

Section 15: BIMM Institute/University of Sussex Undergraduate Academic Regulations

1. Definitions

Award

- 1.1 Successful candidates will be awarded an honours degree.
This is a classified award.

Stages & Levels

- 1.2 A stage is defined as the period of an award between two progression points. A level refers to the difficulty of the module, aligned to the national FHEQ. These levels are usually taken in the following stages of study:
- | | |
|------------------------|---------|
| Foundation Stage 0: | Level 3 |
| Undergraduate Stage 1: | Level 4 |
| Undergraduate Stage 2: | Level 5 |
| Undergraduate Stage 3: | Level 6 |

Note: for the purposes of these regulations 'level' and 'stage' are synonymous and, therefore, the term 'stage' is used throughout this document.

Progression

- 1.3 Courses are defined in stages, as outlined above. Every module contributing to a course is credit-rated by volume and level. Progression from one stage to the next is achieved by acquiring a defined volume of credit and by meeting any course-specific requirements.

Modules

- 1.4 There are two types of modules:
- (i) Core – modules that all students on a course must take.
 - (ii) Optional – one of a group of modules that may be selected.

Credit

Pass mark and credit

- 1.5 The academic credit for a module is achieved by securing the minimum published pass mark for that module (i.e. 40%).

2. Assessment Cycle, Re-sits & Repeats

The assessment cycle

- 2.1 An assessment cycle for a module comprises one Sit and (where necessary) one Re-sit.
- 2.2 A repeat assessment cycle for a module comprises one further Sit and (where necessary) one further Re-sit. Repeat assessment cycles are possible only on the explicit authority of the examination board.

Re-sits

- 2.3 A Re-sit is an opportunity to retrieve an initial failed assessment *without having to* repeat the original period of teaching and learning. Re-sit opportunities will only be offered for modules where the relevant pass mark for the module has not been achieved (40% on stage 0 to 3 modules).
- 2.4 In cases where a single Re-sit mode does not assess all the module learning outcomes, a second Re-sit component will be required to ensure that all the learning outcomes are tested. All students taking the Re-sit/Sit will take the approved Re-sit mode. In cases where there are two Re-sit mode components which are the same as the original assessment mode components, the board may offer a Re-sit of the failed assessment component to be conflated with the passed assessment component, provided that this strategy is applied to all students on the cohort equally. The conflated mark will be capped at the level of the module.

Pass mark to be achieved on all module components (pass required assessments).

- 2.5 There may be some assessments that course teams have identified as pass required; in other words, these assessments must be passed in order for you to achieve the learning outcomes for the course you are studying. These assessments will be clearly identified in the module guide document in your course handbook. Where the conflated module mark is a pass mark but the pass mark requirement on all assessment components has not been achieved, a Re-sit will be given of the failed assessment components. The mark achieved on the Re-sit will be capped and conflated with any existing uncapped mark where the pass mark had been achieved at the first attempt. Where the conflated module mark is not a pass mark, a Re-sit will be given. The Re-sit mark will be capped at the level of the module, even where it is conflated with an existing mark on an assessment component where the pass mark had been achieved.
- 2.6 Re-sit marks are capped at the pass mark for the individual module (and not at a higher progression threshold stage mean requirement), to ensure that students who are offered Re-sits do not have an unfair opportunity to improve

their marks. Unless a student has mitigation, where if approved by the Mitigating Evidence Committee and the Progress & Award Board, the module mark will not be capped. The uncapped Re-sit mark will be considered for progression purposes on all awards. The capped Re-sit mark will be considered for all course transfer applications and for award purposes and will stand for all courses even where it is lower than the mark achieved at the first attempt. The original mark will stand where the Re-sit opportunity has not been taken.

- 2.7 The other types of Re-sit opportunity are a trailed Re-sit and a second Re-sit, which may be offered at the PAB's discretion (see section 3).

Repeats

- 2.8 The repeat of a stage of study means retaking the stage from the beginning, as published, with attendance. That is a repeat of the teaching, learning and assessment. All previous marks and credit will be expunged from the student record and a new full assessment cycle undertaken. The offer of a repeat stage will normally be made at the September Retrievals Board, following a Re-sit opportunity.
- 2.9 A trailed repeat module assessment cycle (with attendance) may be offered with marks capped at the first and the Re-sit attempt (see section 3).
- 2.10 The opportunity to repeat stage 1 (FHEQ level four) is automatic for failing students providing the course of study is available in the following academic session. For students at stage 0 or stages subsequent to stage 1, including the final undergraduate award stage, there is no automatic right to repeat the stage. Any such offer will be at the PAB's discretion. However, the PAB is advised to seriously consider offering a repeat of a stage to a student who has not previously repeated a stage. Evidence of attendance and engagement during the failed stage should not be taken into consideration but academic performance in a previous stage may be a determining factor. Where the PAB exceptionally decides not to offer a repeat of a stage to a student who has not previously repeated a stage in the course, the PAB must set out the rationale for this decision in the minutes.
- 2.11 A student offered a repeat of a stage of study will be asked to agree to abide by the conditions set out in a BIMM Repeat Year Learning Agreement and this may include a requirement for a minimum level of attendance and engagement. BIMM may commence withdrawal proceedings for any student in breach of their Learning Agreement.
- 2.12 No student shall be permitted to repeat the same stage of study more than once and shall only be permitted to repeat where the stage has been failed. In offering a repeat stage to a student who has previously repeated a different stage, the PAB should be mindful of the maximum period of registration as set out in the Course Specification.

3. Retrieving Credit: Trailed Credit, Compensation, Condoned Credit & Second Re-sits

Criteria for retrieving credit

- 3.1 The Progress & Award Board (PAB) may consider the following mechanisms for the retrieval of credit, normally following any Re-sit opportunity, some of which are discretionary, provided that the stage mean requirement has been achieved (see section 4).

Discretionary trailed credit

- 3.2 The Progress & Award Board (PAB) has discretionary authority to offer an undergraduate student (following any Re-sit offered) the opportunity to progress to the next stage of study while trailing up to a maximum of 30 credits from the previous stage, provided that an uncapped stage mean of 40% has been achieved. Credit can be trailed at all stages, including into the final stage but not beyond the final stage.
- 3.3 Normally, trailed credit will result in the student taking a trailed Re-sit for a module/s already studied with the aim of retrieving the initial fail *without* attendance. Trailed Re-sits without attendance will only be offered where there is significant evidence of engagement from the student. The PAB also has the discretion to offer a repeat of the module with attendance. A trailed Re-sit and a trailed module repeat assessment cycle will result in the capped mark being used for award purposes. A trailed Re-sit is a further opportunity to take the Re-sit mode which tests all the module learning outcomes. The Re-sit mode will usually be offered when the module assessment for the next cohort takes place. A trailed repeat assessment cycle is an opportunity to take the main cycle of assessment, for example coursework and an examination, along with the next cohort.
- 3.4 Permission to trail credit will normally only be granted by a September PAB following a failed Re-sit. In exercising its discretion, the PAB will take into consideration evidence of attendance and engagement across the stage such that the student is likely to succeed at the next assessment opportunity. The Re-sit PAB should be mindful of cases where a student has not attended for the Re-sit opportunity as this may be due to course commitments (WBL, placements, or professional engagements). No marks may be carried forward from the original assessment attempt.
- 3.5 Where the trailed assessment has not been passed after the conclusion of the trailed Re-sit or trailed module repeat assessment cycle, the PAB may consider other mechanisms available for the retrieval of credit (as set out below).

Non-discretionary compensated credit

- 3.6 Compensation is automatically applied at each stage of study at the level of the module for a marginal fail up to 30 credits provided the stage mean has been achieved on the basis that a strong performance by a student in one part of the curriculum may be used as the basis for the award of credit in respect of a marginal fail elsewhere.
- 3.7 Where a student has not achieved the credit requirement for progression or award but has met the following criteria, then up to 30 credits will automatically be granted by compensation provided that the remaining credits in the stage meet the pass threshold:
- an uncapped stage mean of 40%
 - a marginal fail on the module (35-39%).
- 3.8 Compensation is not discretionary to the Progress & Award Board (PAB) and is referred to as automatic compensated credit for a marginal fail. The actual mark achieved will stand for progression and award purposes.
- 3.9 A maximum of 30 credits per stage may be awarded by automatic compensation to enable for stage progression or award. Compensation will be applied at the PAB where the criteria are met.
- 3.10 In all cases where automatic compensation has been applied, BIMM will provide a single opportunity for students to register to take a Re-sit instead of receiving the credit via compensation, to enable the pass threshold to be achieved. The mark achieved at Re-sit will be capped and will stand even where it is lower than the original mark achieved which may impact on progression where progression to the next stage had been offered. The Re-sit mode will usually be offered in the Re-sit assessment period or when the next cohort module assessment takes place.
- 3.11 In all cases, compensated credit will not be applied automatically where the criteria have not been met or if more than 30 credits have been failed.

Discretionary condoned credit

- 3.12 Condonement is applied at the level of the course. It is defined as the process by which a PAB in consideration of the overall performance of a student decides that, without incurring a penalty, a part of the course that has been failed need not be redeemed.
- 3.13 The PAB has discretionary authority to award up to a maximum of 30 condoned credits in the final award stage where the course learning outcomes have been met and the relevant stage mean has been achieved as set out in Regulation 4.2. Condoned credit is not dependent upon an individual module threshold mark being achieved and is limited to the final award stage. The original mark achieved will stand for award purposes. A maximum of 30 credits may be granted via a combination of compensated and condoned credit in the final award stage. Alternatively, a PAB can give a Re-sit. The PAB may not condone a module failed as a result of misconduct.

- 3.14 In all cases where condoned credit has been applied, BIMM will provide a single opportunity for students to register to take a Re-sit instead of receiving the credit via condonement, to enable the pass threshold to be achieved. The mark achieved at Re-sit will be capped and will stand even where it is lower than the original mark achieved. The Re-sit mode will usually be offered in the Re-sit assessment period or when the module assessment for the next cohort takes place.

Discretionary temporary withdrawal with a second Re-sit

- 3.15 Exceptionally the PAB has discretionary authority to offer a second and final Re-sit for one or more failed modules for a capped mark, provided that 60 credits have been achieved in the stage. This may only be considered where the progression or award criteria for the stage have not been achieved, after any Re-sit opportunities and other mechanisms to retrieve the credit have been exhausted, and provided that there is good evidence of attendance and engagement such that the student is likely to succeed at the next Re-sit assessment opportunity. The Re-sit will usually be offered when the next cohort module assessment takes place. The student will be required to temporarily withdraw and will be offered a second Re-sit of the failed module/s without attendance. All marks for the second Re-sit on the module/s will be capped at the pass threshold for award and transfer purposes. Uncapped marks can be considered for progression (but not transfer) purposes. The marks achieved will be added to the first cycle marks for modules passed and confirmed by the Module Assessment Board (MAB).

4. Progression & Award Rules

General rules for modules

- 4.1 The following general rules apply:
- (a) the credits achieved on all modules contribute to the credit requirement for the award;
 - (b) Modules contribute to the final award in proportion with their credit value within the designated stage (for example a 20-credit module in a 120-credit stage contributes 16.66% of the weighted mean for that stage);
 - (c) the conflated mark for a module will be calculated to two decimal points;
 - (d) conflated marks must not be rounded to integers;
- 4.2 The following are the progression rules for BIMM courses:

General progression and award requirement

- (a) Students are required to achieve a stage mean of 40%, and 120 credits in order to progress to the next stage or to be considered for an award, following the application of rules on trailed credit, compensation and condonement. The uncapped stage mean is used for progression purposes as it indicates academic potential, whilst the capped mean is used for

transfer and award purposes. The stage mean includes all marks achieved on modules taken in the stage including marks of zero and fail marks.

- (b) **Non-achievement of stage mean:** Where the stage mean requirement has not been achieved (see stage mean criteria above) following any Re-sit opportunity, the student has no right to compensated, condoned or trailed credit nor has the PAB discretion to allow a student to progress or receive an award. Mechanisms available to the PAB to enable the student to retrieve the credit include a repeat stage or, exceptionally, temporary withdrawal from the course with a second Re-sit for a capped mark where 60 credits have been achieved. Alternatively, following a first Re-sit opportunity, the PAB may exceptionally decide that a further retrieval opportunity should not be permitted and so require permanent withdrawal with an exit award where the credit requirement set out in the Course Specification has not been met. Students failing to progress from stage 1 are automatically entitled to a repeat stage.
- (c) **Achievement of stage mean:** Where the stage mean requirement has been achieved (see stage mean criteria above) but the credit requirement has not been achieved, mechanisms available to the PAB to enable the student to progress or achieve the award include the application of compensated or condoned or trailed credit up to a maximum of 30 credits. Where this is not possible, the PAB should consider a first/second Re-sit opportunity to enable credit to be secured or exceptionally a repeat of a stage.

