

Amendments to UPR AS14 (Structure and Assessment Regulations - Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate Programmes) for 2019/20

This paper summarises the amendments to UPR AS14 for the 2019/20 academic year.

1. Contribution of prior UH credit to degree classification

Unless the credits were for standalone UH credit, current UH regulations do not allow any student with more than 30 credits of APL to gain a classified Master's degree other than a pass. Students are unable to re-use grades from a previous UH award, for instance. This affects a significant number of students, including the majority of part-time PGT students in some Schools. Additionally, in some Schools (HSK, LMS) these prior UH awards are required by a PSRB for their licence to practice. For equity and to maximise students' potential in achieving good classifications, it is therefore proposed that any UH module grade (whether a standalone module or a module that has contributed to a prior UH award) can be counted toward the classification of a Master's degree. The proposal does not extend to Honours classification, as a separate level 6 entry classification algorithm negates the need. The following amendment to UPR AS14, section D7.2 has therefore been approved:

D7 Final awards – Awards with distinction and commendation

D7.2 Criteria for conferring University awards 'with Distinction' or 'with Commendation'

- D7.2.7 For entrants to taught Master's Degrees where up to **30** credits of *non-University of Hertfordshire* APL have been approved, awards 'with Distinction' or 'with Commendation' *shall* be determined from the average numeric grade of the best **150** credits contributing to the programme. For entrants where over **30** credits of *non-University of Hertfordshire* APL have been approved and fewer than **150** credits of University of Hertfordshire credit have been passed, awards 'with Distinction' or 'with Commendation' cannot be made.
- D7.2.8 All Pass grades (including referred passes) and compensated grades are eligible for inclusion in the determination of the combined average numeric grade, with the exception of grades awarded for additional modules which are not part of a validated programme of study.
- D7.2.9 Any graded University of Hertfordshire *standalone* credit (~~that is, credit not associated with a programme of study~~) achieved prior to admission to the programme is eligible for inclusion in the determination of the combined average numeric grade, providing that the modules or short courses concerned have been shown to contribute towards the achievement of the programme learning outcomes through an APCL process.

2. Academic Misconduct

- a) The OIA have advised UH that its UPRs on academic misconduct are unduly complex. In particular, the distinction made between the broad category of 'assessment offences' and the subset 'academic misconduct'. This distinction is currently used in the UPRs to explain which types of offences should go to SAMPs rather than being dealt with by SACOs in Schools. It has therefore been agreed that all offences should be referred to as 'academic misconduct'.
- b) It is also felt that in the case of some first offences of cheating, where a student admits the offence, it is unnecessary for the case to be heard by a SAMP. It has been agreed that some allegations of cheating may therefore be dealt with by SACOs in School where the student admits the offence and a disciplinary warning would be an appropriate penalty (rather than Suspension or Exclusion). In light of this, SACOs now have the option of

imposing a Disciplinary Warning where the student admits the offence. An informal warning from a SACO remains an option and would continue to be recorded on the School's Academic Misconduct records but not on the individual student record. Finally, it has been agreed that SACOs should be able to require students to attend sessions to improve their understanding of academic misconduct;

- c) SACOs are facing an increasing number of cases where students are making their coursework available to other students. Whilst UPR AS14, Appendix III, section 2.1.4 does make this an offence of 'other academic misconduct', the wording of the University's definition of collusion in section 2.1.3 does not cover working on one's own and then making work available to another. SACOs frequently fail to refer section 2.1.4 when bringing a case to SAMPs, with the result that students who make their coursework available go unpunished. It has therefore been agreed that in section 2.1.3, the definition of collusion be amended to make it clearer to students that making their work available to others is a very serious offence in itself.

The following amendment to UPR AS14, Appendix III has therefore been approved:

~~ASSESSMENT OFFENCES-ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT~~

SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL CHANGES

General changes	
None	
Section	

(Amendments to version **11.0**, UPR AS14, Appendix III are shown in italics.)

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 ~~Cheating, plagiarism, collusion, other Assessment Offences and~~ Academic Misconduct:
- i ~~are is defined in Appendix I, UPR AS12¹/Appendix I, UPR AS13² which also set out a range of offences that the University will normally regard as Assessment Offences and/or Academic Misconduct:~~ While the University has attempted to present as comprehensive a list as possible, ~~thise list of offences of Academic Misconduct offences set down in section 2~~ should not be considered exhaustive;
 - ii ~~will;~~ In the first instance, *Academic Misconduct offences shall* be dealt with in accordance with the procedure set out in this document (Appendix III, UPR AS14);
 - iii Student Programme Handbooks ~~shall also~~ include a *link to the UPRs on section on cheating, plagiarism, collusion and other Assessment Offences and/or* Academic Misconduct; and
 - iv *the provisions of this appendix apply only to taught students and not to research students. For provisions applying to research students see UPR RE02 Research Misconduct.*
- 1.2 The nature of some of the offences defined in section 2 of this document is such that ~~they are they are either wholly or partly~~ a matter of academic judgement. ~~Whether or not a student intended to commit an Assessment Offence is not relevant for a finding of guilt. Whether Academic Misconduct has occurred shall be judged on a balance of probabilities having regard for the seriousness of the offence.~~

