination shall extend to the whole of each volume, including any diagrams, appendices, or other matter. For preliminary matter roman numerals may, if wished, be used. If chapters have numerical subdivisions these shall be recorded in the contents list.

18. Candidates must make a declaration that the thesis is their own work, and has not been submitted in substantially the same form for the award of a higher degree elsewhere. Any sections of the thesis which have been published, or submitted for a higher degree elsewhere, shall be clearly identified. If the thesis is the result of joint research, a statement indicating the nature of the candidate's contribution to that research, confirmed by the supervisor(s), shall be included.

19. Students registered during or after 2011 must make a declaration granting the institutional repository a number of permissions and conditions with respect to online access to their work. If any subsidiary material owned by third party copyright holders has been included, candidates must declare permission has been sought and obtained to make it available in digital format.

20. Note: in respect of a thesis submitted under the regulations governing a PhD by coursework and thesis the wording of the cover page shall be: 'This thesis is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy'.

Form of theses

21. Candidates’ theses should conform to British Standard 4821 1990 *Presentation of theses and dissertations*, which is available in Lancaster University Library.

22. General guidance on the preparation and presentation of a thesis may be found in the books listed in Lancaster University Library’s online guide to *Study and Research Skills Books*.

23. Guidance on *Citing references* is available on Lancaster University Library’s website. There are links to the main styles (Harvard, APA, Chicago and Vancouver) and lists of useful up-to-date books. However some departments have their own rules on citations and candidates should seek guidance from their supervisor.

Binding of theses – specifications

24. Pages, which should be trimmed on all edges, should be bound in a fixed permanent binding, rounded and backed (samples may be seen in Brady Bookbinders, located on campus):

(a) boards to be of a quality strong enough to support the volume when standing on the shelf and having a square on all edges;

(b) covering material to be of a cotton woven library buckram or rexine with a washable surface;
(c) cloth colours to be dark green (M.A.), burgundy (M.Res.), black (M.Sc.), brown (LLM), dark blue (MPhil), bright red (PhD), dark brown (DClinPsy and MD) and mid green (D.Sc./DLitt.);

(d) lettering to be in gold. In capital letters reading down the spine, candidate’s surname, followed by initials; across the lower half of the spine, title of degree, the word 'LANCASTER', and the year of submission;

(e) photographs and other mounted illustrations should be added after the thesis has been bound. Where mounted material is to be used a system of permanent guarding must be provided.

Binders

25. The University recommends the following binders who can carry out work of a suitable standard. For recommendations as to the mounting and guarding of illustrations binders will give advice. Allow for the possibility of delays in July, August and September. Candidates should ensure that their theses are presented to the binders as perfect copies. It is the responsibility of the candidate to ensure that the pagination is correct when submitted for binding.

Brady Bookbinders, Library Avenue, Lancaster University (telephone 01524 68848, email: gerard.brady@yahoo.co.uk)
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APPENDIX 3: REGULATIONS FOR SPECIFIC DOCTORAL AWARDS OR PROGRAMMES

PhD by coursework and thesis

1. Candidates shall register at the outset for a PhD qualification and undertake taught courses specified by the department of registration. Such courses shall normally be completed within twenty-four months of first registration.

2. To be eligible for confirmation of the PhD, the candidate shall:

   (a) submit for assessment in the taught courses, written work of which a proportion specified by the department shall be of publishable standard; and
   (b) satisfy a departmental exam board that s/he is academically capable of successfully completing a thesis.

The rules for determining confirmation of the PhD on the basis of satisfactory coursework are specific to the individual programme. These rules are approved by the faculty and notified to the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate via Academic Standards and Quality. The board may recommend one of the following:

   (c) that the candidate is eligible for her/his PhD registration to be confirmed, subject to submission of a satisfactory proposal for the thesis; or
   (d) that the candidate be invited to re-submit elements of coursework, to satisfy the requirement of (i) above, with one further opportunity for the PhD registration to be confirmed; or
   (e) that the candidate be invited to complete the requirements for examination for the award of MPhil.

Note: in the event that the board recommends (e), the candidate shall be eligible to appeal.

3. A candidate in respect of whom the board has recommended (d) above, shall submit to a departmental panel normally within six calendar months from the date of notification of (c), a proposal for a thesis of up to 70,000 words. After consideration of the proposal, the panel may recommend one of the following:

   (a) that the candidate’s registration for a PhD be confirmed; or
   (b) that the candidate be invited to revise and re-submit the proposal with one further opportunity for the PhD to be confirmed; or
   (c) that the candidate be invited to complete the requirements for the award of MPhil.
Note: in the event that the board recommends (c), the candidate shall be eligible to appeal.

4. A candidate who has satisfied the requirements is required to submit a thesis of normally not more than 70,000 words, within sixty calendar months of first registration for the PhD. The dissertation shall be examined according to the normal regulations above. To be eligible for the award of the PhD, the thesis shall make an original contribution to knowledge and contain material of a standard appropriate for scholarly publication.

**Integrated PhD programmes**

5. A candidate shall register at the outset for a PhD with a minimum full-time registration period of forty-eight months and maximum of sixty months. Any extension of the maximum period must be approved by Student Registry after consideration of evidence of the student’s progress submitted by the department concerned, up to an absolute maximum of eighty-four months.