The PAB should consider **progression** candidates as follows, following any Re-sit opportunity:

- (d) Where **the stage mean has been achieved and 100 credits or more awarded** then the PAB must seriously consider granting trailed or compensated credit up to a maximum of 30 credits to enable the student to progress, thereby not imposing any undue delay in the achievement of the award aims. Exceptionally, where the PAB has significant concerns about the academic underpinning that could not be achieved through trailing credit the PAB must offer a choice of temporary withdrawal with second Re-sits or a repeat of the stage. A clear minute must record the rationale in all cases where trailed credit has not been granted to enable progression.
- (e) Where **the stage mean has been achieved but less than 90 credits awarded:** The student may not progress. Students failing to progress from stage 1 are automatically entitled to a repeat stage. The PAB must seriously consider offering a repeat stage to students in stage 0 or stages subsequent to stage 1 irrespective of whether the student has previously repeated a stage. Exceptionally the PAB may offer temporary withdrawal with a second Re-sit/s where 60 credits have been achieved and where there is evidence of good engagement. Once 90 credits or more have been awarded, then the

PAB may grant trailed credit or compensated credit up to a maximum of 30 credits to enable the student to progress to the next stage.

The PAB should consider **award** candidates as follows:

- (f) **Where the stage mean has been achieved and 90 credits or more awarded:** Then the PAB may grant condoned or compensated credit up to a maximum of 30 credits to allow 120 credits to accumulate and the award to be made. Alternatively a Re-sit may be offered. Should the credits not be secured after a Re-sit opportunity the PAB may offer an exit award, temporary withdrawal with second Re-sits or exceptionally a repeat stage. Credit trailed from the previous stage may be condoned at award stage provided that the credit granted via condonement for the trailed credit and any failed modules in the final stage does not exceed 30 credits in total.
- (g) **Where the stage mean has been achieved but less than 90 credits awarded:** Following any Re-sit opportunity, the student may not graduate. The PAB must seriously consider offering a repeat of the stage irrespective of whether the student has previously repeated a stage. Alternatively, the PAB may allow a period of temporary withdrawal and the opportunity for a second Re-sit/s where 60 credits have been achieved. Once 90 credits have been accumulated, the PAB may grant condoned or compensated credit up to a maximum of 30 credits to allow 120 credits to accumulate and the award to be made. Exceptionally, the PAB may offer an exit award.
- (h) In all cases, the PAB must specify where undergraduate candidates may be offered a choice of retrieval opportunities (trailed credit, temporary withdrawal and second Re-sits or a repeat of a stage). Where the PAB, exceptionally, decides not to offer a repeat of a stage to a student who has not previously repeated a stage in the course, the PAB must set out the rationale for this decision in the minutes.

4.3 *Criteria for progression from the Foundation Year (stage 0) into stage 1 and the Certificate of Education*

Candidates will progress from stage 0 to stage 1 of an associated course where 120 credits and either (a) or (b) have been achieved:

- (a) The pass threshold on all core modules and a stage mean of 40%.
- (b) The pass threshold on 100 credits, a stage mean of 50% and a mark of 35-39% for the remaining 20 credits. In these circumstances, compensation will be applied by the PAB.

A University of Sussex Certificate of Education will be issued in cases where a student meets the criteria for progression to stage 1, but decides not to continue into stage 1, and in cases where a student does not complete stage 1.

The rules on trailed credit do not apply and there is no automatic right to repeat the Foundation Year.

5. Classification rules

General award rules for modules

- 5.1 The following general rules apply:
- (a) all modules taken at stages 2 and 3 contribute to classification;
 - (b) Stage 2 and stage 3 are weighted against each other in the proportion 40:60;

General rule for the course

Credit requirement

- 5.2 In order to obtain an honours degree, a minimum of 120 academic credits at stage 3 (FHEQ level six) must be achieved and 360 credits overall, for a 3-year course, or 480 credits overall, for a 4-year course, following the application of compensation and condoned credit.
- 5.3 In final marks arrays, the Grand Mean shall be calculated and shown to three decimal places. The Grand Mean will also be shown rounded (up or down) to the nearest 0.5%. If the effect of the rounding results in the Grand Mean of a marginal student being increased above a classification boundary, the subject examination board will have discretion to recommend the reclassification of the student.

Classification divisions

- 5.4 Once the Grand Mean has been calculated, the class of the degree depends on where the Grand Mean falls within the following numerical boundaries. (N.B. the application of the classification boundaries can only be applied where the credit requirements have been achieved, i.e. classification is a two-stage process in that firstly the credits must be achieved to obtain the award and then the classification rules are applied).

1st ≥ 70%
2.1 ≥ 60%
2.2 ≥ 50%
3rd ≥ 40%

Borderlines

- 5.5 Rounding of marks may result in a grand mean mark coming close to but below a degree classification boundary. The PAB shall give consideration to such students falling within a borderline area of one percent below each classification boundary as follows:

69-70 Boundary for 2:1/1st
59-60 Boundary for 2:2/2:1

49-50 Boundary for 3rd/2:2
39-40 Borderline fail

- 5.6 To ensure equity in the consideration of borderline candidates, it has been agreed that a borderline candidate will be automatically reclassified where they have achieved 50% of the credit that contributes to classification in the higher class. When considering undergraduate candidates with less than 50% of the credit that contributes to classification in the higher class, the PAB has discretion to reclassify based on the individual student profile, on the marks array, for all stages of study contributing to the award. The PAB should note that the borderline grand mean may have occurred as a result of exceptional performance in a heavily weighted component of assessment which does not reflect performance overall. The PAB may take the final stage mean into consideration along with performance on a particular module. For each student considered a clear minute will be maintained by the examination board secretary.

5.7 ***Module failure in stage three (final stage)***

- (a) Students are required to achieve 120 academic credits at stage three (FHEQ level six) in order to achieve honours.
- (b) Note: in the case of a 'Sit' being offered against stage 3 module failure where there is accepted mitigation, the mark achieved at Sit will contribute to classification.

Ordinary degree

- 5.8 Where a student has exhausted Re-sit and discretionary repeat opportunities at stage three and has acquired at least 60 stage 3/FHEQ level six academic credits (but fewer than 120 stage 3/FHEQ level six academic credits) and 300 credits overall, for a 3-year course, or 420 credits overall, for a 4-year course, the examination board will award an Ordinary degree.

Diploma/Certificate of Higher Education as an exit award

- 5.9 A Dip HE or Cert HE award can be given to students who have permanently withdrawn from the University, provided that the relevant credit requirement has been met as set out in the Academic Framework.

5.10 ***An absurd outcome for an individual student***

Where the strict application of the rules results in an absurd outcome for an individual student in the view of the PAB, which cannot be remedied within the existing discretion of the PAB, the PAB may make a recommendation to University of Sussex's Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning). The Pro Vice-Chancellor has authority to accept or reject the recommendation. The final application of the accepted recommendation rests with the PAB to enable the normal appeals procedures to apply. The PAB should therefore agree on an alternative outcome should the recommendation not be accepted.

Exam Board Regulations Glossary:

Cycle of assessment: all BIMM modules provide a single cycle of assessment comprising of one first attempt (or Sit) and one Re-sit attempt. Where a stage has been failed, a repeat assessment cycle may be made available comprising of a further sit and Re-sit opportunity.

Repeat of stage: the repeat of a stage of study means taking the modules again, repeating the teaching, learning and assessment. All previous marks and credit for the failed stage will be expunged from the student record and anew teaching, learning and assessment cycle undertaken. The offer of a repeat stage will normally be made at the September Retrievals Progress and Award Board (PAB) following a Re-sit opportunity.

Trailed repeat: a single trailed repeat module assessment cycle (with attendance) may be offered with marks capped at the first and second attempt. A maximum of 20 credits may be offered as trailed in each stage.

Stage 1 repeat year: the opportunity to repeat stage one is automatic providing the course of study is available in the following academic session. A student offered a repeat year at any stage will be required to sign a learning agreement. BIMM may withdraw any student in breach of their learning agreement.

Re-sit: a Re-sit is an opportunity to retrieve an initial failed assessment without having to repeat the original period of teaching and learning. Re-sits will only be offered where the pass mark (40%) for the module has not been achieved, and/or the credit has not been awarded.

Re-sit Mode: where a module may have several pieces of assessed work or a mixture of examination and course work the course team may identify a single *mode* of assessment for Re-sit that meets all the learning outcomes for the module. In cases where a single Re-sit mode does not assess all the module outcomes a second Re-sit component will be required to ensure all the learning outcomes are tested. All students taking the Re-sit/sit will take the approved Re-sit mode. In cases where two Re-sit components which are the same as the original assessment mode components, the course team may offer a Re-sit of the failed component to be conflated with the passed assessment component provided that this strategy is applied to all students in the cohort equally. The conflated mark will be capped at the level of the module (for Re-sits) and uncapped for sits.

Discretionary Trailed Credit: normally trailed credit will result in a student taking a trailed Re-sit for a module already studied with the aim of retrieving the fail without attendance. The PAB may offer a trailed repeat module (including attendance as above). In both cases an additional fee will be charged to cover the costs of assessment or teaching and assessment. In both cases the module will be capped at 40% and students will take the failed assessment along with the next cohort.

Temporary Withdrawal (TWD): at BIMM the PAB may offer students the opportunity to temporarily withdraw from their course in order to retrieve failed credits and return able to progress or gain an award. TWD will be for one academic year allowing students to Re-sit the failed assessments and achieve failed credits. TWD will still allow student's access to tutorial support and other learning resources as appropriate. An additional fee will be charged to cover the costs of assessment.

Absurd Outcome: in exceptional cases, the PAB may recommend to the university a different outcome than that predicated by these regulations. Such cases are very rare and the university will always strive to balance what is in the interests of the student whilst also ensuring fairness to other students and maintaining academic standards.

Appendices to BIMM Institute/University of Sussex Regulations

Appendix 1: Submission of coursework for assessment

Submission dates for coursework are final and not open to negotiation with module tutors or Course Leaders.

You will not be able to get an extension (unless you have a registered disability – see below) because this is not considered an equitable system for staff or students. We expect you to approach your assessments in a well-organised way, allowing good time for the possibility of minor illness and the range of other normal hurdles in life.

To reflect the expectations that work will be submitted on time, even if that means battling through some difficulties, the University and BIMM operate a system of graduated penalties for lateness, which works as follows:

Late hand in:	Penalty:
Up to 24 hours after the submission date	Deduction of 5 percentage points
After 24 hours and up to 7 days after the submission date	Deduction of 10 percentage points
After 7 days	Fail with zero mark

(Essay & Written Work Format)

Unless otherwise specified, written submissions should conform to the following:

- **Format:** A4 single-sided, collated and spiral bound (or other secure method of binding – ring binders are acceptable), standard white 80g paper (only applicable to hard copy submissions)
- **Font:** 11 or 12 point type in a clear font such as Times or Arial
- **Information:** Each page must include your student (candidate) number (in the header) and a page number (in the footer)
- **Spacing:** Double-spaced (so the marker has space to write in comments)
- **Presentation (for physical submissions):** A4 printed and spiral (or other method) bound with a clear plastic cover (no loose leaf and no plastic pockets)
- **Your work** is expected to be readable, clearly expressed and correctly spelled (please use a UK spell checker & ask somebody to proof your written work)
- **Bibliography:** All written work should include a Bibliography and be referenced using Harvard Referencing System.
- **Cover Sheet:** A cover sheet containing the candidate number, the module name, the assessment (or assignment) title and the word count should be included attached to the front of each submission
- **Submission sheet for non-electronic submissions:** If you are submitting your assignment by hand you will need to attach a specific HE submission sheet. You can get these from BIMM reception. This form allows us to provide you with a receipt for your work and confirms that the work is your own and properly referenced.
- **Transcription/notation** submissions may be hand-written in pen or pencil. All written work should be word-processed unless the brief specifically states otherwise.

- **Written exams** will be performed under university exam conditions. All exam locations and times will be published well in advance on the BIMM VLE and BIMM Notice-boards.
- **It is the student's responsibility** to keep copies of all their work, either in digital, print or photocopied form, including CDs and recorded submissions.

Word count – The word count required for a written assessment is published to students and a variation of +/-10% from the specified figure is permitted without incurring a marking penalty. The limits as stated include quotations in the text, but do not include the bibliography, footnotes/endnotes, appendices, abstracts, maps, illustrations, transcriptions of linguistic data, or tabulations of numerical or linguistic data and their captions.

Any excess in word count should not confer an advantage over other students who have adhered to the guidance. Students are requested to state the word count on submission. Where a student has exceeded the word count by between 11% - 20% the Marker should penalise the work by deducting 10 percentage points from the grade. In excessive cases (>20%) the Marker need only consider work up to the designated word count, including the allowed 10% margin, and discount any text beyond that to ensure equity across the cohort.

Where an assessment falls significantly short (>10%) of the word count, the Marker must consider, when assigning a mark, if the argument has been sufficiently developed and is adequately supported, and not assign the full marks allocation where this is not the case.

Although markers are principally looking for well-structured arguments and interesting ideas, poorly written work may be penalised. Students with dyslexia will have their disability taken into consideration when marking work particularly in regard to issues of spelling, structure or grammar.