2 DEFINITIONS

¹ UPR AS12 Appendix I 'Assessments and Examinations - Regulations for Candidates(Including Requests for the Review of Examination Decisions (Appeals Procedure) (University-delivered provision)'

² UPR AS13 Appendix I 'Assessments and Examinations - Regulations for Candidates (Including Requests for the Review of Examination Decisions (Appeals Procedure)) (Partner Organisation-delivered provision)'

2.1 ~~Appendix I, UPR AS12¹, and Appendix I, UPR AS13², defines cheating plagiarism, collusion and other Assessment Offences/ For the purposes of UPR AS14, Appendix III and UPR AS13, Appendix I, Academic Misconduct is defined as follows:~~

“2.1.1 ‘cheating’:

to *gain or* attempt to gain an unfair, improper or dishonest advantage in the assessment process;

~~to gain an unfair, improper or dishonest advantage in the assessment process;~~

~~where on the balance of probability it could reasonably be construed that a candidate intended to gain an unfair, improper or dishonest advantage in the assessment process.~~

Cheating includes:

- a impersonation - either where a student allows any other person to take *an* assessment ~~on their behalf or to presents themselves as being that student~~ or where a current University of Hertfordshire student takes an assessment on behalf of another University of Hertfordshire student;
- b obtaining or attempting to obtain unauthorised access to examination / *in-class test* papers *and any other forms of assessment*;
- c the copying of, or attempting to copy, the work of another candidate in the examination or other in class assessment, whether by *overlooking looking over* what he or she has written or is writing or by asking him or her for information in whatever form;
- d the introduction into an examination room (or any other room in which a formal assessment is taking place) of aids including books, notes, personal notes or revision notes in any form, papers, stationery, computer disks or other devices of any kind other than those permitted in the rubric of the examination paper. This includes, for example, unauthorised information stored in the memory of a pocket calculator, in a mobile telephone, personal organiser or any other device;
- e requesting a temporary absence from an examination room (or any other room in which a formal assessment is taking place) with the intention of gaining, or attempting to gain, access to information that may be relevant to a formal assessment;
- f *submitting false documentation or making* false statements ~~made~~ in order to receive special considerations by the Board of Examiners or to obtain extensions to deadlines or exemption from work;
- g assisting or attempting to assist another University of Hertfordshire student to gain or attempt to gain an unfair, improper, or dishonest advantage in the assessment process;
- h the misappropriation of material submitted for assessment;
- i contract cheating - using one or more of a range of services provided or input from a third party, with or without payment of any kind:
 - i ‘services’ includes the provision of essays or other types of assignments, conducting research;
 - ii ‘third party’ includes web-based companies or auction sites (essay mills), sharing websites (including essay banks), or an individual such as a lecturer, fellow student, friend or relative;
 - iii ‘Input’ means that the third party contributes to the work of the student, such that there is reasonable doubt as to whose work the assessment represents’;

~~j — academic misconduct offences as defined by section 2.1.4, a – f, where on a balance of probability, it could reasonably be construed that a candidate attempted or intended to gain an unfair, improper or dishonest advantage in the assessment process.~~

2.1.2 ‘plagiarism’:

the misappropriation or use of others’ ideas, intellectual property or work (written or otherwise), without acknowledgement or permission. This may include, but is not limited to:

- a the importing of phrases from or all or part of another person’s work without using quotation marks and identifying the source;

- b *making extensive use of another person's work, without acknowledgement of the source*, either by summarising or paraphrasing the work merely by changing a few words or by altering the order in which the material is presented;
- c the use of the ideas of another person without acknowledgement of the source or the presentation of work which substantially comprises the ideas of another person and which represents these as being the ideas of the candidate.

(Note for guidance:

For the avoidance of doubt, plagiarism may be intentional or unintentional.)