6. A candidate shall undertake taught courses specified by the department of registration. Such courses shall normally be completed within twenty-four months of first registration and lead to the award of MRes.

7. Re-registration for the second year of study shall be contingent upon the recommendation of the department. Such recommendation shall be contingent upon:

   (a) successful completion of the specified taught courses, normally above the level of the minimum pass mark; and

   (b) confirmation that a suitable topic for research has been identified i.e. a topic for which the student is deemed eligible and for which the department can provide appropriate support and supervision.

8. In the absence of such a recommendation, the candidate shall withdraw from the programme. Students may appeal against this decision under the procedures for Academic Appeals.

9. To be eligible for confirmation of the PhD, normally after a minimum of twenty-four months from first registration, the candidate shall:

   (a) submit for assessment written work of which a proportion specified by the department shall be of an appropriate standard; and

   (b) satisfy a departmental exam board that s/he is academically capable of successfully completing a thesis.

10. The board may recommend one of the following:

   (a) that the candidate is eligible for confirmation of her/his PhD status, subject to submission of a satisfactory proposal for the thesis; or
(b) that the candidate be invited to re-submit elements of written work to satisfy the requirement of (a) above, with one further opportunity to apply for confirmation of the PhD; or
(c) that the candidate be invited to complete the requirements for examination for the award of MPhil.

Note: In the event that the board recommends (c), the candidate shall be eligible to appeal.

11. A candidate in respect of whom the board has recommended (i) above, shall submit to a departmental panel, normally within six calendar months from the date of notification of (i), a proposal for a thesis of up to 70,000 words. After consideration of the proposal, the panel may recommend one of the following:

(a) that the candidate’s registration for a PhD be confirmed, or
(b) that the candidate be invited to revise and re-submit the proposal with one further opportunity to apply for a transfer of registration to PhD; or
(c) that the candidate be invited to complete the requirements for the award of MPhil.

Note: in the event that the board recommends (c), the candidate shall be eligible to appeal.

12. A candidate who has satisfied the requirements shall be required to submit a thesis of normally not more than 70,000 words. The thesis shall be examined according to the normal regulations. To be eligible for the award of the PhD, the thesis shall make an original contribution to knowledge and contain material of a standard appropriate for scholarly publication.

Research degrees undertaken in LICA

13. Subject to careful negotiation with LICA, a candidate for the degree of PhD or MPhil may submit, as an alternative to the standard PhD or MPhil written thesis, a project on a single research topic that has two components:

(a) a written thesis; and
(b) a substantial practical work (e.g., a theatrical production, installation, exhibition of work, recital, lecture-recital, or some other performative event, a play, a translation, a design, computer software, etc.).

14. The practical and written components, which interdependently constitute the “thesis” as such, will be evaluated in relation to each other after the written component has been submitted.

15. The examiners will evaluate the practical and written components according to the extent to which they both respond to a single list of specific and explicit research questions which should be submitted prior to the presentation of the practical component.
16. The practical component must negotiate and articulate a response to the research questions through a high level of skill in the manipulation of the materials of production or performance event. For the degree of PhD, the practical component, which can consist of a minor and a major submission, should normally be of an appropriate professional standard.

17. If the practical component involves the creation of a performance event/works or exhibition of work other practical outputs could also include, a model/prototype, or a series of conceptual works:

   (a) the board of examiners is required to attend the performance;
   (b) an audiovisual record of that event/work, or even live performances of that work on tour, will not be acceptable in lieu of a live performance at a designated venue unless the medium of video and DVD, the contingencies of touring, or the absence of locality, are factored into the research topic.

18. A permanent record of the practical component should normally be deposited with the written thesis in the University Library. If this creative aspect involves live performance or exhibition of work the permanent record should normally comprise:

   (a) a DVD and where appropriate an audio recording;
   (b) a short written factual description of the performance event or exhibition and its materials;
   (c) any artefacts or documentation integral to the creation of the work (e.g. audio tapes, production book, photographs, notation, copies of scores);
   (d) in the case of design, the design output could be included in documented form in the thesis itself, either in paper format or as a DVD, both of which form a permanent record of the work.

19. Just as the examiners can, according to the rules of the University, require the candidate to amend or revise a written thesis in part or in whole as a condition of an award, so they can also require the candidate to amend or revise the practical component in part or in whole, but only on the condition that they are not satisfied that any shortcomings in the practical submission can be compensated or accounted for in the written thesis. In such a case, the examiners should, wherever possible, set a cost-effective practical assignment that addresses their concerns rather than demand a revision of the original practical work in its entirety.

20. The written thesis must be of a quality commensurate with the usual standards set for MPhil or PhD, but need not be of the same length. The Department will advise each candidate on the exact minimum length of the written thesis. For a 50/50 split assessment the written thesis should not normally exceed 40,000 words for a PhD and 20,000 words for a MPhil (including any footnotes and appendices but excluding the bibliography). In other cases (e.g. 70/30 thesis/practical split) the word count will be agreed by the supervisor, the appropriate upgrade panel and the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate. The length of the written thesis should normally be agreed on a proportionate basis.
21. Entry requirements for candidates who wish to pursue a research degree with a practical component within the Department are as follows:

(a) all candidates would normally be expected to hold at least a good second class degree of a recognised institution or comparable institution or qualifications regarded by the University as equivalent;
(b) candidates should provide clear supporting evidence of experience and competence in a field of practice directly relevant to their proposed topic of study. While this experience may not necessarily have been gained within the professional sphere, candidates will be expected to demonstrate that they have achieved, or have the potential to achieve a “professional standard” of practice.