Digital Media

- **All digitally stored work must** be backed up twice.
- **Media:** CDs or additional materials should be firmly attached (a folder with a CD pocket is advisable).
- **Digital Compatibility:** It is the student's responsibility to check that audio and video discs (CD or DVD) are formatted correctly (see your assignment brief and/or course handbook) and that the discs play on standard domestic audio/video equipment (UK standard Audio CD Player or DVD video players). You should test this by playing final disks on 2 or more different machines. If in doubt seek advice from your tutor and remember – if we can't play it, we can't mark it!
- **Labels:** Ensure that your discs are labelled with your candidate number and the assignment name and module title. Avoid using stick on paper labels as these may jam if inserted into slot-loading CD/DVD players.

All hard copy coursework should be handed in as specified in the course handbook (also posted on the BIMM VLE). Ensure you sign the submission form in the presence of the person collecting the work (you will need your candidate number and student ID card). Work is recorded as submitted when the last item is handed in, so there is no benefit to submitting bibliographies, appendices, etc. separately and later.

Electronic Submission (BIMM VLE)

If submitting work electronically, make sure that you understand which format is required and what file size/type restrictions are in place.

Marks may be reduced by allowed-lateness penalties to, but not beyond, the pass mark. This means, for instance, that allowed lateness penalties cannot in themselves prevent progression. Specifically, it also means that such penalties may not cause the failure of an assessment unit that is a progress pre-requisite, nor can students be required to Re-sit assessments that they have academically passed, as a result of allowed-lateness penalties.

There are, however, no limits to the assessment, progression or classification consequences of zero marks that result from missing both the original deadline and the expiry of the period of allowed (but penalised) lateness. Unless mitigating evidence for this degree of lateness is accepted, the zero mark will stand and may indeed affect progression and require Re-sitting of the assessment units in question.

Important: Delays in typing or failure of word-processing facilities will not constitute acceptable reasons for non-submission or late submission of work.

Appendix 2: Examination Assessment Regulations

Time and place of examinations

Assessment Calendars can be found on Moodle.

Changes to the published timetable will only be made if a previously overlooked clash between exams is identified or in special cases relating to religious observance.

Invigilation

BIMM will arrange for appropriate invigilation throughout the examinations. However, it is the responsibility of the examiner (normally the module leader) who set the paper to be available (by phone) throughout the duration of the paper in the event of a query.

Late arrival and early departure

Students, who arrive late, but within 60 minutes of an examination commencing, will be allowed to join the examination, but no extra time will be allowed. No student will be admitted to the examination room more than 60 minutes after the start of an examination. Arrival more than 60 minutes late will be deemed as absence from the examination, for which a zero mark is recorded, but the student will have the opportunity to present evidence in mitigation of the absence for consideration by the BIMM Mitigating Evidence Committee.

Students may not leave the examination room during the first 60 minutes or the last 10 minutes of an examination.

Attendance lists (Exam Register)

A record of attendance will be taken prior to the start of the examination. At the end of the examination session, the Invigilator will report any absences to the BIMM HE Office. A record of the scripts submitted by each student will be made on the attendance sheet – 2 copies of this register **must** be submitted to the HE Administrator.

Examination aids

For certain papers, the invigilators will provide specific aids or hand-outs where questions necessitate their use. The use of other aids (e.g. dictionaries) is not permitted.

Recording of viva voce examinations and music performances

The recording **by students** of viva voce examinations or music performance examinations is forbidden (as is recording by members of the audience in the latter case). Live performance assessments will be recorded by staff for the purposes of external examination.

Seen Examinations

Where seen examinations are permitted, students must not bring any materials into the examination hall.

Ill-health and impairment occurring during the examination period

Please contact your tutor and Course Leader for advice.

Long-term medical conditions and disabilities

Please contact the Course Leader for advice.

Written exams will be performed under exam conditions or, for one-week papers, returned to the tutor in the following class. All submission locations and times are at the discretion of the tutor.

Students with dyslexia and learning impairments

To maintain a consistent approach in dealing with the assessment issues relating to dyslexia and similar impairments that affect students' ability to express themselves, dyslexic students or students who think that they may be dyslexic should arrange an assessment with the Head of Student Services at BIMM. Assessment arrangements require the written recommendation of the Head of Student Services BIMM – previous diagnoses and arrangements will not be taken as proof of need for current circumstances. In the first instance the student should contact the Head of Student Services BIMM, which will then carry out an assessment and inform the relevant staff. BIMM will contact the student to let them know that the arrangements for assessments are being dealt with. Subsequently the Head of Student Services will write to the student with the arrangements of their assessments.

Alternative assessments for disabled students

Where a student with a disability feels that they are substantially disadvantaged by the existing assessment for a module, they should contact the Head of Student Services BIMM (HE students) by week 6 of the autumn term. Support staff will make an initial judgement as to whether there is a reasonable basis for the request and, if so, will initiate a process involving the Head of Education, who is also the Examination Board Deputy Chair, to consider possible alternative modes of assessment that would provide an equivalent test of the same learning outcomes of the module without compromising academic standards. The procedures will operate as set out at the following URL:

<http://www.sussex.ac.uk/equalities/disability/informationfordisabledstudents>

A student may appeal against the decision to retain the original assessment or if they remain concerned that the additional support will not obviate a perceived disadvantage.

Religious festivals and holy days

Special arrangements will be made for students in the event of religious festivals or holy days (which preclude normal work being undertaken by the students) coinciding with a scheduled examination period.

Students should notify the Student Services Office by end of the Autumn Term if they wish to request special arrangements to be made, or exemption for examinations, on the prescribed days of a religious festival.

Suitable arrangements will then be made for students to remain incommunicado for the period whilst religious devotions are practiced and for the duration of any examination sat at an alternative time, until such time as the student is able to return to the normal examination time-table; the student will normally take their paper(s) after the majority have completed. Such arrangements depend on the student's individual exam timetable and reasonable operational constraints.

Appendix 3: Generic Undergraduate Assessment Marking Scheme

Level 3 (Foundation)	Level 4 (Certificate)	Level 5 (Diploma)	Level 6 (Degree)
<p>90%-100% Exceptional work with presentation of a very high standard. Demonstrates comprehensive knowledge and understanding in applying skills and methods to address complex problems. The work displays exceptional technical competence and the ability to work autonomously. The work shows a very high level of awareness of different perspectives or approaches.</p>	<p>90%-100% Exceptional work with presentation of a very high standard. There is coherence of ideas and demonstration of a thorough knowledge and understanding. The work demonstrates a very high level of technical competence and skill and is supported by external knowledge that is meticulously referenced where required.</p>	<p>90%-100% Exceptional work with presentation of the highest standard. The work is coherent and high levels of skill and subject knowledge have been demonstrated. The work exhibits ability in problem solving and critical evaluation (where required) and exceptional levels of technical ability and skill. There is evidence of a sound ability to critically interrelate theories with examples from practice where appropriate.</p>	<p>90%-100% Denotes work approaching professional quality in all key areas. Outstanding skill and ability is exercised equally with regard to form, content and purpose. Demonstrates an exceptional degree of commitment, creativity, research, critical engagement and contextual understanding. The quality and vision of the work is exemplary.</p>
<p>80%-89% Outstanding work with presentation of a very high standard. Demonstrates a depth of knowledge of key concepts and methods and an ability to apply those methods to solve complex problems. Technically highly competent displaying a very good level of appropriate skill and autonomy. The work indicates a high level of awareness of different perspectives and approaches.</p>	<p>80%-89% Outstanding work with presentation of a very high standard. There is coherence of ideas and demonstration of a thorough knowledge and understanding of the subject. The work demonstrates a high level of technical competence and skills and is supported by external knowledge accurately referenced as appropriate.</p>	<p>80%-89% Outstanding work with presentation of a very high standard, creative and imaginative, in engaging the recipient. There is comprehensive understanding of key concepts and knowledge and evidence of critical analysis and insight. The work is appealing and technically proficient and is clearly related to external knowledge and engagement with reflective learning. There is some evidence of an ability to critically interrelate theories with examples from practice where appropriate.</p>	<p>80%-89% Outstanding work - articulate, imaginative and thorough. Clearly and purposefully structured, maintaining a high level of audience interest. Work that is exciting and innovative as well as being commercially/academically and technically confident. All elements combine to consciously create the required finished product. Makes strong reference to external knowledge and its relationship to the work, and illustrates clearly a critical engagement with what has been learned through the process.</p>
<p>70%-79% Extremely good work with presentation of a high standard. Demonstrates excellent levels of knowledge and understanding of key concepts and methods and the ability to apply them to solve complex problems. Technically very competent displaying skill and autonomy. The work indicates a good level of awareness of other perspectives and approaches.</p>	<p>70%-79% Extremely good work with presentation of a high standard. There is coherence of ideas and demonstration of thorough knowledge and understanding. The work demonstrates a strong level of technical competence and skills and is supported by external knowledge which has been properly referenced where necessary.</p>	<p>70%-79% Extremely good work with presentation of a high standard, which fulfils its aims with clarity. Work that is interesting, creative and technically confident. The work demonstrates effective understanding of the relationship between theory and practice. Significant evidence of critical analysis and reference to external knowledge and research where required.</p>	<p>70%-79% Extremely good work with presentation of a high standard, which fulfils its aims with precision. Work that is exciting, technically assured and commercially/academically confident with a clear understanding of the theoretical issues and application to practice where appropriate. There is effective critical and analytical application of relevant research, external knowledge and learning.</p>
<p>60%-69% The work is very-well presented. Demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of key concepts and methods and the ability to apply them to solve complex problems. Technically competent displaying skill and autonomy. The work indicates awareness of other perspectives and approaches.</p>	<p>60%-69% The work is well presented and coherently structured. There is evidence of a sound knowledge and understanding of the issues with theory linked to practice where appropriate. The work demonstrates a good level of technical competence and skills and is supported by external knowledge that is well referenced where required.</p>	<p>60%-69% A very sound piece of work, which is well presented and engaging on the whole. Demonstrates sound techniques, knowledge and understanding with an emerging ability to critically engage with and apply the concepts involved linking them to practice where appropriate. Content is wholly relevant and is coherently structured and referenced to external knowledge.</p>	<p>60%-69% A stimulating, engaging and successful piece of work. Cohesive in structure and impact, but perhaps exhibiting some minor flaws. May have many of the qualities of work in the categories above but without the same level of excitement, vision, accuracy or originality. Makes reference to external knowledge and its relationship to the work, and illustrates what has been learned through the process.</p>

Level 3 (Foundation)	Level 4 (Certificate)	Level 5 (Diploma)	Level 6 (Degree)
<p>50%-59% Work is of a good standard and presentation is acceptable with some errors. Demonstrates knowledge and understanding of key concepts and methods and their use to address complex problems. Technically competent demonstrating skill and autonomy. The work shows some awareness of other perspectives and approaches.</p>	<p>50%-59% Work is of a good standard and presentation is acceptable but with some errors. There is knowledge and understanding of issues under discussion and some evidence of the application of knowledge and ideas where appropriate. The work demonstrates a sufficient level of technical competence and skill and is supported by appropriate references to external knowledge as required.</p>	<p>50%-59% Work is of a good standard but displays some shortcomings. Evidence of a sound knowledge base but limited critical and practical application of concepts and ideas. Overall, technically competent, but may omit some significant (but not vital) aspects of the task set. Some reference is made to external knowledge together with some connection between ideas and the meaning of the work, where appropriate.</p>	<p>50%-59% Good work, successful in meeting its aims and meaningful to the recipient, though there may be minor problems with structure or execution. A well-considered and produced piece of work that meet and in parts exceeds the intended outcomes. Overall, technically competent, but may omit some significant (but not vital) aspects of the task set. Makes reference to external knowledge and some connection with ideas and the meaning of the work.</p>
<p>40%-49% Work is of an acceptable standard but may contain a number of errors. Demonstrates a basic knowledge and understanding of key concepts and methods that may be used to solve complex problems. Demonstrates acceptable technical ability and a basic level of autonomy. The work makes reference to other perspectives and approaches.</p>	<p>40%-49% Presentation is acceptable but attention to structure and style is required. The content is relevant but largely descriptive or unimaginative. There is evidence of a reasonable level of knowledge and understanding but there is limited use of external knowledge to support the ideas. Some links are made to external knowledge where appropriate.</p>	<p>40%-49% Overall a competent piece of work with adequate presentation. The work makes some links between theory and practice where appropriate, and there is also some reference to external knowledge. The work may lack coherence and may be unsubstantiated by relevant source material or partially flawed. Technical skills are limited. The work has elements that are poorly structured and confused: the recipient may have to concentrate to find meaning.</p>	<p>40%-49% Overall the work shows some degree of competence although there are some obvious technical problems. Often lacking in imagination and perhaps conventional in approach or concept. The work may communicate with difficulty: the recipient may have to concentrate to find meaning. Lacking in cohesion, the work does impart a message, but only partially and may be deficient in individuality or creativity.</p>
<p>30%-39% – Fail The work is poorly structured and presented with the inclusion of irrelevant material. Demonstrates little knowledge and understanding of key concepts and methods or their use in solving complex problems. Indicates a lack of technical competence and/or autonomy and may not display awareness of other perspectives and approaches.</p>	<p>30%-39% – Fail The work is poorly structured and presented. Some material may be irrelevant. There is little evidence of technical competence or skills. Content is based largely on taught elements with very little evidence of independent study and little or no reference to external knowledge.</p>	<p>30%-39% – Fail The work is poorly structured, incoherent and poorly presented and contains numerous errors, inconsistencies and omissions with limited use of source material. Evidence of a weak knowledge base with some key aspects not addressed and use of irrelevant material. Flawed use of techniques. Limited evidence of engagement with external knowledge and no evidence of critical thought. Little reference is made to practice or theory where appropriate.</p>	<p>30%-39% – Fail The work is poorly presented and contains numerous errors, inconsistencies and omissions with limited use of source material. Fails to communicate a coherent message, perhaps through a mixture of lack of logical thought, poor organisation of material and/or technical incompetence. It may show basic technical proficiency, but the student is unable to apply these skills to produce meaning. Lacks critical analysis and reflection and makes very limited reference to theory and practice.</p>
<p>20-29% – Fail Fails to meet the brief. The work is very poorly structured and presented and much or all of it is irrelevant. Demonstrates little or no knowledge and understanding of the key concepts and methods for complex problem solving. Displays little or no technical competence and/or autonomy and does not demonstrate any awareness of other perspectives or approaches.</p>	<p>20-29% – Fail Fails to meet the brief. The work is very poorly structured and presented. Much material is irrelevant. There is minimal evidence of technical competence or skill. Content is based almost entirely on taught elements with very little evidence of any purposeful engagement with or reference to external knowledge.</p>	<p>20-29% – Fail Fails to meet the principal requirements of the assignment brief and the work has limited meaning. Very poorly structured and presented, incoherent and lacking in imagination or insight. Evidence of a very weak knowledge base with many key omissions and much material irrelevant. Use of inappropriate or incorrect techniques. Very little or no evidence of appropriate references to external knowledge, and no evidence of critical thought.</p>	<p>20-29% – Fail Fails to meet the principal requirements of the assignment brief and the work has limited meaning. Very poorly structured, incoherent and lacking in imagination or insight. The work is very poorly presented and contains numerous serious errors, inconsistencies and omissions. The work displays a very weak knowledge base and a lack of sufficient understanding of the topic. Very little or no evidence of appropriate references to external knowledge and no evidence of critical thought.</p>