2.1.3 'collusion':

~~evidence of~~ The representation by an individual of work which he or she has undertaken jointly with another person *or persons* as having been undertaken independently of that person. *Collusion includes, but is not limited to, the submission by a student of the work of another student in circumstances where the latter has willingly made the work available and where it should be evident that the recipient of the work could submit it as their own. In such cases, both students are guilty of collusion.*

2.1.4 'other Academic Misconduct/~~Assessment Offences~~'

evidence that a student failed to comply with the University's assessment and examination regulations, other than those offences falling under sections 2.1.1 to 2.1.3, above, including:

- a the falsification of data including the creation of false written materials or statistical data or its alteration, for example, by the invention of the statistics presented or the invention of quotations or references;
- b the duplication of assessed work – the submission of broadly similar *academic* work *previously* completed by the student for academic credit as part of the same programme without express acknowledgement of the previous submission;
- c the removal of an examination script or examination stationery or other materials from the examination room (or any other room in which a formal assessment is taking place);
- d failure to comply with the instructions of an invigilator;
- e the introduction into the examination room of any personal notes or revision notes in any form or stationery *regardless of any attempt to use it;*
- ~~f permitting or assisting another to present work that has been copied or paraphrased from a student's own work without attribution or as if it were the work of the other;~~
- f* breach of professional confidentiality;
- g* failure to obtain ethics approval prior to undertaking work involving human participants (*UPR RE01 refers*);
- h* failure to comply with the terms and conditions of an ethics approval granted for work involving human participants (*UPR RE01 refers*).

~~2.1.5 'Serious Adverse Circumstances':~~

~~Section C.3.8, UPR AS14³, refers.~~

~~2.2 Offences~~

~~2.2.1 The following are regarded as offences:~~

- ~~i cheating;~~
- ~~ii plagiarism;~~
- ~~iii collusion;~~
- ~~iv Academic Misconduct/Assessment Offences."~~

³ UPR AS14 'Structure and Assessment Regulations – Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate Programmes'

2.2 Allegations of ~~cheating, plagiarism, collusion and other Assessment Offences~~ *Academic Misconduct shall* be investigated in accordance with the procedures set out in this document (UPR AS14, Appendix III). Should such allegations be proven, the University reserves the right, at its sole discretion, to impose any of the ~~academic~~ penalties set out in this document (UPR AS14, Appendix III), and where the allegation is ~~referred to a Student Academic Misconduct Panel treated as an Academic Misconduct matter~~, under the provisions of UPR SA13⁴ or UPR SA15⁵ in Appendix I, UPR SA13⁶/Appendix I UPR SA15⁷.”

3 **ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT - CASES DEALT WITH THROUGH THE STUDENT DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURES**

~~3.1 Alleged Academic Misconduct offences which necessarily involve making decisions that go beyond purely academic judgement will be dealt with in accordance with the provision of UPR SA13⁴ or UPR SA15⁵. The University regards the following as matters to be referred for consideration under the provisions of UPR SA13⁴ or UPR SA15⁵:~~

~~i **Plagiarism**, as defined in section 2.1.2, where an Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) (or nominee) considers the matter to be sufficiently serious to be dealt with under the provisions of the student disciplinary procedures (UPR SA13⁴) or to be considered under the provisions of UPR SA15⁵.~~

~~ii **Cheating**, as defined in section 2.1.1.~~

~~iii **Collusion**, as defined in section 2.1.3, where an Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) (or nominee) considers the matter to be sufficiently serious to be dealt with under the provisions of the student disciplinary procedures (UPR SA13⁴) or to be considered under the provisions of UPR SA15⁵, in which case the circumstances will include, but may not necessarily be limited to:~~

~~a where an allegation of collusion has been made and one or more of the parties contests it, the matter will be dealt with through the student disciplinary procedure for the specific purpose of determining whether the alleged offence has been committed and by whom; where the disciplinary process identifies an offender, in addition to any disciplinary penalty that may be applied under the provisions of Appendix I, UPR SA13⁶ or Appendix I, UPR SA15⁷, the matter will then be referred to the appropriate Short Course/Module Board of Examiners (see section 3.2).~~

~~iv **breach of professional confidentiality;**~~

~~v **failure to obtain ethics approval prior to undertaking work involving human participants** (UPR RE01⁸, refers) where the Chairman of the relevant Ethics Committee with Delegated Authority (ECDA), acting as the nominee of the relevant Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance), considers the matter to be sufficiently serious to be dealt with under the provisions of UPR SA13⁴ or UPR SA15⁵ (UPR RE01⁸, refers);~~

~~vi **failure to comply with the terms and conditions of an ethics approval granted for work involving human participants** (UPR RE01⁸, refers) where the Chairman of the relevant ECDA, acting as the nominee of the relevant Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance), considers the matter to be sufficiently serious to be dealt with under the provisions of UPR SA13⁴ or UPR SA15⁵ (UPR RE01⁸, refers).~~