22. If the candidate is employed by the University as a member of staff, a second external examiner will be appointed. This examiner will preferably, but not necessarily, view the practical component, and has the primary function of ensuring that the whole thesis is scrutinised fairly.

Doctor of Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy)

23. In addition to the normal requirements for admission and award, a candidate shall maintain throughout the period of study her/his registration with the British Psychological Society.

24. A candidate shall register at the outset for a DClinPsy qualification and undertake taught courses and clinical placements specified by the department of registration. Such courses shall normally be completed within thirty-six months of first registration.

25. Successful completion of each course and placement is both qualificatory and progressional. A candidate who fails to satisfy the requirements of the scheme of assessment within the specified opportunities for examination and re-examination shall be required to withdraw. Students may appeal against this decision under the procedures for Academic Appeals.

26. A candidate who successfully completes all the required courses and placements shall, normally by early June of the third year of study, submit for examination a dissertation. The dissertation shall not exceed 50,000 words in length, inclusive of references and appendices. A successful candidate for the degree of DClinPsy shall show convincing evidence of the capacity to pursue scholarly research or scholarship, the results of which shall be embodied in a dissertation which makes an original contribution to knowledge and contains material of a standard appropriate for scholarly publication.

Doctor of Medicine (MD)

27. Eligibility: the award of MD is at doctoral level, and shall normally be taken after a candidate can demonstrate suitable clinical experience as an element of the admissions process.
28. Level: the Lancaster MD shall be a research degree that contains research conducted at the doctoral level, both in terms of the publishable quality of research that is expected in the thesis, and when viewed alongside the QAA’s FHEQ level descriptors. It shall be comparable in level to the Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DClinPsy).

29. Content: the degree will be awarded for research by thesis or by publication. The thesis should contain original work of publishable quality, but not necessarily in a publishable format. An award based on published work (defined as papers produced during registration) will use the same criteria as the University’s existing PhD by Alternative Format.

30. Duration: candidates will demonstrate, as an element of admissions, suitable prior experience in their chosen area of clinical study so as to be able to provide a basis for research equivalent to one-year of doctoral research; thereafter there will be a two-year minimum period of registration, full-time (or equivalent); exceptionally less for MD by published work.

31. Entry requirements: applicants must hold a medical or dental qualification which is recognised by the General Medical/Dental Council for the United Kingdom, shall have held this qualification for at least three years, by the date of submission, and shall be employed during their period of registration in appropriate clinical or scientific work in hospitals or institutions associated with the University.

32. Admission: The University shall only admit students for whom it is able to provide adequate and appropriate academic supervision. Each application shall be considered by an MD admissions panel, whose members shall include the potential supervisor(s) and the relevant head of department.

33. Initial registration: Students shall be initially registered for MSc by Research and the registration shall be upgraded to MD on satisfactory completion of the first year, based on evidence of research performance commensurate with doctoral level of study, judged by a written report and a viva voce examination.

34. Supervision: Each student shall be allocated to a supervisor by the department, who shall normally be an academic member of staff of the University, and who shall carry out the normal duties of a supervisor. In addition the faculty shall, where appropriate, arrange for each student to have access to clinical supervision, normally through the clinical institution where the student is undertaking his/her research.

35. Research skills: Each student shall be provided with opportunities to develop generic research skills including taking appropriate postgraduate taught modules, which shall be defined by the principal supervisor in consultation with the student. This taught element shall not form part of the formal assessment for the award of MD.
Alternative format

36. The candidate’s department of registration shall maintain and publish guidelines on the alternative format(s) judged appropriate to the discipline, for the information of students, supervisors and examiners. A department must obtain the approval of the faculty postgraduate teaching committee for its guidelines.

Notes:

(a) a candidate is encouraged to seek advice within her/his department of registration that the alternative format is more appropriate for the research project and that s/he can take full advantage of the alternative format;
(b) supervising departments are encouraged to seek, where practicable, the advice of the External Examiner(s) with respect to the alternative format proposed; and
(c) the guidelines shall form the basis of agreement between the student, supervisor and head of department (or her/his nominee) on the alternative format to be employed in the submission.

37. The thesis shall include original, researched materials, of which a significant proportion shall be derived from original research undertaken after the date of first registration.

Notes: materials may be:

(a) already published; and/or
(b) accepted for publication; and/or
(c) submitted for publication in externally refereed contexts such as journals, conference proceedings and on-line sites, and may include materials which are solely and/or partly authored by the candidate.

It is not a requirement that the materials be published or accepted or submitted for publication, prior to the submission of the thesis for examination.

38. Examiners shall satisfy themselves that the thesis as a whole meets the criteria for award of the degree, as outlined above.

Notes: examiners:

(a) may wish to pay particular attention to satisfying themselves that of any multi-authored materials included, a significant proportion is the work principally of the candidate; and
(b) are reminded of the freedom to specify additional tests as part of the examination.

European Doctorate

39. The European Doctorate is a qualification that was created by the Confederation of EU Rectors’ Conference (now the European University Association- www.eua.be)
and provides the opportunity to study for a qualification which meets the criteria which are commonly understood to be met in a doctorate, using examination procedures that are widely recognised across Europe, involving an ability to work in more than one language, and entailing periods of time spent working in institution across more than one EU member state.