Level 3 (Foundation)	Level 4 (Certificate)	Level 5 (Diploma)	Level 6 (Degree)
<p>0-19 % - Fail Work is of an extremely poor standard with significant errors and presentation is poor. Demonstrates no knowledge and understanding of key concepts and methods and their use to address complex problems. Technically incompetent demonstrating little skill and autonomy. The work shows no awareness of other perspectives and approaches.</p>	<p>0-19 % - Fail The work is extremely poorly structured and presented. It demonstrates no real knowledge or understanding of key concepts and principles. Much material is irrelevant. No effective use of external knowledge. No evidence of technical competence or skill. Not a genuine attempt to engage with the assessment requirements and/or subject matter.</p>	<p>0-19 % - Fail The work is extremely poorly structured and presented. It demonstrates no real knowledge or understanding of key concepts and principles. Much material is irrelevant, incorrect or omitted. No evidence of critical thought, technical competence or skill. No effective use of external knowledge. No links to practice where appropriate. Not a genuine attempt to engage with the assessment requirements and/or subject matter.</p>	<p>0-19 % - Fail The work is extremely poorly structured and presented. It demonstrates no real knowledge or understanding of key concepts and principles. Much material is irrelevant, incorrect, inconsistent or omitted. No evidence of critical analysis and reflection. No effective use of supporting material and external knowledge. No evidence of technical ability or skill. No application of theory to practice where appropriate. Not a genuine attempt to engage with the assessment requirements and/or subject matter.</p>

Appendix 4: Moderation of Marks

Policy

1. All formally assessed work is to be systematically moderated, based on a sample across the full spread of grades, in order to verify overall marking standards.
2. In keeping with the expectations of our awarding partners, all assessments that contribute to the award (levels 5 and 6), with the exception of assessment components weighted at 30% or less of the module total, are subject to moderation. Any assessment of modules that do not contribute to the award (levels 3 & 4) will not be subject to verification and will be marked by one Tutor*.

N.B. 'Scripts' refers to all submitted student work whether practical, written or project-based.

Level	Moderation Requirements
3+4	None required*.
5	10% of scripts (minimum of two; maximum of 50) from each banding (0-9, 10-19, 20-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60-69, 70-79, 80-89, 90-100) across the full range of First Markers, subject to availability.
6	For all 20 credit modules, 10% of scripts (minimum of two; maximum of 50) from each banding (as above) across the full range of First Markers, subject to availability. For all 40/60 credit modules, all scripts will be double marked.

Procedure

1. The First Markers mark to the appropriate marking criteria, annotate scripts as necessary, clearly state how the mark has been arrived at and provide feed forward.
2. The Moderator reviews a percentage of scripts, as outlined in the above table, in order to ensure that the criteria have been applied consistently and at the right pitch by the First Marker(s), and to evaluate the quality of feedback and feed forward elements. For small batches of scripts, a sufficient number should be reviewed in order to assess the appropriateness of First Marker(s) work.
3. If no issues are identified by the Moderator, they complete the moderation form by clearly identifying student and module data and stating that the process has been completed satisfactorily.
4. If the Moderator identifies a problem with the consistency of marks awarded by a First Marker, this is reported to the Course Leader and/or Head of Education, all that First Marker's scripts are second marked and the new marks are agreed, recorded on the moderation coversheet and amended in the original location.
5. If the Moderator identifies a problem with the quality of feedback written by a First Marker, this is reported to the Course Leader and/or Head of Education, one of whom works with that

First Marker in revisiting and improving their feedback. This process will be recorded on the moderation coversheet.

6. If the Moderator finds a problem with pitch (i.e. consistently over or under-marking) the two markers agree a recalibration in consultation with the External Examiner, but do not need to second mark all scripts. The recalibration is annotated on the moderation coversheet and marks are amended in the original location.
7. Upon completion of double marking, both tutors agree a final mark. Only this mark will be returned to students.

All practical assessments will be recorded and the First Marker will attend and mark the performances of all candidates. Moderation of these marks will be carried out later using the recordings.

Marking by new members of staff will be monitored as appropriate, which may include double-marking, until they have demonstrated competence in the application of appropriate standards. Sessional tutors will only engage in solo marking after completing training provided by BIMM.

Once the internal moderation/double-marking process has been completed, external moderation is carried out by External Examiners appointed by the awarding partner.

*Whilst assessments at levels 3+4 are not subject to moderation, marking by new members of staff and on new modules will be monitored as appropriate (this may include double-marking), until competence in the application of appropriate standards has been demonstrated. Tutors will only engage in solo marking after completing training provided by BIMM.

The requirements detailed above constitute the minimum moderation requirements for BIMM colleges delivering University of Sussex-validated courses. Additional moderation may be carried out if, for whatever reason, a Head of Education deems it appropriate to do so.

Appendix 5: Extensions for students with registered learning difficulties

Students with Learning Difficulties must provide external evidence of such from a registered practitioner in the first term of the academic year. This is to be given to Head of Student Services. Subsequent written work extension requests should be made to the Head of Student Services who will inform the relevant Course Leader, Head of Education and HE Administrator.

Extension requests must be made pre-emptively, in advance of the work deadline as published in the relevant course manual. This will normally be three weeks, although requests can be made up to the hand in date at the discretion of Head of Student Services and the relevant Head of Education. Requests cannot be made retrospectively, and non-pre-emptive submission problems will be dealt with via the established MEC procedures.

Head of Student Services is to confirm the extension request with the Course Leader and Head of Education and let the student know the result. Extensions can only refer to written coursework, and are only to be allowed where this avoids disadvantage in cases of students with registered learning difficulties. Extensions will normally be 5 days only, but up to 10 days can be allowed.

Appendix 6: Anonymity in the marking of assessed work

Candidates should submit written work identified only by candidate number and not candidate name. It is the candidate's responsibility to remember and use their number. The marking of assessed work will then be conducted anonymously via this candidate number as far as reasonably practical, although examiners cannot guarantee that they will not recognise the work, particularly where tutorial support has been given. Candidate numbers will also be used in the marking of unseen examinations.

In performance assessments; where anonymity is impractical, students will be marked by name and then, the mark will be recorded by candidate number.

Students should use their candidate number on all written and notated submissions. Submissions that contain the candidate's name may be returned for removal. Candidate numbers will also be used to return marks via notice boards and email.

Appendix 7: Return of Marks and Feedback to Students

BIMM aims to inform students of marks via the VLE and/or email no later than 15 working days (i.e. 21 calendar days plus public holidays) of the submission deadline/ performance date. Please note that this period will be extended by a week over the Xmas break to reflect the fact that BIMM closes completely for this length of time, thus losing these working days.

If, for any legitimate reason, BIMM is unable to meet this deadline, we will communicate clearly with the affected students, both to make them aware of the situation and of the proposed new date for publication.

It should be noted that provisional marks are for guidance only, as the external examination process may result in marks being revised, and that final marks are confirmed at the Progression and Award Board.

Appendix 8: Mitigating Evidence

Criteria for making an individual mitigating evidence claim

Individual mitigating circumstances is the University's description of circumstances which are **sudden, unforeseen and temporarily** prevent a student from undertaking assessment, or significantly impact on student performance in assessment in general, including late submission: as such the measure of severity is not about the impact on the student but the impact on the assessment.

A mitigating evidence claim may be made against the following circumstances:

- *Late or non-submission* of assessment
- Absence from an in-person assessment
- Assessment submitted on time and/or in-person assessment (such as examination) taken on scheduled date – but assessment performance is *seriously* and *unexpectedly impaired*.

A claim can only be submitted for the current academic year. Late claims may be permitted via an Appeal following Progression and Award Boards and within the 21-day period allowed.

Pre-existing conditions and other long term conditions or disability (not mitigation)

If your circumstances are not sudden, unforeseen or temporary in nature then you cannot claim individual mitigating circumstances but may be supported by 'reasonable adjustments'. Students with a declared disability (such as dyslexia) or a pre-existing condition (such as anxiety, depression, ME, cardiovascular or respiratory disease) may register with BIMM Student Services Department for an evaluation of their needs which may lead to a change to existing assessment arrangements (including extensions to deadlines, alternative assessment modes and in-person exam arrangements). Student Support staff will contact your Course Leader who will consult with academic colleagues including the Head of Education to ensure the on-going academic integrity of the module assessment.

Reasonable adjustments may also be made for cases of pregnancy or related maternity needs, and for cases of evidenced 'temporary illness' expected to last for greater than 3 weeks duration, such as anticipated medical treatment, including hospitalisation.

Student Services will require appropriate evidence (such as medical or dyslexia assessment) and a few weeks to evaluate your support needs and arrange an individual 'reasonable adjustment'. Therefore, you are advised to register early.

Mitigating evidence to be submitted

The evidence submitted to support a claim must be independent and robust and cover the period related to the assessment date(s).

Examples of acceptable evidence include:

- Medical certificate with dates of consultation and diagnosis
- Death certificate of close relative or significant other
- In the absence of a death certificate a letter from a relative (with full contact details to corroborate) confirming relationship to deceased will be acceptable.
- Hospital admissions report or appointment letter

- A letter from Psychological and Counselling Services with consultation dates and statement of impact on assessment
- A letter from Student Services confirming that 'reasonable adjustments' were not yet in place or in need of revision due to acute flare up of a long term stable condition such as asthma. For the latter, a GP certificate would constitute evidence if the condition was usually stable. Claims may be rejected if a student fails to register with Student Services for support as multiple claims cannot be made for a period of instability of a long-term condition that should be managed by a 'reasonable adjustment'.

Statement of impact on assessment

In making a Mitigating Evidence Claim you need to describe how the ***sudden, unforeseen and temporary*** circumstances ***significantly impacted*** on your performance in assessment. Your personal statement on the claim form should describe how your individual module assessment (s) has been affected by the illness/event supported by accurate dates, which correspond to the evidence supplied. The dates are particularly important, as individual **mitigating evidence is not about the severity of the impact of the circumstances on you personally but on your ability to perform in assessment.**

Timeline for submission of a claim

Your statement should be completed as early as possible, either before or normally within 7 days of the assessment deadline. This should be supported by independent documented evidence submitted within 21 days of the assessment deadline. An early submission of your claim may also speed up an assessment of entitlement to additional support should your circumstances indicate on-going health or support issues. Claims may be made 'in advance' for known absence/non-submission (for example a scheduled operation) but you must ensure that the period that you cite is covered by the evidence supplied. A claim for an impaired assessment cannot be submitted in advance.