3.1 Where a Student Academic Misconduct Panel ~~or Fitness to Practise Panel~~ (or equivalent panel in a partner institution, where agreed), convened under the provisions of UPR SA13⁴ or UPR SA15⁵, finds that an Academic Misconduct offence, as defined in section 2, has been committed, the Student Academic Misconduct Panel ~~or the Fitness to Practise Panel shall se~~

⁴ UPR SA13 'Student Discipline', or equivalent Student Discipline Code operating in a partner institution, where agreed

⁵ UPR SA15 'Fitness to Practise'

⁶ Appendix I, UPR SA13 'University Schedule of Sanctions and Penalties for Academic and Non-Academic Disciplinary Offences'

⁷ Appendix I, UPR SA15 'University Schedule of Sanctions and Penalties for Academic and Non-Academic Disciplinary Offences'

⁸ UPR RE01 'Studies Involving the Use of Human Participants'

inform the Short Course/Module Board of Examiners. The Short Course/Module Board of Examiners *shall* exercise its academic judgement *and when* allocating marks (see section 4.4.2). The role of the Short Course/Module Board of Examiners is to exercise academic judgement. It has no role in determining the disciplinary ~~or other sanctions or~~ penalties that might be imposed *by (i) the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or nominee* under the provisions of section 4.4.3 or *(ii) a Student Academic Misconduct Panel UPR SA13⁴ or (iii) a Fitness to Practice Panel under UPR SA15⁵. Conversely, neither a Student Academic Misconduct Panel nor the Vice-Chancellor may seek to influence a Short Course/Module Board of Examiners in exercising its academic judgement in relation to a student.*

~~4 ASSESSMENT OFFENCES DEALT WITH BY SHORT COURSE/MODULE BOARDS~~

~~4.1 Assessment Offences~~

~~4.1.1 The following types of Assessment Offence will be dealt with by Short Course/Module Boards and will not be referred for consideration under the provisions of UPR SA13⁴ or UPR SA15⁵:~~

- ~~i **plagiarism**, as defined in section 2.1.2, not referred by an Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) (or nominee) to the student disciplinary process (see section 3.1);~~
- ~~ii **collusion**, as defined in section 2.1.3, where an Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) (or nominee) considers that the collusion should not be dealt with under the provisions of the student disciplinary process and where the allegation is not contested;~~
- ~~iii **Assessment Offences as defined in section 2.1.4, a-f inclusive.**~~

~~4.2 The Assessment Offences referred to in section 4.1, i – iii, will be dealt with in accordance with the procedures set out in section 5 of this document. The Short Course/Module Board has absolute discretion to impose any of the penalties set out in section 5.~~

4 PROCEDURE

4.1 Allegations of ~~plagiarism, collusion and other Assessment Offences and/or~~ Academic Misconduct, as defined in section 2, *shall* be made, in writing, to the appropriate Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or nominee and *shall* be accompanied by appropriate documentary evidence to support the allegation (see section 4.3).

4.2 To enable alleged offences involving the ethics regulations to be considered (UPR RE01⁸, refers), one or more of the Chairmen of Ethics Committees with Delegated Authority (ECDA) *shall* be appointed as nominees of the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) for the purposes of dealing with cases relating to alleged breaches of the University's ethics regulations (UPR RE01⁸, refers).

(Note for guidance:

The matters referred to in section 4.2 include alleged failure to obtain ethics approval prior to undertaking work involving human participants (UPR RE01⁸, refers) and failure to comply with the terms and conditions of an ethics approval granted for work involving human participants (UPR RE01⁸, refers).

For the proper administration of these procedures, where an allegation is received by the Chairman or Clerk of an ECDA or other member of staff, he or she is expected to inform the relevant Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) who *shall* ensure that the matter is referred to the most appropriate ECDA Chairman and that he or she has been formally designated to act as nominee.

The *nominated* Chairman of the ECDA ~~so designated~~ is required to follow the procedures set out in section 4.3 and to ensure that the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) is fully briefed on the progress of the matter.

Where the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) is also the Chairman of the ECDA and intends to deal with the allegation in that capacity, he or she may nominate another member of staff of appropriate standing to act as the nominee of the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) for the purposes of these procedures.}

4.3 Responsibilities of the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or nominee

~~(Note for guidance~~

Associate Deans of School (Academic Quality Assurance) and their nominees are advised to note their responsibilities under the provisions of UPR SA13⁴ and UPR SA15⁵.

4.3.1 The Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance)-or nominee *shall* carry out a preliminary investigation.