40. The characteristics of the European Doctorate are those of the traditional Lancaster PhD with the following amendments.

(a) The thesis should be reviewed by at least two academics from different higher education institutions in different EU countries, excluding the UK. At least one member of the exam board should come from a EU country other than the UK. In the Lancaster context, this requirement would most easily be implemented by having two External Examiners at the board from EU countries other than the UK.

(b) Part of the defence must take place in one of the official languages of the EU other than English.

(c) The thesis must have been prepared partly as a result of a research period of at least one term spent at an institution in a EU country other than the UK.

41. The European doctorate is available in any of the areas in which the PhD is currently available at Lancaster, and is offered under the title of European Doctorate in XXXX, with postnominal letters of PhD.

DSc and DLitt

42. To be eligible for the degree of Doctor of Science (DSc) or of Doctor of Letters (DLitt), candidates shall be either graduates of the University, or members of staff of the University, whose record of published work and research shows conspicuous ability and originality and constitutes a distinguished and sustained achievement.

43. Any person who wishes to be considered for the award of the degree of DSc/DLitt shall submit a formal written letter of application to the Head of Student Registry, stating in outline on what basis the award is sought and what evidence in support of the application is available. Such letters of application may be submitted at any time.

44. As soon as possible after the letter of application has been submitted, the Head of Student Registry, acting on the advice of the relevant faculty dean, shall recommend to the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate an appropriate senior academic member of staff of the University or equivalent with appropriate specialist knowledge of and expertise in the field, to consider the information supplied.

45. The member of staff appointed shall consider whether a prima facie case for formal examination exists and shall recommend either:
(a) that the application proceed, in which case the procedure to be followed is that specified below; or
(b) that the application is not suitable for examination, in which case the procedure to be followed is that specified below.

46. Where a recommendation for formal examination to proceed is made, the member of staff shall recommend persons who might be appointed as examiners. The body or officer with delegated authority from Senate, acting on behalf of the Committee of Senate on the advice of the Head of Student Registry, shall approve the appointment of not fewer that two independent External Examiners, with expertise in the field, one of whom shall be the lead examiner. The officer with delegated authority from Senate, or his/her nominee, shall act as the internal examiner.

47. The Head of Student Registry, shall inform the applicant of the appointment of examiners, of what additional material in support of the application is required, and of the fee to be paid prior to the examination.

48. Where a recommendation is made that the application is not suitable for examination, the Head of Student Registry shall advise the candidate of this recommendation.

49. In such cases the candidate may:

(a) withdraw the application, whereupon no fee shall be payable;
(b) elect to proceed with the examination, and be liable for payment of the full fee, subject to confirmation by the Head of Student Registry that appropriate External Examiners are available and willing to act. In the absence of such confirmation the application will lapse.

PhD by Published Work

Award criteria

50. To be awarded a PhD by Published Work a candidate must show that his or her work makes a significant contribution to knowledge in a particular field. The publications must also provide evidence of the capacity of the candidate to pursue further research, representing a coherent contribution to research in a given field and demonstrating a depth of scholarship and originality comparable with that required in a PhD thesis. The material submitted shall be sufficiently extensive as to provide convincing evidence that the research constitutes a substantial contribution to knowledge or scholarship.

Admissions criteria

51. Candidates for the degree of PhD by submission of published work must be:

(a) members or past members of staff at Lancaster University or at one of Lancaster University's associated institutions (Edge Hill University, University of Cumbria, Blackburn College, and Blackpool and The Fylde College); or
(b) alumni of Lancaster University or of one of Lancaster University's associated institutions.

52. In order to be eligible for consideration, alumni must be graduates of at least five years' standing and have already obtained a Masters degree or show evidence of having received research training or equivalent experience. In exceptional circumstances, other candidates may also be considered.

Applications and registration

53. Applications may be made at any time. A letter of application should be accompanied by:

(a) a list of the publications to be submitted: these may include refereed articles, authored chapters, authored books, and edited works. They may not include course readers, internally published material or unpublished seminar/conference papers; and

(b) a supporting paper: this should summarise each publication submitted, outline their interrelationship, give a critical review of the current state of knowledge and research in the applicant's field and indicate how his or her work has contributed to the field. It should also comment on the standing of any journals and the reception of the publications as indicated by citations and reviews.

54. The candidate's application shall first be considered by either a Faculty's Associate Dean for Research or Postgraduate Studies (according to which officer has responsibility for PhD study), in consultation with the Head of the appropriate department. If the application is accepted, the applicant will then be registered to submit for the degree of PhD by Published Work, and an internal adviser will be appointed by the Head of Department to assist the candidate. A minimum period of three months and a maximum period of twelve months are allowed before submission.

Examination

55. Candidate shall submit for examination:

(a) three copies, in published form, of each item forming part of the work on which the application for the degree by published work is based. Permission to include work in manuscript, but which has been accepted for publication, may be granted;

(b) four copies of the supporting paper, modified, if necessary after consultation with the advisor;

(c) a statement as to what part if any of the material has been submitted for a degree or other qualification in this or any other University or other institution, explaining the reason for its inclusion and, if joint work is submitted, what part of it is the candidate's contribution.
56. A panel of examiners consisting of one internal and two External Examiners shall be appointed by the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate on behalf of the Committee of the Senate on the nomination of the department(s) concerned. The internal examiner will not normally have been appointed as adviser to the candidate. An oral examination will normally be held for the degree, but this requirement may be waived with the approval of the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate provided that all the examiners are in agreement.