Possible outcomes of an accepted mitigating evidence claim against an Individual Assessment:

1. **Removal of a late penalty** for work submitted up to 7 days late **under the authority of the Mitigating Evidence Committee.**
2. **Discretion for the progression and award board (PAB) to offer a 'sit'** of the 'Re-sit mode of the module' (that is taking the Re-sit mode at the next opportunity without capping at the pass mark). The mark achieved on the 'sit' will then be scaled for the proportion of the marks with accepted mitigation in relation to non-submission/absence/impairment (see above). If a student takes the offer of a Sit the marks achieved at the first attempt (module mark or element of assessment with accepted mitigation) will be removed from the student record and will be replaced with the mark achieved at the Sit (even where a lower mark is achieved). If a student does not take the Sit then the existing mark (including any zeros) will be used by the next PAB for progression and award decisions.
3. **Discretion for the PAB to confirm the marks array** without the offer of a 'Sit' in cases where the impact of the accepted claim is not apparent on the overall module mark as evidenced by the small weighting of the assessment affected and/or the module mark being consistent with the students' performance on other unaffected modules. This decision does not question the legitimacy of the accepted claim, but seeks to avoid the over assessment of such students who may be required to take a 'Sit' unnecessarily. In all cases

the PAB must ensure that the academic standards of the award or decision to progress a student is upheld in accordance with BIMM's Examination and Assessment Regulations.

Right of appeal if evidence is rejected

Evidence will be judged to be: **accepted; rejected; or inadmissible** (such as loss of computer files). If the evidence is rejected, you may submit additional evidence within 21 days of notification (equivalent to the appeal period) so far as timescales in relation to the relevant exam boards allow. If deemed inadmissible there is no further opportunity to submit evidence.

Examples of **inadmissible as evidence** (no further opportunity to submit evidence)

- circumstances that you could have reasonably foreseen or prevented (such as suspension, intoxication or conviction for illegal activity)
- minor illness or ailment (cold, minor allergy)
- holiday arrangements
- wedding arrangements
- financial issues
- personal computer/data loss and/ or printer problems
- jury service

Examples of **rejected evidence** (opportunity to submit additional evidence)

- your statement indicates you have an acute medical condition but no medical evidence is submitted or medical certificate lacks detail to support claim 'retrospective' medical note – consultation dates do not support the claim
- long-term events and conditions which have already been claimed for and Student Services Department has offered to review and/or consider reasonable adjustments.

Claims that appear to relate to 'on-going' issues, and thus potentially generate repeat claims, will be referred, as a matter of course, to your Student Support Officer who will contact you with information about appropriate services at BIMM and/or the procedures for consulting a disability advisor.

Notification of Outcome of Claim

If you provide all the required documentation and your case is supported with dated, robust evidence, your claim may be accepted by the Chair of the Mitigation Evidence Committee (MEC). The Chair of MEC has the power to remove any lateness penalties, in most cases, but referral to MEC may be required for some claims. In all other cases you may be notified that your evidence has been accepted, but that the decision to offer a 'Sit' of the 'Re-sit mode' lies with either the Interim Progress Board, which meets at the mid-point in the academic year, or the Progress & Award Board, which meets in the summer.

Where the Chair of MEC does not feel able to make a decision, it will be referred to the MEC, which meets regularly.

If you are a student with identified support issues, have disclosed a disability or have registered with BIMM, and if your claim meets the MEC criteria it will be considered and decisions made in accordance with the usual principles of the MEC. However, in addition to any waiving of penalties or other MEC-related recommendations to the PAB, your existing 'reasonable adjustments' will be reviewed, and any further anticipatory adjustments will be made in discussion with you, your disability advisor and the Head of Student Services.

General advice and guidance

If you are concerned with your academic progress you should contact your Course Leader without delay to discuss how you may obtain additional support.

For non-academic advice, the Student Support Officers can provide guidance on the MEC process and may help you to understand the form you need to complete and any relevant BIMM rules or processes. However, it is not their role to write your statement or complete the form for you, nor to indicate the possible outcome of any claims.

Confidentiality

Your Course Leader and tutors do not have access to the details of your claim. The Chair of MEC handles most claims. More complex cases, or where evidence is less clear, will be anonymised and discussed by the MEC. The process is highly confidential, with forms and evidence documents kept securely.

Attendance Procedure

Students must attend all lessons and other timetabled commitments throughout their course. Whenever a student is absent s/he must be prepared to explain the reasons for absence upon their return to college, and to produce satisfactory evidence to justify it. All absences should be notified on forms available from your Student Support Officer.

Implementation

It is the responsibility of tutors to record all absences and to check their registers weekly. All absences should be followed up upon the student's return to the College. The student services team record all absences and authorised absences and these computerised records are available to Course Leaders and tutors on request.

On the first occasion the student will receive an informal warning via email. On the second occasion, a formal warning will be issued via a standard letter, and the student may be asked to attend a tutorial with their Student Support Officer. Subsequent concern over attendance will result in further tutorials.

At this stage, students will be warned that any further unauthorised absence may result in the permanent withdrawal from the module(s) in question and/or the course.

With respect to longer continuous periods of unauthorised absence, a student may be withdrawn from the course, if they are continuously absent from BIMM without reason or contact with BIMM for a period of three weeks.

Appendix 9: Arrangements for Intermission

Students who wish to intermit between Stages 1 and 2 will be required to have fulfilled the progression requirements before intermission.

Any student who has intermitted will be classified in accordance with the weighting scheme and assessment criteria, which relate to the year/stage in which the student is finally assessed and classified (and not the scheme in operation when the student initially registered).

A student may be allowed intermission from study at any point in the academic calendar. However, because most BIMM modules are yearlong, re-admission is normally only possible at the start of an academic year. We would prefer, therefore, that students intermit only after completing the year of study on which they are registered, i.e. at the end of Year Two/Level 5, in order that, all modules from that year are completed, appropriate credit achieved and progression requirements satisfied. In the case of genuine hardship or illness BIMM will endeavour to be as flexible as possible and may (at BIMM's discretion) allow a student to resume studies at any point after assessing the individual case and the level of additional support required to ensure that the student is not unduly disadvantaged.

If the intermission period extends to more than twelve months and the individual would miss more than one academic year BIMM reserves the right to reassess the individual's case before readmitting them to the course. This will ensure any unforeseen circumstances, such as changes to the course structure, will not hinder successful progression through the remainder of the course.

Appendix 10: External Examiners

Appointment is by the University's Teaching & Learning Committee. Nominations are submitted on a standard template from the Partnership Office. Criteria for appointment are to be found in the University's External Examiner Handbook:

<http://www.sussex.ac.uk/adqe/standards/externalexaminers>

Nominations are considered in detail by the Collaborative Provision Committee, which then makes a recommendation to the University's Teaching & Learning Committee. Nominations must be put forward at least four months before the expiry of the previous examiner's tenure.

New External examiners are invited to visit BIMM to review course documents, meet staff, observe teaching and meet with students.

Heads of Education/Higher Education are responsible for briefing external examiners and overseeing the action plans prepared in response to external examiner reports.

Work Samples provided to External Examiners

External moderation is conducted by the External Examiner, who will have access to the same sample of assessments and statistical data that has been reviewed as part of the internal moderation process. They will also have access to the internal Moderator's decision and any comments made. This ensures that evidence is provided to the External Examiner that marking, feedback and moderation have been completed.

Notes:

- Fails with marks of zero (i.e. non-submissions or non-attendance at assessments) are not included in samples.
- Assessments involving musical performance work should include a variety of instrumental disciplines within the sample where appropriate.
- Additional sample work will be made available to External Examiners if requested.

Appendix 11: Academic Misconduct

Academic misconduct

It is an offence for any student to be guilty of, or party to, attempting to commit or committing collusion, plagiarism, or any other misconduct in an examination or in the preparation of work that is submitted for assessment.

Misconduct in assessment exercises, examinations or in the presentation of marks achieved elsewhere is conduct likely to be prejudicial to the integrity and fairness of the examination process. The submission of a dissertation, essay or any other assessment exercise will be considered by the examiners to be a declaration that it is the candidate's own work.

Collusion

Collusion is the preparation or production of work for assessment jointly with another person or persons unless explicitly permitted by the examiners. An act of collusion is understood to encompass those who actively assist others as well as those who derive benefit from others' work. Where joint preparation, is permitted by the examiners but joint production is not, the submitted work must be produced solely by the candidate making the submission.

Where joint production or joint preparation and production of work for assessment is specifically permitted, this must be published in the appropriate course documentation. Assessments in this handbook are clearly marked as individual or group work, please consult your tutor or module leader if you are unsure about group or individual assignments.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is the use, without acknowledgement, of the intellectual work of others, and the presenting as new and original an idea or product derived from an existing source in work submitted for assessment.

To copy sentences, phrases or even striking expressions without acknowledgement of the source (either by inadequate citation or failure to indicate verbatim quotations), is plagiarism; to paraphrase without acknowledgement is, likewise, plagiarism.

Where such copying or paraphrase has occurred the mere mention of the source in the bibliography shall not be deemed sufficient acknowledgement; each such instance must be referred specifically to its source. Verbatim quotations must be either in inverted commas, or indented, and directly acknowledged.

Self-Plagiarism

Self-plagiarism occurs when a student submits work for credit which has previously been submitted for assessment elsewhere. This may be part of a piece of work or the entire piece of work, and may have been submitted to BIMM or another institution.

The situations in which self-plagiarism is permitted by BIMM are:

- Where a student undertakes a repeat year, they may resubmit part of a piece of work or the entire piece of work on a module for which credit has not been achieved, provided that it has

not been submitted for and achieved credit elsewhere. In such cases, however, the student should be aware that a different mark may be awarded for the repeat submission for a variety of reasons.

- Work submitted previously may be used as an element of a dissertation or double-weighted final year project, provided that it does not comprise more than 20% of the total word count and is properly referenced.

Personation

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

Students who attend an examination without their student ID-card or other acceptable form of photo-ID will not have their examination script marked until their identity has been confirmed.

The College takes personation extremely seriously and any suspicion of personation will result in an investigation of potential academic misconduct

Misconduct in unseen examinations

Misconduct in unseen examinations includes having access, or attempting to gain access, during an examination, to any books, memoranda, notes, unauthorised calculators, or any other material, except such as may have been supplied by the invigilator or authorised by official university bodies. It also includes aiding or attempting to aid another student, or obtaining or attempting to obtain aid from another student, or any other communication within the Examination Room.

Fabrication of results

All instances of plagiarism, collusion, fabrication of results, or misconduct in an unseen exam are serious failures to respect the integrity and fairness of the examination process.

Non-Contributory Work

In the case of non-contributory work, which contains material that would otherwise be subject to misconduct procedures were the work to be contributory, and such potential misconduct is identified, students should be referred to the published guidance on avoiding plagiarism and may receive advice as to future conduct.

A 'notice of advice', which should include an indication of the guidance provided, may be held on the student's file. The student will be notified at their registered address if such a notice is retained. The notice of advice may be used only to establish that appropriate guidance has been provided, and may not be used to establish the extent of guilt should subsequent cases arise.

Investigation of misconduct

If a member of staff has sufficient reason to suspect that misconduct has taken place, an investigation into the case will be held. Candidates must be available, if required, to attend an academic misconduct hearing at BIMM. The BIMM assessment procedures are designed to enable the identification of plagiarism, personation and collusion, and the college may make use of electronic means in reviewing student work. Where there is evidence indicating that there may be a case of collusion or plagiarism

or personation the assessment is referred to the Investigating Officer who will investigate the case in detail.

The hearing will adhere to the following procedures:

Investigating Officer

An Investigating Officer is appointed for each course. Investigating Officers may also act as Misconduct Panel members in cases where they have not determined the prima facie case. Where Investigating Officers believe misconduct has occurred in work done by students they have taught or by their personal tutees, they will pass the consideration of allegations to the Investigating Officer of another course.

Types of Misconduct

Determination of minor and major cases of misconduct

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

- a) The assessment impact is not a relevant issue. For example, cheating will not be condoned just because the work in question is not heavily weighted in terms of the overall mark for the unit, or the module itself is not a significantly weighted module within the course. Level of study is not germane to the decision;
- b) The extent of the misconduct is a key factor: a piece of work, which has been downloaded verbatim from the internet will inevitably be regarded as a prima facie case of major misconduct whereas the lack of proper citation in one or two articles or where it is incorrectly formatted might be seen as a minor case of misconduct;
- c) Consideration of the extent of the pre-meditated intention involved in the misconduct. Where the evidence suggests the student has been sophisticated in their use of unattributed material, e.g. deliberate minor editing of plagiarised text to give the impression that it is their own work, what appears initially to be a quantitatively minor breach might instead be deemed major. Conversely, a large but single and un-edited example of non-attribution within an essay, which is otherwise properly referenced, might justify deeming an apparently major case as minor.

Minor misconduct

Minor misconduct is where a small proportion of a piece of assessed work is found to be plagiarised or has been subject to minor collusion (for example, where two students work together on producing a small section of an assessment or where minor examination room infringements occur).

Minor misconduct may also be used where students are inexperienced and the misconduct relates mainly to the poor use of referencing protocols.

Multiple instances of minor misconduct are likely to lead to a charge of 'major' misconduct.

Major misconduct

Major misconduct is where a significant proportion of a piece of work is found to be plagiarised, where there is substantial collusion or fabrication of results or abuse of examination room protocols, where there is evidence of serial minor misconduct, or where personation has occurred.

Misconduct is more likely to be considered 'major' where the work contributes to the classification of an award, or where the student has experience of UK higher education.

Students found guilty of submitting work which they describe as their own but, which has been produced on their behalf by another person, or found guilty of soliciting another person to undertake an assessment on their behalf (for example by commissioning someone to write an essay for them), or of undertaking to solicit or prepare an assessment on behalf of someone else shall be guilty of personation.