4.3.2 Provided that there is a prima facie case to be discussed with the student and investigated further by the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or nominee, he or she *shall*:

- i within five (5) working days of the date on which the allegation was referred to him or her, or as soon as possible thereafter:
 - a inform the student, in writing, by means of a **Letter of Notification**:
 - 1 of the alleged offence and the underlying facts that have been provided to support the allegation;
 - 2 that the student has a right to refute the *allegation(s)* of ~~Assessment Offence and/or~~ Academic Misconduct to the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or nominee ~~either in person or~~ in writing within five (5) working days of the date of the **Letter of Notification** (not the date of its receipt by the student);
 - 3 that, based upon the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or nominee's investigation, the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or nominee may refer the matter to be dealt with under the provision of UPR SA13⁴ or UPR SA15⁵.
- ~~ii consider the allegation and any supporting documentation, seek advice from whomsoever he or she deems appropriate and either:~~
- ii *using the criteria set out in section 4.3.3 below, decide whether or not the allegation should be referred to a Student Academic Misconduct Panel to be determined under the provisions of UPR SA13 or a Fitness to Practise Panel under the provisions of UPR SA15 using the following criteria set out in para 4 3.3 below.*

4.3.3 **Criteria for referral to a Student Academic Misconduct Panel under UPR SA13**

- a. *The following cases of Academic Misconduct must be referred to a Student Academic Misconduct Panel under the provisions of UPR SA13 or (unless the decision has been taken to refer the case to a Fitness to Practise Panel under UPR SA15):*
 - i *allegations of impersonation as defined by section 2.1.1 a;*
 - ii *obtaining or attempting to obtain unauthorised access to examination / in-class test papers and other forms of assessment section 2.1.1b;*
 - iii *the falsification of documentation or the making of false statements in order to receive special considerations by the Board of Examiners as defined by section 2.1.1f;*
 - iv ~~the stealing~~ *or misappropriation of material submitted for assessment;*
 - v *contract cheating as defined by section 2.1.1 i;*
 - vi *where an allegation of collusion under section 2.1.3 is contested by one or*
 - vii *a serious breach of professional confidentiality;*

- viii *failure to obtain Ethics approval prior to undertaking work involving human participants* (UPR RE01⁹, refers) where the Chairman of the relevant Ethics Committee with Delegated Authority (ECDA), acting as the nominee of the relevant Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance), considers the matter to be sufficiently serious to be dealt with under the provisions of UPR SA13⁴ or UPR SA15⁵ (UPR RE01⁸, refers);
 - ix *failure to comply with the terms and conditions of an ethics approval granted for work involving human participants* (UPR RE01⁸, refers) where the Chairman of the relevant ECDA, acting as the nominee of the relevant Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance), considers the matter to be sufficiently serious to be dealt with under the provisions of UPR SA13⁴ or UPR SA15⁵ (UPR RE01⁸, refers).
 - x *any allegation of academic misconduct as defined by section 2.1 that the student denies.*
- b *any other allegation of academic misconduct as defined in section 2.1 not included in (a) above may be referred by the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or nominee to a Student Academic Misconduct Panel to be considered under the provisions of UPR SA13 or Fitness to Practise Panel under UPR SA15 where the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or nominee considers it appropriate taking into account a student's previous proven /admitted Academic Misconduct offence or offences or where the circumstances surrounding a single offence are considered to be so serious as to justify a disciplinary panel hearing.*

4.3.4 *The Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or nominee shall:*

- a inform the student that the matter is to be referred to be dealt with under the provision of UPR SA13⁴ or UPR SA15⁵ or
- b where the *Assessment-Offence-Academic Misconduct* is not to be dealt with under the provisions of UPR SA13⁴ or UPR SA15⁵:
 - 1 prepare a draft report (**Recommendation Report**) for the Short Course/ Module Board in the required format, based on the investigation and
 - 2 provide *a copy of* the **Recommendation Report** to the student prior to its submission to the Short Course/Module Board and
 - 3 invite the student to respond to the **Recommendation Report** within five (5) working days of the date of the **Recommendation Report** (not the date of its receipt by the student) and
 - 4 where the student has responded to the **Recommendation Report**, submit the student's comments to the Short Course/Module Board together with the **Recommendation Report**.

Recommendation Reports and **Letters of Notification** *shall* be sent ~~by recorded mail and~~ to the email address the student has provided to the University for all correspondence.

- 4.3.5** The School Administration Manager or nominee *shall* make a written record of any meeting between the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or nominee and the student.
- 4.3.6** Only the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or nominee *shall* communicate with the student concerning any matter being considered under the provisions of the process set out in this section (4.3).
- 4.3.7** Where section **4.3.4a**, applies, the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or nominee *shall* inform the Chairman of the Short Course/Module Board, in writing, that consideration of the candidate should be deferred to await the conclusion of the process ~~before by~~ the Student Academic Misconduct Panel.