57. The examiners shall make one of the following recommendations:

(a) that the degree of PhD by published work be awarded;
(b) that the degree be awarded subject to specified revisions of the supporting paper; or
(c) that the degree be not awarded.

58. The examiners may not recommend the award of a lower degree.

59. A candidate whose work has been found unacceptable for the award of the degree may be permitted to resubmit only after completing re-registration; normally, this would be no earlier than two years after the original submission.

60. Examiners’ reports and recommendations are considered by the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate on behalf of the Committee of the Senate, and a decision given to the candidate within one month of the oral examination.
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APPENDIX 4: REGISTRATION PERIOD FOR STUDENTS WHO REGISTERED ON OR BEFORE 30 SEPTEMBER 2008

PhD

1. For full-time students the minimum period of registration for the degree shall normally be thirty-six calendar months from the date of commencement of studies to the date of submission of the thesis. Full-time students may, with the approval of the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate or nominee, be permitted to register for a shorter period, as proposed by the admitting department. A shorter period of registration, which may in no case be for a period of less than twelve months, may be justified by accrediting the applicant’s attainment in original research prior to application and not otherwise accredited for a degree already awarded.

2. For part-time students the minimum period of registration for the degree shall normally be forty-eight calendar months from the date of commencement of studies to the date of submission of the thesis. Part-time students may, with the approval of the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate or nominee, be permitted to register for a shorter period, as proposed by the admitting department. A shorter period of registration, which may in no case be for a period of less than twenty-four months, may be justified by accrediting the applicant’s attainment in original research prior to application and not otherwise accredited for a degree already awarded.

3. For students registered as full-time the maximum period or registration shall be forty-eight months unless a shorter period is approved. For part-time students the maximum period shall be seventy-two months (or sixty months for any student registered before 1 October 2002). Any extension of the maximum period must be approved by Student Registry after consideration of evidence of the student’s progress submitted by the department concerned, up to an absolute maximum of eighty-four months for full-time students and ninety-six months for part-time students. The Head of the admitting Department may permit a candidate who has undertaken a period of study for the degree of MPhil, MSc by research, MSc, LLM, MMus, MBA or MA in this University, or an appropriate higher degree in another University, to register for the degree of PhD and may recognise all or part of such a period of study as counting towards the minimum and maximum periods of registration for the PhD degree. Such recognition shall not, however, be granted if the higher degree has already been awarded.

4. In cases where a student combines periods of full-time and part-time registration the following applies when calculating the maximum period of registration permissible: if full-time for 12 months or more then treat as full-time throughout, if full-time for less than 12 months then treat as part-time throughout.
MPhil

5. For full-time students the minimum period of registration for the degree shall normally be twenty-four calendar months from the date of commencement of studies to the date of submission of the thesis. Full-time students may, with the approval of the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate or nominee, be permitted to register for a minimum period of less than twenty-four months but in no case less than twelve months. Full-time students may, with the approval of Student Registry, be permitted to extend registration for a further twelve months. Normally an extension beyond that period will not be permitted.

6. For part-time students the minimum period of registration for the degree shall normally be thirty-six calendar months from the date of commencement of studies to the date of submission of the thesis. Part-time students may, with the approval of the body or officer with delegated authority from Senate or nominee, be permitted to register for a minimum period of less than thirty-six months but in no case less than twenty-four months. Part-time students may, with the approval of Student Registry, be permitted to extend registration for a further twelve months. Normally an extension beyond that period will not be permitted.

7. For students registered as full-time the maximum period shall be thirty-six months and for those registered as part-time the maximum period shall be forty-eight months. Any extension of the maximum period must be approved by Student Registry after consideration of evidence of the student's progress submitted by the department concerned. For both full- and part-time students the absolute maximum period shall not exceed sixty months. The Head of the admitting Department may recognise all or part of a period of study for the degree of LLM, MA., MBA, MMus, MSc, MRes, or PhD in this University, or for an appropriate higher degree in another University, as counting towards the total period for the degree of MPhil. Such recognition shall not, however, be granted if the higher degree has already been awarded.

8. In cases where a student combines periods of full-time and part-time registration the following applies when calculating the maximum period of registration permissible: if full-time for 12 months or more then treat as full-time throughout, if full-time for less than 12 months then treat as part-time throughout.
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APPENDIX 5: FRAMEWORK FOR THE RESEARCH DEGREE VIVA

The following Framework was adopted as ongoing institutional practice in May 2005, and is now incorporated within the regulations for research degrees.

The guidance set out below, and approved by the Senate, is designed to best protect the interests of all participants in the process, for any research degree examination leading to a Lancaster award (even when a viva voce is held away from Lancaster).

1. Definition of the viva voce

1.1 A viva voce is an oral examination of a research degree thesis, and of the student who wrote it, which is normally conducted in person, at Lancaster, by an internal and an external examiner.