Students guilty of personation are likely to receive a more severe penalty.

Where the Investigating Officer is unable to decide whether a case is either major or minor misconduct they should refer the case to the Misconduct Panel.

No Case

If the Investigating Officer believes that the evidence presented does not constitute a prima facie case, they will return the material to the examiner with a request for more information. If this is not forthcoming, the Investigating Officer will not proceed with the case.

Procedures for determining allegations of misconduct

Where it is suspected that a student has committed misconduct in the preparation and/or presentation of their work, the examiner should take appropriate steps to identify all instances of misconduct in the assessment exercise and highlight these for easy reference.

The Course Leader will be responsible for ensuring that the Investigating Officer receives appropriate assistance in undertaking the initial determination in relation to reviewing the submitted assessment (which may be of particular relevance where the examiner who raised the concern is not a permanent member of faculty).

If the suspected assessment is coursework undertaken, submitted, and returned during the course, the Module Leader should photocopy the exercise, retain the original, give the copy to the student with coversheet etc. and inform the student and the College Principal that the work is being investigated for possible misconduct.

Where the allegation is plagiarism, the examiner should mark the work taking the plagiarism into account. If a piece of work is plagiarised, in whole or in part, the mark should be reduced in proportion to the extent of the plagiarism identified. Non-plagiarised sections should be marked as standard. Therefore, the final mark should reflect a combination of the extent of the plagiarised passages, and the quality of the non-plagiarised work; it may or may not be a fail mark.

Where the allegation is another form of misconduct, the assessment should be given a mark which reflects the examiner's opinion of the work, as far as possible with the suspicion of misconduct set aside i.e. award a mark that reflects the quality of the work as it stands.

The marked-up original should be sent to the Investigating Officer by the Module Leader, together with the course handbook and a summary of any study skills information given to students.

The Investigating Officer may consult with course or module leaders, examiners, relevant subject examination board officers, invigilators (where allegations relate to unseen exams), and will determine whether or not a prima facie case for suspecting a student of misconduct has been presented.

If a prima facie case has been presented, the Investigating Officer shall determine whether the alleged misconduct is either a minor or major case of misconduct.

Once the Investigating Officer has made a determination that the case is either minor or major, BIMM will send a letter to the student to inform them that their work is under investigation, and what will happen next.

Procedure for a first case of plagiarism

Where plagiarism is identified in work submitted for assessment, and there is no previous incident of plagiarism logged on the student's record, the student will be referred to an Academic Practice tutorial. This will apply whether the case is determined to be minor or major.

The evidence file will be forwarded to the Investigating Officer who will make the usual determination whether the case is minor or major.

The Module Leader will be responsible for arranging to see the student to explain why the work is problematic, and will refer the student to an Academic Practice tutorial.

The student should be seen within 10 working days of the case being identified. The Module Leader will tell the student the proportion of the work judged to be plagiarised, and that it has been marked on that basis.

The student may accept the referral to the Academic Practice tutorial, or decline, or choose to challenge the allegation. Challenging the allegation of plagiarism would involve electing to go through the relevant standard procedure for minor or major cases (see below).

The plagiarism incident will be recorded against the student's assessment record; attendance and satisfactory engagement at the Academic Practice tutorial will be recorded and will be checked if a second incident of plagiarism occurs.

After seeing the student, the Module Leader will return the evidence file to the BIMM Office for retention.

Where a second case of plagiarism related misconduct occurs, the full Academic Misconduct Procedure, as set out below will be applied.

NB: Where the evidence file alone is not sufficient for the Investigating Officer to be able to define the suspected misconduct precisely (e.g. where a case might be plagiarism or personation; or plagiarism or collusion) the Investigating Officer may refer the case directly to the Academic Misconduct Panel for a fuller investigation into the facts.

Procedure for minor misconduct (other than a first case of plagiarism)

For minor misconduct, the Investigating Officer shall send the details to the Secretary of the Misconduct Panel who will then send the case to the College Principal for consideration and determination.

The College Principal may nominate another member of academic faculty to undertake the task of dealing with all minor misconduct cases. The College Principal (or nominee) will consider the case presented and interview the student about the allegation.

The College Principal may dismiss the case or may apply a penalty as set out below.

The application of penalties, which would result in, the overall failure of the course are reserved for major breaches and must be administered by Panels. If the College Principal (or nominee) feels minded to apply such a penalty, they must refer the case to the Misconduct Panel.

The way that the range of penalties open to the College Principal (or nominee) relate to those available to Panels is outlined above. The student may also be directed to undertake some form of remedial academic skills coaching.

The Secretary to the Misconduct Panel will formally inform the student of the outcome, and record the penalty on the marks database. A formal record will file.

The evidence file from the case will be returned to the Panel Secretary for archiving. Where the case is not proven, the College Principal (or nominee) will dismiss original copy of the suspected exercise will be returned to the student.

Procedure for major misconduct (other than a first case of plagiarism)

For major misconduct, the Investigating Officer shall send the details to the Secretary of the Misconduct Panel who will inform the Chair of the subject examination board. A provisional mark will have been entered on the array.

The Secretary of the Misconduct Panel will organise a misconduct hearing, which will comprise a Chair and two members of staff from the membership of the Board of studies.

The Module Leader will normally act as Presenter at the hearing. In cases where the Module Leader cannot be the Presenter they will be asked to identify an appropriate substitute Presenter, which may be the original examiner or the Investigating Officer, or another appropriately briefed member of the Staff.

The student shall be informed in writing by the Secretary of the date and purpose of the misconduct hearing, which will be at least 5 days (including weekends) from the date of the letter. The student will be provided with notice of the allegation made against them stated in broad terms and shall be directed to the relevant sections of this handbook. The student has a right to be accompanied at the hearing by a member of faculty.

Students are entitled (but not required) to attend a hearing. The student shall notify the Secretary at least 48 hours in advance of the hearing whether they will attend the hearing and who will accompany them. If the student does not attend they may submit a written statement. The evidence file will be available at an appropriate place for inspection by the student and their representative prior to the hearing and copies of the evidence will be provided to the student on request. Hearings may proceed in the absence of the student.

Panel members are required to familiarise themselves with the evidence before the panel in advance of the hearing the hearing must not depend entirely on the presentation of the case on the day of the Hearing. At the hearing, panel members will establish the facts and come to a conclusion as to whether or not misconduct has taken place.

Conduct of the hearing

The hearing will be conducted as follows:

- a) The Chair will explain to the student the procedure of the hearing. It will be made clear that the panel will seek, initially and as far as possible, misconduct has occurred or not, and will reach a decision on that point a legitimate factor in considering mitigation or aggravation;
- b) The Chair will read out the accusation, including the relevant definitions of misconduct, and will then ask the student whether they admit or deny the accusation;

Admission of accusation

- c) If the student admits the accusation, the hearing will be concerned with assessing the gravity of the offence and considering any evidence in mitigation. The presenter will be invited to assess the extent of the misconduct. The student will be invited to respond with the help of their representative.

Denial of accusation

- d) If the student denies the accusation, the hearing will first be concerned to establish whether misconduct has taken place. The presenter will make the case against the student. The student will defend their case with the help of their representative. Members of the panel may intervene from time to time to raise a question;
- e) Where the Chair of a misconduct panel considers it to be beneficial in resolving a case (either in advance of a hearing or during a hearing), the Chair may invite an academic from the relevant department (but not the person responsible for marking the work) or the external examiner or other person of independent status and of equivalent expertise to attend the misconduct hearing and to question the student on the academic content of the work under investigation.

The purpose of the questioning will be to establish the students' knowledge of the work in question, knowledge of the methods used to produce the work, and knowledge of the sources (cited or otherwise) informing the work. In the case of this requirement emerging during a hearing, the meeting will be adjourned and a new date established.

- f) Once the Chair deems that all the relevant evidence has been heard, the chair will ask the presenter to withdraw, while the panel members reach a conclusion (by simple majority vote in the absence of unanimity). The Chair will then invite the student, their representative and the presenter to return to hear the panels conclusion and whether the student has been found guilty or not guilty;

Not guilty

- g) If the student is found not guilty, the provisional mark awarded will stand and be used for progress and classification purposes. The student will be told, at the end of the hearing, the outcome and the Secretary to the hearing will so inform the student, in writing, within ten working days from the date of the hearing.

Guilty

- h) If the student is found guilty the panel will then hear evidence and once the student and presenter have left the room, the panel will agree an appropriate penalty.
- i) The student will be told, at the end of the hearing, the penalty to be applied. The panel reserves the right to defer its decision for a short period but the student will be informed informally as soon as possible once a decision has reached. The Secretary to the hearing will formally inform the student, in writing, within ten working days from the date of the hearing of the penalty (if any) and will give the student a copy of the report sent to the subject examination board.
- j) The decision of the panel will then be sent to the subject examination board for application and will not be open for revision.

Second offence

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

Penalties to be applied

1. The following penalties are available to the College Principal or a Misconduct Panel:
 - I. A caution, and referral to guidance on referencing (usually reserved for a first offence where improvements to referencing would be sufficient to avoid a charge).
 - II. Require student to correct the referencing in order to receive the mark for the assessment (usually reserved for a first offence, or where mitigation applies).
 - III. Require the student to repeat (i.e. re-submit) the assessment unit (or equivalent) in order to receive an uncapped mark.
 - IV. Require the student to repeat (i.e. re-submit) the assessment unit (or equivalent) in order to receive a capped mark (the capping must be at the level required for the student to progress on their course).
 - V. Reduce the mark for the assessment by n%, short of causing module failure.

The requirement to repeat an assessment (iii and iv) is more likely to be the penalty where the mark contributes to classification or determination of an award.

Note: a record of the minor misconduct decision and penalty will be held on the student record.

2. The following penalties, which may be applied singly or in combination, are available only to a formal Misconduct Panel:
(Note: loss of credit under the following rules cannot be compensated via general credit mechanisms)

- I. Reduce the mark for the assessment unit to 0. Where this results in the loss of credit and consequently to failure to progress or to qualify for an award the student will be able to re-sit under normal examination board regulations.
- II. Reduce the mark for the module to 0. Where the resultant loss of credit leads to failure to progress or to qualify for an award the student will be able to re-sit the assessment under normal examination board regulations.
- III. Require the student to repeat (i.e. resubmit) the assessment unit (or equivalent) to pass level in order to obtain credit, but record a mark of 0 for the assessment unit.

Note: The requirement to repeat the assessment is to ensure that the learning outcomes are met, which may be in doubt where a student is guilty of major misconduct.
- IV. Require the student to repeat (i.e. resubmit) the assessment unit (or equivalent) to pass level in order to obtain credit, but record a mark of 0 for the module as a whole.
- V. Reduction of grand mean for the course by up to 10% (value to be specified by the misconduct panel) [Note: this penalty is not available for first year undergraduates].
- VI. Reduction of classification by one or more class [Note: this penalty is not available for first year undergraduates]
- VII. Disqualify from honours [Note: this penalty is reserved for undergraduate final year students].
- VIII. Disqualify from award.

(a) in the case of undergraduate finalists where no resit opportunity exists the reduction of a mark to 0 with no possibility of general credit being awarded will result in the student being precluded from receiving classified honours. Misconduct panels must therefore exercise caution in using options (i) and (ii).

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

Examination Boards

Examination boards will not proceed to confirm progress or determine classification whilst an allegation of academic misconduct is outstanding in relation to a student.

Appeals

Students shall have the right of appeal against decisions concerning academic misconduct, on the following grounds:

- (a) That there existed circumstances, or new evidence has become available, which affects the students case; of which those who determined the judgement were not aware when their decision was taken, and which could not reasonably have been presented to them.
- (b) That there is evidence of procedural irregularity, including administrative doubt as to whether the result might have been different had there not been such an irregularity; those who determined the penalty were not aware when they made their decision, and which could not reasonably have been presented to them;
- (c) That there exists evidence of prejudice or of bias on the part of those making the decision.

Operationally, the appeals will operate according to the procedures for all academic appeals.

Appeals must be submitted, using the appropriate form, to cap@bimm.co.uk within **21 days** of the decision being notified to the student. Forms are available from <http://www.bimm.co.uk/academic-complaints-appeals/>

Appendix 12: Complaints & Appeals Procedures

Complaints:

Level 1

Wherever possible complaints should be raised immediately with the member of staff responsible, or with a member of the Student Support team, with the aim of resolving the problem directly and informally. This will generally be an oral process and a written record will not be made.

If you remain dissatisfied with the response to your complaint at Level 1 you should use Level 2 of the process.

Level 2

Where it has not been possible to resolve matters at Level 1 you may submit a formal complaint by returning the appropriate form to cap@bimm.co.uk. Complaints forms can be found at <http://www.bimm.co.uk/academic-complaints-appeals/>.

In order for your complaint to be properly investigated it is essential that you are specific about the cause and nature of your complaint. You should present full details, including your name and term-time address and include all relevant documentation. You should detail what attempts you have already made to resolve the complaint, and state what outcome and remedy you are seeking.