⁹ UPR RE01 'Studies Involving the Use of Human Participants'

4.3.8 Following the conclusion of the process ~~before~~ with the Student Academic Misconduct Panel, the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or nominee *shall* provide a report to the Chairman of the Short Course/Module Board so that it may determine the appropriate academic penalty to be applied under section 4.4.2 of this document.

4.3.9 Where an allegation is upheld at the level of the Student Academic Misconduct Panel *under UPR SA13 or a Fitness to Practise Panel under UPR SA15*, in addition to any sanction or penalty imposed under ~~these provisions to confirm an Academic Misconduct offence has occurred of UPR SA13⁴ or UPR SA15⁵~~, the Short Course/Module Board may, ~~where cheating, plagiarism, collusion or other Assessment Offences Academic Misconduct (as defined in section 2 of this document) has occurred~~, impose one or more of the academic penalties set out in section 4.4.2 of this document.

4.4 Chairmen of Short Course/Module Boards

4.4.1 Chairmen of Module Boards and Short Course Boards are responsible for:

- i reporting all allegations of ~~an Assessment Offence, including proven cases of cheating, plagiarism, collusion or other~~ Academic Misconduct to all members of the Board;

(where a Student Academic Misconduct Panel, convened under ~~the provisions of~~ UPR SA13⁴ or *a Fitness to Practise Panel convened under* UPR SA15⁵, finds that an Academic Misconduct offence, as defined in section 2, has been committed, the Student Academic Misconduct Panel *or Fitness to Practise Panel shall* so inform the Short Course/Module Board. The Short Course/Module Board of Examiners *shall* exercise its academic judgement and allocate marks (see section 4.4.2)).

- ii ensuring that the report of the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) ~~(or nominee)~~ is provided to the Short Course/Module Board of Examiners so that it may determine the appropriate penalty to be applied and that receipt of the report is noted formally in the minutes of the Board meeting at which it is received;
- iii within ten (10) working days of the meeting of the Board, or as soon as possible thereafter, notifying the student, in writing, of the action taken by the Short Course/Module Board of Examiners in exercising its responsibilities and of his or her right to request a formal review of the decision or recommendation of a Board of Examiners under the provisions, as appropriate, of Appendix I, UPR AS12¹/Appendix I, UPR AS13², refers);
- iv ensuring that a report of the incident is made to any relevant Professional Body requiring such information.

4.4.2 Academic penalties

Short Course/Module Boards may, on academic grounds, and at their absolute discretion, impose any of the following academic penalties:

- i award a grade for an assessment based purely upon academic merit, taking into account the extent to which the work submitted represents evidence of the student having met the relevant learning outcomes, where the Board is, in its academic judgement, able accurately to determine this; or
- ii reduce the grade awarded for an assessment, to reflect the extent to which the cheating, plagiarism, collusion and/or other Assessment Offences as defined in section 2.1 has, in their academic judgement, created doubt about the evidence represented by the submitted work for the student having met the relevant learning outcomes; or
- iii award a grade of **0** for an assessment, where the extent of the cheating, plagiarism, collusion and/or other Assessment Offences is, in their academic judgement, such as to make it unsafe to award any academic credit for the work.

4.4.3 Powers of Associate Deans of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or nominee, to apply disciplinary warnings in cases where allegations of Academic Misconduct are not referred for consideration under UPR SA13 or UPR SA15

In addition to an academic penalty applied by a Module/Short Course Board, in circumstances where a student has admitted guilt in writing, the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or nominee has delegated authority to assign one or more of the following penalties:

- i. give an informal School warning noted on the School's records of Academic Misconduct offences but not noted on the student's academic record; or*
- ii. give a Disciplinary Warning within ten (10) working days of the completion of the investigation, but only where in addition to admitting guilt the student accepts in writing the Disciplinary Warning. Before accepting a Disciplinary Warning, the student must be made aware of the option to obtain independent advice e.g. from the Student Union. (The Disciplinary Warning should be recorded on the School's records of Academic Misconduct offences and details (name, student number, nature of the offence) must be sent to Student Procedures for recording on the formal University record.)*
- iii. In addition to i or ii above, require a student to attend a mandatory training session with the Centre for Academic English (or School equivalent) within fourteen (14) working days of the completion of the Academic Misconduct investigation. Students have five (5) working days from the completion of procedures in which to accept attendance at a 'drop in' session. Failure to attend shall result in the student being referred to the Dean of Students for a sanction or penalty under SA13.*

3. The capping of grades for modules passed on re-enrolment

Re-enrolment opportunities in the following academic year (after failure at first and referred attempts) are not always taken up, with one reason being that a student often cannot improve their degree classification by doing so. This is because the grade awarded for re-enrolled modules is capped for classification purposes, and so is not likely to be included in the University's 'best of' algorithm for degree classification. The Assessment Working Group has therefore proposed that grades awarded for modules on re-enrolment should not be capped for classification purposes, to (i) encourage more students to retake failed modules instead of relying on compensation and (ii) partly protect the University from a potential fall in continuation rates (a HESA Performance Indicator and TEF metric). The current financial pressures on students suggest that the vast majority would not want to 'strategically' fail modules in order to reattempt them a year later, due to the additional time required to complete their studies.