1.2 The first stage of the examination is the review of the student’s thesis. The student submits his/her thesis directly to the Postgraduate Office (A.30, University House) in the Student Registry. The Registry is responsible for sending a copy to each examiner. The examiners independently read the thesis and write a Pre-Viva Voce report on it, with comments about its contribution to the field, its strengths and weaknesses, and possibly a range of points which they will raise at the viva voce.

2. Status of the viva voce

2.1 The viva voce is a compulsory part of all research degree examinations (M.Phil. and Ph.D.), however excellent or poor the thesis may be. The student always has the right to defend his/her work to the examiners.

2.2 It is not possible under current regulations for a student to fail a research degree outright without undertaking a viva voce.

3. Role of each participant in the viva voce

3.1 The external examiner(s): the role of the external examiner(s) (someone not connected with the University) is to assess the quality of the submission and help to uphold the quality of the degree in the UK.

3.2 In certain circumstances, there may be a third examiner, external to the University, involved to ensure impartiality. This would happen if:

   (a) the student is a member of staff, or holds a temporary teaching or research contract at the University;
   (b) the student is being examined for a Ph.D. by Published Work;
   (c) the student’s supervisor is acting also as the internal examiner.
3.3 The internal examiner(s): the role of the internal examiner(s) is to assess the quality of the submission and help to uphold the quality of a Lancaster award. The role is similar to that of the external examiner(s), and it has equal status and standing. It is not the role of the internal examiner to protect the student, to be the student’s friend, and/or to defend the supervisor, department or institution against criticism from the external examiner(s), nor to act as chair in the viva voce (unless the department decides not to have an independent chair: see clause 6.1). The internal examiner must be and be seen to be independent; and thus wherever practicable he/she should not have played any significant role in either the supervision of the student or the assessment of the student during his/her studies (e.g. annual progress review, upgrade panel).

3.4 The independent chair: the role of the independent chair is to be an observer and manager of the meeting, and to ensure that procedures are followed properly. The chair does not need to be a subject specialist, does not need to have read the thesis, and is not directly involved in examining it. If a department decides not to have an independent chair (see clause 6.1), it must arrange for an audio record of the viva voce to be made and retained (see clause 7). If there is no independent chair, the internal examiner will normally be expected to chair the viva voce. There should always be an independent chair where the internal and/or external examiners are inexperienced (usually defined as having participated in less than two vivas at the appropriate level).

3.5 The student: the role of the student is to discuss, explain and defend his/her work as represented in the thesis being examined, to be open to critical appraisal by the examiners, and to be prepared and willing to engage in a dialogue with the examiners about the substance and field of enquiry of the thesis.

3.6 The supervisor(s): whether the supervisor is present throughout the viva voce (see clause 5.1 (a)), or attends at the end when the examiners report to the student their decision about the outcome of the examination, his/her role is to be a silent witness to the proceedings, and through that to be able to provide feedback to and advise the student after the viva voce is completed.

4. Student preparation for the viva voce

4.1 All students should be allowed and encouraged to acquire relevant experience in defending the thesis, in advance of the viva voce, including:

(a) by robust interrogation of their work and progress during each annual appraisal and at the upgrade panel;
(b) by being given special training for the viva voce (including a mock viva voce). This is probably best done by their faculty (e.g. through the faculty training programmes).

4.2 It would be inappropriate for the chair and/or internal examiner(s) to be directly involved in the student’s training for the viva voce.
4.3 The Student Registry should send a *Guide to the Viva* to each student when he/she submits a thesis for examination.

5. **Membership of viva voce panel**

5.1 *Supervisor*

   (a) The student’s supervisor(s) may attend the viva voce with the approval of the examiners and the student.

   (b) If not present throughout the viva voce, the supervisor(s) should normally be invited to attend the final stage of the viva voce when the examiners report their decision to the student, unless the student advises the chair, before the viva voce, that he/she would prefer the supervisor not to attend.

   (c) If present, the supervisor(s) must remain silent and impassive, unless specifically invited to comment on specific points, by the examiners, through the chair.

5.2 *Independent chair*

   (a) There should normally be an independent chair present throughout the viva voce (see clause 6.1). The chair should normally be a member of academic staff (or an emeritus member), who is neither an examiner nor a supervisor of the student being examined.

   (b) The independent chair should be selected by the relevant head of department or his/her nominee.

   (c) The chair must be familiar with this guidance, and with the Regulations for Higher Degrees of the University.

   (d) The chair would normally be expected to have experience of conducting at least three research degree vivas as an examiner.

   (e) No member of staff should normally be expected to serve as independent chair on more than one viva voce per term (three per year).

6. **Chair and/or audio record**

6.1 Departments have discretion to decide, on a case-by-case basis, whether to have an independent chair (see clause 5.2) and/or to keep an audio record (see clause 7.1) of the viva voce proceedings. They must adopt at least one of the two.

6.2 An independent chair and an audio record do not serve the same purpose, so departments need to give careful thought about which one(s) they will adopt in each case.
6.3 The decisions about the independent chair and the audio record must be notified to the Student Registry at the time of appointment of the internal and external examiners.

7. Record keeping

7.1 Departments have discretion not to make an audio record of a particular viva voce, provided they appoint an independent chair (see clause 6.1).

7.2 If the department decides that it is appropriate to record a viva voce on audio tape or minidisk, the person taking the chair at the viva voce should ensure that the audio record is made and lodged with the Student Registry.

7.3 Nothing will be done with the audio record (no one will listen to it) unless it is to be used as evidence in the event of an appeal/complaint.