Formal (Level 2) complaints should be lodged within 90 days of the conclusion of the informal (Level 1) phase. Complaints received later than this will not normally be considered. You should expect to receive an acknowledgement of the receipt of your complaint within five working days.

Type of complaint

- Academic complaints relate to issues that have a direct effect on the provision of teaching, learning, research and supervision.
- Non-academic complaints usually relate to issues connected with The College's services but also cover any inappropriate behaviour from BIMM staff, including allegations of behaviour, which is discriminatory or harassing.

If the College Principal has already been involved at Level 1, The Executive Principal (or nominee) will deal with the Level 2 stage.

In some cases, you may be contacted for further information or clarification and you have the right to request a meeting with the person investigating your complaint, to discuss the issues in person.

You will be informed, in writing, of the outcome of your complaint. It is our aim to resolve most complaints at Level 2 within 28 days. You will be informed if, for any reason, there is likely to be any delay in the process. This letter is termed a Completion of Procedures letter.

Internal Review

For non-academic Complaints if the student is dissatisfied with the outcome they are entitled to request an internal review of the decision.

This must be submitted to cap@bimm.co.uk within 21 days of receiving the outcome letter using the correct form.

A receipt will be issued within 7 days and BIMM aims to complete the review within 28 days of receiving the complaint.

The Dean of Higher Education (DoHE) will investigate the case in the first instance. In the event that the DoHE has had prior involvement with the case it may be considered by the Executive Principal or Director of Academic Development and Quality Assurance.

A review of the original decision can only be made on the following grounds:

- There existed circumstances, or new evidence has come to light, which affects the student's complaint which could not reasonably have been made known to the investigators at the time the complaint was considered.
- There existed a procedural error in the complaints process such that it is likely the outcome would have been different had the error not occurred.
- There exists evidence of bias in the complaints procedure such that it is likely the outcome would have been different had the bias not occurred.

Requests for internal review should be accompanied with supporting evidence. It is the student's responsibility to supply all supporting evidence with their review application.

Outcome of review

The reviewer is able to offer the following outcomes:

- To overturn the original decision and issue a new decision on behalf of BIMM. This could include referring matters to different procedures where appropriate.
- To uphold the original decision issued by BIMM.

Awarding Institution Review

If your complaint is of an academic nature and you are dissatisfied at the end of Level 2 when the BIMM complaints procedure has been exhausted the validating or awarding institution will consider your complaint under their own complaints procedure provided you lodge a request for a review of the BIMM decision within one month of receiving the BIMM Completion of Procedures letter the awarding institution will initially ascertain that all the correct procedures have been followed by BIMM and if, after considering the case against the criteria set, the awarding institution decides to undertake further investigation, s/he will consult senior officers at BIMM as well as the relevant awarding institution officers.

As stated above, note that you would enter this process at Level 3.

You will be informed of the result of the awarding institution Level 3 investigation in writing. Should you still be dissatisfied, there is the option of an independent review by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator.

Option for Independent Review

The Office of the Independent Adjudicator (the OIA) provides an independent scheme for the review of student complaints or appeals. When all procedures investigating the complaint have been exhausted, the University of Sussex or BIMM will issue a Completion of Procedures letter. Students wishing to avail themselves of the opportunity of an independent review by the OIA must submit their application to the OIA within 1 year of the issue of the Completion of Procedures letter. The OIA will not normally consider a complaint, which, has not previously been considered under all the procedures available within UoS, and will not normally consider complaints where the Completion of Procedures Letter is issued more than three years after the substantive event(s) complained about.

Further details about the OIA are available from the Office of the Independent Adjudicator at <http://www.oiahe.org.uk/> or:

OIA

Third Floor

Kings Reach

38 – 50 Kings Road

READING

RG1 3AA

0118 959 9813

Email: preferably use the online form. Alternatively use: enquiries@oiahe.org.uk

For further advice about contacting the OIA please contact the Head of Student Services. Students seeking an independent review through the OIA should note that any complaint at that stage would be in respect of the awarding institutions' procedures and not those of BIMM.

General Principles

As a general principle BIMM expects that complaints will be dealt with informally in the first instance. Many complaints can be dealt with quickly and effectively in this manner without the need to follow formal procedures. This complaints procedure has been designed with this in mind.

BIMM is committed to providing a high quality service to its students and you are encouraged to let us know when there is cause for concern or a need for improvement. However, BIMM will not accept complaints, which are frivolous (unfounded, trivial), or malicious (with vindictive motivation).

You should be assured that no complainant will be disadvantaged by having raised a complaint. Privacy and confidentiality will be maintained in the handling of complaints except where disclosure is necessary to progress the complaint. It is the University's expectation that the confidentiality of any documentation generated by a complaint will be respected by all parties. If you wish for BIMM to communicate with a representative throughout this process we must have written permission from yourself to do so. It should be noted, however, that the complaints procedure is an internal process and BIMM will not communicate or meet with legal representatives as part of the proceedings.

If you are considering making a complaint you are strongly advised to talk to one of the following. They can advise you on how to deal with your complaint, help to resolve it informally and, if necessary, support you in the process of making a formal complaint.

- Student Support Officer at BIMM
- Your Course Leader
- The Head of Student Services
- The College Principal

- One of your Student Representatives

The following list indicates examples of the type of complaint covered by the procedure:

- Poor teaching or supervision
- Misleading information in prospectuses or in advertising or promotional material
- A failing in a BIMM service, academic or non-academic
- Inadequate facilities
- The behaviour of a member of BIMM staff

The following are not covered by the procedure:

A request for a review of a decision of an academic body (e.g. Examination Board) regarding student progression, assessment and award. This is defined as an Appeal and is dealt with under the separate Appeals Procedure.

Complaint against another student. These are dealt with under the separate Student Disciplinary Procedures.

It is important to remember that complaints will not always produce the outcome preferred by the complainant. There may be a number of reasons for this, including lack of evidence to substantiate the complaint or the fact that circumstances beyond BIMM's control may affect the level of service provided. However, whatever the decision, you will be informed of the result of your complaint in writing and will be provided with the reasons for the outcome.

Appeals:

Purpose of the Appeals Procedure

The appeals procedure is intended to provide a formal means for reviewing a decision made on student progression, assessment and awards, and resolving the student's concerns in a fair and consistent manner. This is different from the Student Complaints Procedure, which provides a means for resolving other problems that may arise during the academic year, relating to teaching provision or other services, for example. If you need advice about whether the matter you wish to raise is a complaint or an appeal, please consult either the **College Principal or Head of Student Services**.

Principles of the Appeals Procedure

Students lodging an appeal will not be disadvantaged by doing so. Privacy and confidentiality will be respected, and disclosure of information provided by a student in the course of an appeal will be restricted to those individual officers directly involved in consideration of that appeal, and that may include Chairs of Mitigating Evidence Committees and Examination Boards. The appeal will be considered, in the first instance, by the College Principal, who may appoint a member of BIMM staff as the Investigating Officer for the case. The appeal will be considered in accordance with BIMM's Equality and Diversity Policy. There is no right of appeal against matters of academic judgement, however students do have the right to appeal against certain academic decisions such as:

- a. That there existed circumstances affecting the student's performance of which the examiners were not aware when their decision was taken, and which could not reasonably have been presented to the examiners**

BIMM recognises that sometimes situations will arise that prevent you from submitting a piece of work on time, or that might affect the standard of work that you are able to submit. The usual procedure for dealing with such circumstances is to apply to the Mitigating Evidence Committee (MEC) as and when the situation arises.

Students intending to lodge an appeal on these grounds should note that, for an appeal to succeed, you will need to show that all three criteria listed below are met:

1. *Circumstances affecting the student's performance ...*
Evidence of these circumstances should be submitted, with a clear explanation of the period of time, and particular pieces of assessed work that were affected.
of which the examiners were not aware when their decision was taken ...
2. An appeal will not have strong grounds where the examiners were already aware of the circumstances described, and made their decision in the knowledge of those circumstances.
which could not reasonably have been presented to the examiners
3. An appeal can usually only be considered where the student has been unable to follow the normal procedure for submitting evidence to the MEC and it would not be reasonable to have expected them to have done so. An example might be that the student was in hospital, or was suffering from mental health difficulties, which meant that they were unable to prepare a submission to MEC at the appropriate time. It is not sufficient for the student to say that they were unaware of the procedure for making a submission to MEC, or had chosen not to do so.

b. There was a procedural irregularity (including administrative error) or other inadequacy in the conduct of the examinations, or processing of marks or grades, or the categorisation of an award

An appeal may be brought where the student believes that the award or mark is incorrect because BIMM has made an error. It is not enough to show that an error has taken place - it will be necessary for you to show that the error resulted in an incorrect decision being made. If the error is clearly demonstrable, it can often be corrected without the necessity to go through a formal appeal process, so students are advised to seek urgent advice from the College Principal or their Course Leader in the first instance.

c. There exists evidence of prejudice or bias on the part of an examiner

An appeal brought on these grounds should clearly identify the particular individual(s) considered to have shown prejudice or bias against you, and should be supported by evidence.

Grounds for Non-Academic Appeals

Students may not appeal the professional judgement of a decision making panel but may appeal on the following grounds:

- a) That there existed circumstances, or new evidence has become available, which affects the student's case; of which those who determined the judgement were not aware when their decision was taken, and which could not reasonably have been presented to them.
- b) That there is evidence of procedural irregularity (including administrative error) in the consideration of the student's case of such a nature as to cause doubt as to whether the result might have been different had there not been such an irregularity.
- c) There exists evidence of prejudice or bias on the part of those making the decision.

Deadlines for appeal

Academic Appeals: An **academic appeal** must be lodged within **21 days** of the publication of the examiner's decision.

Withdrawal: If you wish to appeal against the fact that you have been required to **withdraw** from a course at BIMM, you will need to appeal within **9 days** of being notified of the decision in writing.

Fitness to Study Withdrawal: Due to the nature of Fitness to Study panels students are given slightly longer to appeal, appeals must be submitted within **21 days** of being notified of the decision in writing.

All appeals should be submitted to cap@bimm.co.uk. Appeals forms are available from <http://www.bimm.co.uk/academic-complaints-appeals/>

What decisions can students appeal against?

- Failure of the course of study
- The recommended category of award
- A decision that the student is required to withdraw from the course because s/he has failed to satisfy the requirements for academic progress within that course
- A decision that a student is required to submit one or more assessment units, having failed to satisfy the requirements for academic progress (this can include a decision that a student is required to repeat a year)
- A particular assessment result (this can include a penalty for late submission, or failure to submit a piece of work)
- A decision from BIMM that a student is deemed to have withdrawn

There is also a right of appeal against the following decisions:

- Academic Misconduct Panel Decisions
- Mitigating Evidence Committee
- Decision to refuse to allow an alternative mode of assessment

Appeals must be submitted, using the appropriate form, to cap@bimm.co.uk within **21 days** of the decision being notified to the student. Forms are available from <http://www.bimm.co.uk/academic-complaints-appeals/>

How the Appeal will be considered

Receipt of your appeal will be acknowledged within 7 days. Relevant information will then be gathered. This will include the Course Leaders or College Principal comments on the appeal, the student transcript, any Mitigating Evidence Committee records and Examination Board minutes. This process will normally take a minimum of two or three weeks and may take longer for particularly complex cases, or when someone who has critical information is unavailable. You may also be asked for clarification of statements in your appeal or for further evidence.

Please bear in mind, however, that it is the student's responsibility to ensure that you have provided full information and supporting evidence to substantiate your grounds for appeal. Students must ensure that BIMM can contact you quickly about an appeal, by keeping BIMM informed of any changes to contact details.

Once this information has been gathered together, a decision will be taken as to whether the appeal is admissible. It may be, for example, that the grounds of appeal are that there were circumstances of which the examiners were unaware, but on investigation, it is evident that those circumstances had been considered by the Examination Board. Another example might be that the grounds for appeal are a procedural error, but there is no evidence that any error has taken place. If the appeal is considered to be inadmissible, a letter will be sent to the student, confirming that decision.

Admissible appeals are then considered further to establish whether they can be decided without a hearing of an Appeals Panel. This will only be the case if it is clear that the appeal should be upheld (i.e. the decision should go in the student's favour) because all parties consulted are in agreement. Students will be notified in writing if an appeal has been upheld.

Where there is any doubt, the appeal will be decided at a hearing of an Appeals Panel.

Appeals Panel Hearings

If it has been decided that an appeal is admissible and is to be considered at a hearing, members of the central administration who are independent from the running of assessment operations, will first prepare a detailed report on the nature of the appeal, the evidence, and the outcomes available under your course regulations. A date for the hearing will be set, and a letter confirming the date and time of the hearing will be sent to the student, with a copy by email, so that the student has a minimum of seven days' notice of the hearing. A copy of the report and any other information that is being sent to members of the Appeals Panel will be sent to the student by post (or by airmail if the student is abroad).

The Appeals Panel

The composition of the Appeals Panel is as follows:

- A BIMM Director or BIMM Principal (or nominee)
- Two academic members of staff who have not been involved in teaching the student
- A student – usually one of the student representatives for the course

Before the Hearing

Students should contact the person who wrote to them from BIMM immediately if:

- The student does not intend to be present at the hearing;
- The student wishes a friend to attend with them; and if so, whether the student wishes them to answer questions from the Panel on your behalf;
- The student has any special needs (e.g. due to a disability).