A new status code has been developed, **P(REN)**, which will indicate to students that a module has been passed on re-enrolment. This will replace the **P(40)** and **P(50)** status codes.

4. The capping of grades for modules passed on referral

In general, it is considered that the capping of grades (for classification purposes) passed on referral is appropriate. If referred grades were not capped, evidence suggests that some students would 'strategically' fail modules at first attempt, in order to reattempt them in the referred assessment period and so spread their assessment load without penalty. This would also disadvantage those students who pass at first attempt. However, the penalty of a capped grade is considered to be unfair if the first-sit failure was due to only one assessment that contributed a small amount to the module grade. It is therefore recommended that students retain their grade(s) for any passed elements of a module, and only the failed elements are capped at a bare pass on referral. In these circumstances the student may achieve a grade for a referred module which is higher than a bare pass.

A new status code has been developed, **P(REF)**, which will indicate to students that a module has been passed on referral. This will replace the **P(40)** and **P(50)** status codes.

5. Grading options

UH currently utilises two numeric grading scales (a 100-point and a 27-point subset of the 100 point scale) for assessment grading. The University supplemented these numeric grades with 'Grade Points' (to enable the publication of a Grade Point Average, GPA), in September 2017, for the purpose of module grading only (not for the grading of individual assessments). However, no grading system is perfect. Rather than changing to a new grading system, the University should focus on making grading more reliable by re-enforcing that UH has a range of grading systems to choose from, so that the system chosen is no more complex than the situation demands.

There are also benefits to developing clearer, more effective grade descriptors. The generic UH grade descriptors are currently out of line with national expectations, which reflect that a 'Good' Honours degree requires 'good' performance.

In response to items 3, 4 and 5, above, the following amendments to UPR AS14, section D have been approved:

D ASSESSMENT AND AWARD REGULATIONS

D1 Module and short course assessment grading

A student's performance on an individual module or short course *shall* be reported to Boards of Examiners using the following grades for reporting/recording achievement, along with associated status codes for reporting additional information.

D1.1 Interpretation of grades

Grade awarded				Interpretation of Grade			
100-point Numeric Grade	Grade Point ¹	19-point Numeric Grade	10-point Numeric Grade	Grade Descriptor		Indicative Classification Descriptor	
90-100 ²	4.50	95 ²	95 ²	Outstanding		1 st Class Honours/ Distinction	
80-90		85	85	Excellent			
75-79	4.25	77	75	Very good (Excellent)			
70-74	4.00	72					
67-69	3.75	68	65	Good (Very good)		Upper 2 nd Class Honours/ Commendation	
64-66	3.50	65					
60-63	3.25	62					
57-59	3.00	58	55	Clear pass (Good)		Lower 2 nd Class Honours/ Pass ⁴	
54-56	2.75	55					
50-53	2.50	52					
				Levels 0, 4, 5, 6	Level 7	Levels 0, 4, 5, 6	Level 7
47-49	2.25	48	45	Marginal pass (Pass)	Marginal fail	3 rd Class Honours/ Pass	
44-46	2.00	45					
40-43	1.75	42					
37-39	1.00	38	35	Marginal fail	Clear fail	Not applicable	
34-36	0.75	35					
30-33	0.50	32					
20-29	0.25	25					
0-19	0.00	10	10	0	0	Little or nothing of merit	

~~1 — Where a coarser-grained reporting and recording mechanism is required for marking individual assessments, a reference scale is available on the Learning and Teaching Innovation Centre's StudyNet pages. Student performance on assessments more suited to coarse-grained judgements may be recorded using these reference grades.~~

1 Module Boards award grade points alongside numeric grades for all modules from 2017/18.

2 For classification purposes, a cap of **90** *shall* be applied to all module or short course numeric grades contributing toward the average numeric grade used to determine Honours classification and for conferring University awards 'with Distinction' or 'with Commendation'.