7.4 The audio record should normally be kept in the Student Registry for no longer than twelve months after the viva voce, unless the student has made an appeal/complaint against the decision of the examiners (in which case the audio record should be kept until the end of the appeal/complaint process).

8. Timing and arrangements

8.1 The maximum period of time between submission of thesis by student and the date of the viva voce examination should normally be three months.

8.2 The postgraduate director in the student’s department is responsible for making arrangements for the viva voce (including day, time, location and name of the independent chair if there is one), and for communicating this information to the examiners, the student, the chair and the supervisor(s).

8.3 Appropriate arrangements should be made available for disabled students, on the same basis as for other forms of University assessments, in order to provide an equal opportunity to defend the thesis.

8.4 The examiners, chair and student should be given as much notice as possible about the day and time of the viva voce, and this should normally be not less than two weeks prior to the appointed date.

8.5 The chair is responsible for making sure that seating arrangements in the viva voce room are appropriate for dialogue between the participants.

8.6 Video-conferencing of a viva voce examination, with either the candidate or an examiner at a remote location, is permissible as long as the student is not disadvantaged by its use, and as long as all parties consent to it. The University retains the right to refuse a request to use video-conferencing; such a refusal will not constitute grounds for appeal. Guidance for the conduct of such a viva voce examination is in Appendix 6.
8.7 The internal examiner should collate written guidance from all the examiners on required changes to the thesis to be undertaken within a reasonable period of time after the viva voce. For minor corrections (3 months) the information should normally be collated within two weeks; for major revisions (6 or 12 months) within one month.

8.8 The internal examiner should forward the written guidance from the examiners to the student, and send a copy to the Student Registry, without delay.

8.9 The period of minor corrections (3 months) or major revisions (6 or 12 months) should commence on the day written guidance from examiners on required changes is sent to the student (and to the Student Registry) by the internal examiner.

9. Examiners’ written report

9.1 Examiners are required to provide written reports on the thesis before the viva voce examination, to establish that they have read the thesis before the viva voce, and to record their initial judgements formed on the basis of reading the thesis.

9.2 Examiners are required to write separate such reports independently of each other, and send them to the Student Registry, before they exchange views and compare notes with the other examiners.

9.3 Examiners should be given the opportunity (but not be required) in such reports to give a provisional decision about the outcome of the examination.

9.4 The reports should only be seen before the viva voce by administrative staff who have no vested interest in the outcome of the examination.

9.5 Under Data Protection legislation, the student has no right of access to the reports before the examination process is complete.

10. The purpose of the viva voce examination

10.1 The viva voce is an opportunity for the student to defend the thesis.

10.2 It is not a purpose of the viva voce to test the student’s command of spoken English in what is often a stressful situation. This is particularly important for students whose first language is not English, and for some disabled students.

10.3 The viva voce should normally include the assessment of the student’s ability to:

(a) locate his/her research in the broader context;
(b) display detailed knowledge of the thesis;
(c) authenticate the work (i.e. to prove that it is the student’s own work).

10.4 Criterion (a) should be explicitly commented on in the examiners’ reports.
10.5 Criteria (a) to (c) should be explicitly evaluated during the viva voce.

10.6 It is appropriate in the viva voce to ask questions about the originality of the thesis, and about the contribution the thesis makes to knowledge.

10.7 The student should also be able to defend the methodology and conclusions of the thesis, and display awareness of the limitations of the thesis, in the viva voce.

10.8 For the viva voce to be regarded as successful, the student should satisfy the examiners that s/he is worthy of the research degree, which ultimately is a matter of academic judgement by the examiners.

11. Conduct of the viva voce

11.1 Existing University Regulations cover procedures for dealing with disagreements between examiners.

11.2 Examiners should not normally be able to fail or refer a thesis on grounds that are not considered with the student in the viva voce. The decision should be based on what is discussed in the viva voce.

11.3 An audio record (see clause 7) is helpful in reconstructing what was discussed in the viva voce, and how it was discussed.

11.4 The viva voce should give the student an opportunity to defend anything the examiners regard as problematic. It will normally be expected to touch upon the issues that the examiners regard as important in reaching their decision about the award of the degree in question.

11.5 The student should be told by the chair at the beginning of the viva voce, that no information about outcomes will be provided until the end of the viva voce examination, and that no conclusions should be drawn from this. This is because to indicate or hint at outcomes could:

(a) partly negate the value of the viva in the assessment process;
(b) compromise the ability of the examiners to change their mind during the course of the viva voce;
(c) have a significant impact on how the student feels and responds to questioning during the viva voce.

11.6 A typical viva voce should normally last for not less than one hour and not more than four hours, although it is recognised that practice varies between disciplines.

11.7 Questions during the viva voce should be fair and appropriate. Fair play should be maintained, and proper procedures should be followed.
11.8 If the chair and examiners anticipate that a viva voce is likely to last more than about two hours, the chair should give an opportunity for a break after two hours, provided that to do so does not disadvantage the student.

11.9 The chair shall have final decision on when the viva voce should finish, taking into account the views of the examiners, and the need to uphold fair play and to give the student an opportunity to defend his/her work.

12. **Student role in the viva voce**

12.1 Examiners are expected to be open-minded in their probing of the student’s work, and to approach the task in a spirit of academic integrity.