If the student intends to be accompanied, please let BIMM know the name of that person at least one working day before the hearing. It is the student's responsibility to ensure that their friend has copies of any papers, and is aware of the date, time and location of the hearing. We will not contact them on your behalf. The student cannot be accompanied by legal representation.

If the student does not intend to attend the hearing, they may send in written comments in response to the papers that have been sent to them, if they wish. Such comments must be received at least four days before the day of the hearing.

If any of the information in the papers that have been sent to the student are unclear, the student should contact the writer of the letter inviting them to the hearing or the Head of Student Services.

What Happens at the Hearing

The Panel members will have read the appeal papers that have been sent to the student before the hearing. The procedure at the hearing is as follows:

- The student (and, if applicable, a friend) will be invited to join the Panel, who will introduce themselves.
- The student will be invited to make any statement, either to highlight particular points made in their written appeal or to add further comments, in light of the documentation.

The Panel members may ask you questions about the evidence or the circumstances of the student's appeal;

- The student's friend (if applicable) will be asked whether they wish to make any additional statement on the student's behalf.
- The student (and, if applicable, their friend) will be asked to leave the room and to wait nearby, while the Panel considers the evidence and the discussion with them.
- The student will be invited to re-join the Panel, so that they can give the student their decision.

Panels are expected to reach a decision on the day of the hearing. If, extraordinarily, this is not possible, the hearing may have to be adjourned while additional information is sought and copied to the Panel and to the student.

The decision will subsequently be confirmed in writing within seven working days of the hearing; this outcome will be summarised in a Completion of Procedure letter.

Internal Review

For non-academic Appeals if the student is dissatisfied with the outcome they are entitled to request an internal review of the decision.

This must be submitted to cap@bimm.co.uk within 21 days of receiving the outcome letter using the correct form.

A receipt will be issued within 7 days and BIMM aims to complete the review within 28 days of receiving the appeal.

The Dean of Higher Education (DoHE) will investigate the case in the first instance. In the event that the DoHE has had prior involvement with the case it may be considered by the Executive Principal or Director of Academic Development and Quality Assurance.

A review of the original decision can only be made on the following grounds:

- There existed circumstances, or new evidence has come to light, which affects the student's appeal which could not reasonably have been made known to the investigators at the time the appeal was considered.
- There existed a procedural error in the Appeals process such that it is likely the outcome would have been different had the error not occurred.
- There exists evidence of bias in the Appeals procedure such that it is likely the outcome would have been different had the bias not occurred.

Requests for internal review should be accompanied with supporting evidence. It is the student's responsibility to supply all supporting evidence with their review application.

Outcome of review

The reviewer is able to offer the following outcomes:

- To overturn the original decision and issue a new decision on behalf of BIMM. This could include referring matters to different procedures where appropriate.
- To uphold the original decision issued by BIMM

In cases where there is doubt as to whether the case should be upheld or not the reviewer may refer the case to an appeals panel for consideration.

Awarding Institution Procedures

If an appeal is not upheld by BIMM and the student remains dissatisfied, they may invoke the awarding institutions appeal procedures. A student must write to the awarding institution within 21 days of the notification of the outcome of the appeal at BIMM. There is no right of appeal against the academic judgement of examiners. The awarding institution will ascertain if the correct process was observed. Once the process is finalised, the awarding institution will issue a Completion of Procedure letter.

Final Redress

Where the student is not satisfied with the outcome of the procedure, s/he may request a review by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA). The OIA provides an independent scheme to enable the review of unresolved student complaints, including appeals.

The student must submit an appeal to the OIA within one year of receiving the notification of the decision of the awarding institution. An appeal to the OIA is made by completing a Scheme application form. Copies of this form are available from the Head of Student Services.

Alternatively, the form can be downloaded from the OIA website or requested by telephone or letter:
www.oiahe.org.uk

OIA
Third Floor
Kings Reach
38 – 50 Kings Road
READING
RG1 3AA
0118 959 9813

Email: preferably use the online form. Alternatively use: enquiries@oiahe.org.uk

Appendix 13: Academic Framework

1. Preamble

1.1 The Academic Framework establishes the criteria and rules for courses of the University of Sussex. It sets out the basic criteria for awards by establishing the design parameters necessary to assure the quality and academic standing of University courses in accordance with the *Qualifications and Credit Framework in England and Wales and Northern Ireland (Ofqual 2010)*, *Framework for Qualifications of Higher Education Institutions in England, Northern Ireland and Wales (2008)*, *the Higher Education Credit Framework for England: guidance on academic credit arrangements in higher education in England (2008)*; and the *European Qualifications Framework for Higher Education (Bergen 2005)*.

2. Credit

2.1 Credit is a quantified means of expressing equivalence of learning. Credit is awarded to a learner in recognition of the verified achievement of designated learning outcomes at a specified level for a complete module. It is a way of comparing learning achieved in a variety of different contexts.

2.2 All credit-bearing modules shall be credit rated according to level and volume.

Credit Level

The Level shall be:

- Level 3 (foundation year/stage 0)
- Level 4 (undergraduate stage 1/certificate level)
- Level 5 (undergraduate stage 2/diploma level)
- Level 6 (undergraduate stage 3/honours level)

Credit volume

The credit volume reflects the notional student effort to complete a module successfully. It is determined by calculating the required learning hours on the basis of 1 credit for 10 hours of learning. The credit volume reflects all student effort in particular, taught provision, independent or guided study, assessment and revision. All BIMM undergraduate modules between RQF Level 3 to FHEQ Level 6 shall be weighted as 20/30 credits or multiples thereof.

3. Undergraduate degree structures

3.1 University of Sussex taught degrees, diplomas and certificates shall be designed in accordance with the credit values and rules stated in the table below.

3.2 Undergraduate courses will normally be delivered in full-time mode and any derogations must be formally approved.

3.3 The maximum period of registration for a taught award is normally the minimum period plus 3 years for undergraduate irrespective of FT or PT mode of study. The maximum period of registration is not extended for any time spent on temporary withdrawal.

Award Title	FHEQ /QCF Level	Minimum Credit requirement	Minimum Credit requirement at the level of the award	Minimum Period of Registration	Award rules
BA/BMus (Hons) Single Honours	6	360	90	3yrs FT	This is a degree comprising a main area of study from a single School. It may include modules from outside the 'major' area of study, but shall incorporate at least 240 out of 360 credits from the major area. At least 90 credits shall be at Level 6.
Ordinary Bachelor degree (BA/BMus)	6	300	60	3yrs FT	This is an exit award granted in recognition of student learning where insufficient credit has been achieved to award an undergraduate honours degree in the subject.
Diploma of Higher Education	5	240	90	2 yrs FT	These awards may be approved as an exit award only. The name of the award appearing on the award certificate shall be Diploma or Certificate of Higher Education without reference to a subject of study.
Certificate of Higher Education	4	120	90	1 yr FT	
University of Sussex Certificate of Education	(3)	120	90	1 yr FT	This is not a formally recognised award but an exit certificate of achievement for students successfully completing a Foundation Year but failing to attain the necessary threshold for admission to undergraduate study from the Foundation Year.

4 . Credit and module status in undergraduate courses

- 4.1 Credit is module specific and is available upon completion of the module. Undergraduate courses comprise a sequence of credit-rated modules to the value of 120 credits per academic year for students studying full time. All modules contributing to an award must be credit-bearing.
- 4.2 Students can normally take up to 30 credits at the **lower** level as indicated by the credit requirements for the award above. Students are not permitted to take any credits at the **higher** level in any stage in an undergraduate course.
- 4.3 Individual undergraduate modules may contribute to more than one course, but the credit volume and level of the module shall be the same irrespective of the course to which the module contributes.
- 4.4 Two modules at different levels may rationalise resources by co-teaching. Where this occurs, the shared teaching element must be at the lower level with an equivalent proportion of teaching delivered independently to the student studying at the higher level. In addition, both modules must have differentiated titles, learning outcomes and assessments.
- 4.5 Modules may be delivered within a single term or across two terms. Where a module is delivered across two terms the minimum credit volume will be 20 credits.
- 4.6 Undergraduate courses may designate modules in the following ways. The designations are course-specific and will be set out in relevant published course documents.

Module type	Description
Core	<p>A module that all students must study as part of their course. Normally these modules are owned and delivered within a single School. Exceptionally core modules may be explicitly approved by the University Teaching and Learning Committee for cross-school delivery in single honours courses where there is a compelling pedagogical rationale. For joint honours courses where each component is provided by a different School, cross-school delivery of core modules will be permitted.</p> <p>All core modules shall be weighted as 20/30 credits or multiples thereof.</p>
Option	<p>A module that forms part of a group of options owned and delivered within a School. Exceptionally option modules may be explicitly approved by the University Teaching and Learning Committee for cross-school delivery in single honours courses where there is a compelling pedagogical rationale. For joint honours courses where each component is provided by a different School, cross-school delivery of option modules will be permitted.</p> <p>All option modules shall be weighted as 20/30 credits or multiples thereof.</p>
Elective	<p>A module timetabled into the University Elective Timetable for Single Honours undergraduate courses. Electives are designed to enable students to broaden their learning beyond the core subjects of Single Honours. An elective may be positioned at either QCF/FHEQ level 3, 4 or 5 in the University's Academic Framework. All electives shall be weighted as 15 credits. Electives may exist as an individual module or as part of a 60 or 90-credit Pathway.</p> <p>Electives may be taught in each teaching term, depending upon demand, and must be approved by the University Teaching and Learning Committee and timetabled to be delivered within the University's Elective Timetable. Stage 1 students shall study QCF/FHEQ level 3/4 electives and Stage 2 students shall study FHEQ level 4/5 electives.</p> <p>Students may be offered a choice between an approved option or an elective.</p>
60-credit Pathway	<p>A pathway that consists of 60 credits (4 elective modules x 15 credits). A 60 credit pathway consists of a cohesive course of study that provides academic progression between Levels 4 and 5, with at least 30 credits achieved at or 5. Optionality within pathways is not permitted.</p> <p>The aim of the 60-credit Pathway is to provide students with a focused degree of study an opportunity to broaden their learning and shall consist of sufficient academic credit to warrant specific recognition on the degree certificate but does not constitute an entry pathway. These pathways shall be made available to students taking Single Honours degrees that opt into the Elective Scheme and shall be delivered within the University's Elective Timetable.</p>

	<p>60 credit Pathways can be designated as either Type 1 and Type 2:</p> <p>Type 1: a 60 credit pathway which is open to all students.</p> <p>Type 2: a 60 credit pathway with approved pre-requisites and/or exclusions as determined by the host School. This type is employed where the School is targeting a particular cohort by course of study.</p> <p>Elective modules that comprise a pathway must be delivered at the appropriate level of study. Stage 1 modules must be at Level 4 whilst Stage 2 modules must be at Level 5.</p> <p>Whilst the award certificate will record the achievement of a pathway, the subject of the pathway will not appear in the degree title. The pathway will usually be recognised on the degree certificate outside of the degree title in the form '<Major element> with (<pathway name> studies)'. Alternatively, another form of words may be used where the University considers this to be more appropriate. The School will obtain approval for the exit title from Portfolio Approval Committee.</p>
<p>Language Pathways</p>	<p>Exceptionally, language elective modules forming part of a pathway may be delivered in Stage 3 where this complements a particular pattern of delivery, for example where a student is away from campus during a placement period or to enable entry to study a language at the ab initio level.</p> <p>In relation to languages the award certificate shall be recorded as "x with proficiency in 'language' (intermediate)" where the language has been taken at levels 3 and 4 and "x with proficiency in 'language' (advanced)" where the language has been taken at levels 4 and 5.</p>
<p>90-credit Pathway</p>	<p>A pathway that consists of 90 credits (4 elective modules x 15 credits at Stages 1 and 2, together with a further 30 credits studied at Level 6). A 90-credit pathway consists of a cohesive course of study that provides academic progression with 30 credits achieved at levels 4, 5 and 6. Optionality within pathways is not permitted.</p> <p>The aim of the 90-credit Pathway is to provide students with a focused degree of study an opportunity to broaden their learning. The Pathway shall consist of sufficient academic credit to warrant specific recognition on the degree certificate as a minor component of a major/minor award.</p> <p>A 90-credit pathway will be recognised on the degree certificate in the form '<Major element> with <pathway name>'. Alternatively, another form of words may be used where the University considers this to be more appropriate. The School will obtain approval for the exit title from Portfolio Approval Committee.</p>

	<p>A 90-credit pathway must form part of entry route where it constitutes the minor element of study for a single honours major/minor course. Portfolio Approval Committee will have the authority to approve specific entry titles.</p> <p>These pathways shall be made available to students taking Single Honours degrees that opt into the Elective Scheme and shall be delivered within the University's Elective Timetable for the first two Stages. For students not entering the University on a specified major/minor award title, progression into Stage 3 of the will be dependent on there being sufficient capacity within the relevant stage of their course. Portfolio Approval Committee will have the authority to approve new award titles in such circumstances, thereby ensuring the academic coherence of the proposed award.</p>
--	--