~~3 A referred or re-enrolled pass for Level 7 modules will be awarded 50 (with a grade point capped at 2.50).~~

~~4 A referred or re-enrolled pass for Levels 0, 4, 5 and 6 modules will be awarded 40 (with a grade point capped at 1.75).~~

D1.2 Interpretation of module status codes

The following status codes *shall* be reported by Module Boards to describe a student's status on a module:

Status Code	Description
P	Passed
P(REF)	Passed, capped at 40. A module or short course passed at referral or re-enrolment, or where an alternative module to a failed module has been passed. The numeric grade for the module is limited through elements failed and re-attempted being capped to the minimum pass grade for classification purposes
P(REN)	Passed, capped at 50. A module or short course passed at referral or re-enrolment, or where an alternative module to a failed module has been passed. The numeric grade for the module is capped to the minimum pass grade for classification purposes
	etc.

D5.2 Referral

D5.2.2 Referral in undergraduate programmes

i to iii omitted....

iv Students who are successful in referred assessments *shall* be awarded a ~~P(REF) P(40) or P(50), as appropriate~~, status code for the module. *The numeric grade for the module shall be limited by any assessment elements which have been failed and then passed at referral being capped to the minimum pass grade.*

D5.2.3 Referral in postgraduate programmes

i to iii omitted....

iv Students who are successful in referred assessments *shall* be awarded a ~~P(REF) P(50) or P(40), as appropriate~~, status code for the module. *The numeric grade for the module shall be limited by any assessment elements which have been failed and then passed at referral being capped to the minimum pass grade.*

D5.3 Re-enrolment

D5.3.1 omitted....

D5.3.2 Students who have achieved a pass grade in any module or short course *shall* be credited accordingly. They may not elect to repeat the module or short course in an attempt to improve the grading, nor may they be required to repeat the module or short course in order to qualify for an award.

D5.3.3 Following re-enrolment on any module or short course, whether or not the student has attended, the grades awarded *shall* be those actually achieved in the assessment. ~~However, for the purpose of Honours classification, for conferring awards 'with Commendation' or 'with~~

~~Distinction' and GPA calculation, the module numeric grades will be capped to 50 (with grade points capped to 2.50) for Level 7 modules or short courses and 40 (with grade points capped to 1.75) for any Level 4, 5 or 6 modules or short courses.~~

- D5.3.4 Whether students are eligible for re-enrolment on the module concerned (indicated by the award of a FREN/FRENC/FRENE status code) or not (indicated by the award of a FNFA status code), they may elect to study an alternative module, only if available on the validated programme of study and at the discretion of the Programme Board. Attendance *shall* be required and the grades awarded *shall* be those actually achieved in the assessment. ~~However, for the purpose of Honours classification and for conferring awards 'with Commendation' or 'with Distinction', the module numeric grades for the chosen alternative modules or short courses will be capped to 50 (with grade points capped at 2.50) for Level 7 modules or short courses and 40 (with grade points capped at 1.75) for any Level 4, 5 or 6 modules or short courses.~~ Further re-enrolment on the replacement module is not allowed.

D6 Final awards – Honours classification

D6.1 Calculation of overall classification grade for Honours classification (Bachelor's Degree)

~~D6.1.1 and D6.1.2 omitted...~~

~~D6.1.3—For the purpose of Honours classification, numeric grades awarded following re-enrolment on any failed module or short course (or alternative to that module or short course, if available on the validated programme of study) will be capped, as described in section D5.3 (Re-enrolment).~~

D6.2 Calculation of overall classification grade for Honours classification (Integrated Master's Degrees)

~~D6.2.1 and D6.2.2 omitted...~~

~~D6.2.3—For the purpose of Honours classification, numeric grades awarded following re-enrolment on any failed module or short course (or alternative to that module or short course) will be capped, as described in section D5.3 (Re-enrolment).~~

D7 Final awards – Awards with distinction and commendation

D7.2 Criteria for conferring University awards 'with Distinction' or 'with Commendation'

~~D7.2.1 to D7.2.3 omitted...~~

~~D7.2.4—For the purpose of conferring awards 'with Commendation' or 'with Distinction', numeric grades awarded following re-enrolment on any failed module or short course (or alternative to that module or short course, if available on the validated programme of study) will be capped, as described in section D5.3 (Re-enrolment).~~

D8 Final awards – Determination of a Grade Point Average (GPA)

~~D8.1 and D8.2 omitted...~~

~~D8.3—For the purpose of GPA calculation, grade points awarded following re-enrolment on any failed module or short course (or alternative to that module or short course, if available on the validated programme of study) will be capped, as described in section D5.3 (Re-enrolment).~~

NB. Deleted sub-sections only are shown above. Other sub-sections are not shown above and are unchanged.