12.2 The chair should ensure that the student is given the opportunity to present a brief verbal summary of their work (15 minutes maximum), towards the start of the viva voce, if they wish to do so.

12.3 The chair should ensure that the student is given an appropriate right of reply to points raised by the examiners, during and at the end of the viva voce.

12.4 If the student feels during the course of the viva voce that the questions are not fair or appropriate, that they are being denied the right of reply, or that proper procedures are not being followed, s/he should be able to call for a break, and talk privately with the chair.

12.5 If the chair grants such a time out during the viva voce, the conversation between student and chair should not be overheard by the examiners, but it should be recorded on the audio tape or mini-disk if the viva voce is recorded.

13. **Outcome of the viva voce**

13.1 Towards the end of the viva voce, the student (and supervisor(s) if present) should be asked to leave the room while the examiners decide what outcome they think appropriate (see section 18).

13.2 The chair should remain present throughout the viva voce.

13.3 When the examiners have reached their decision, the student (normally accompanied by the supervisor(s)) should then be invited back into the room, to be told (normally by the external examiner) what the examiners will be recommending to the University.

13.4 The outcome given at the end of the viva voce is a recommendation, subject to approval by the body or officer with delegated authority from the Committee of Senate.
14. **Post-Viva Voce Reports**

14.1 All examiners are required to submit a further written report after the viva voce, which includes their judgement of the quality of the thesis and the student’s performance in the viva voce, and contains their recommendation about the award of the degree:

(a) examiners can submit a joint report if they agree on the outcome, and if producing a joint report is practical under the circumstances;
(b) examiners must submit separate reports if they disagree on the outcome.

14.2 Under Data Protection legislation, students have a right of access to their post-viva voce report after Senate approval of the examiners’ recommendation is confirmed and the examination (including any revisions) has been completed.

14.3 Any examiner may indicate that part (to be highlighted explicitly) or all of his/her report should be disclosed to the student before the examiners’ recommendations are approved by the Senate, if the examiner believes this would help the student to make appropriate corrections or revisions.

14.4 The internal examiner is responsible for making sure that the student is made fully aware of the examiners’ expectations in respect of which corrections or revisions are felt necessary (see 8.6).

15. **Second Viva Voce**

15.1 The examiners can require a student to attend a second viva voce as part of the examination of a resubmitted thesis, but not for minor corrections.

16. **Student’s right of appeal**

16.1 A student has no right of appeal against the academic judgement of the examiners. A student may appeal, however, against the outcome of the examination under the procedures for Academic Appeals as defined in the chapter on Academic Appeals.

16.2 All students of the University have the right to make a complaint under the Student Charter.

17. **Publication of guidelines**

17.1 These guidelines and criteria will be published - in printed form, on the University web site, and in other Alternative Formats (large print, Braille and audio) entitled Guidance to the Viva, and will be:

(a) given to each research degree student when submitting the thesis;
(b) given to the examiners on appointment, to the chair on designation, and to the supervisor on submission of the thesis.
APPENDICES TO THE POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH ASSESSMENT REGULATIONS

APPENDIX 6: VIVA VOCE EXAMINATIONS VIA VIDEO-CONFERENCING

1. Video-conferencing facilities may be used in viva voce examinations only when either an examiner or the candidate is based at such a distance from the University that it is unreasonable, because of prohibitively high cost, difficulties of time or restricted mobility, to insist that all parties should be present in the same location.

2. It is strongly recommended that those involved should not be in more than two locations.

3. The consent of all involved must be obtained prior to any party being allowed to participate via video-conferencing.

4. The candidate’s supervisor(s) and internal examiner are responsible for ensuring that all parties involved in the examination are informed in good time of the details of the video-conferencing arrangements.

5. Student Registry must be informed, in advance of the examination, if any party is to be participating via video-conferencing.

6. Any time differences between the two locations must be taken into account to ensure that the candidate is not disadvantaged by an examination taking place at an inappropriate time.

7. The equipment/software should be tested at least one week in advance of the examination, using the same computers, systems and locations as will be used for the examination. Care must be taken to ensure that the technology used is as reliable as possible.

8. Contingency plans are essential in the event of technology failure.

9. The set-up of the conference facilities should be such that all those involved should be able to see one another at all times.

10. Where the candidate is the remote party, a member of Lancaster University staff who can confirm the candidate’s identity must be present at the beginning of the examination, and any materials brought into the conference by the candidate should be identified at the start of the examination and be visible throughout.

11. The University will not normally permit any person to be present with the candidate other than technical staff involved in the use of video-conferencing facilities.
12. When concluding a viva voce examination which has involved video-conferencing, all participants should be asked to confirm that the holding of the examination by video-conference has had no substantive bearing on the examination process.

13. If not co-located, the examiners may agree on the wording of the joint report by email or telephone. Each examiner should sign the independent report and the joint report and forward them to Student Registry as soon as possible after the examination.

14. Examiners should comment on the conduct of the viva voce examination using the standard examiner’s report form and should refer explicitly to the use of video-conferencing.

15. Having agreed to a viva voce examination involving video-conferencing the candidate will not be permitted to use this as grounds for appeal, unless the circumstances of technical failure or other unforeseen eventualities beyond the control of the Board of Examiners were deemed to have adversely affected the candidate’s performance and these were identified at the end of the examination (see 12 above).