

Section 18: BIMM/University of West London Academic Regulations

Table of Contents

Section 1 – Framework & Governance	3
1.1 Introduction.....	3
1.2 Applicability.....	3
1.3 Scope.....	3
1.4 Approval of Regulations, Courses & Modules.....	3
1.5 Designation of Special Regulations.....	4
1.6 Assessment & Award Boards.....	4
1.7 Module Assessment Boards (MAB).....	5
1.8 Membership of MABs.....	5
1.9 Award Boards.....	6
1.10 Membership of Award Boards.....	6
1.12 Membership of Student Progress Boards (SPB).....	8
1.13 Joint Assessment Board (JAB).....	8
1.14 Membership of Joint Assessment Boards.....	9
1.15 Administrative Arrangements.....	10
1.16 Responsibilities of the Head of School/College within the Assessment Process.....	11
1.17 Responsibilities of the Secretary to Assessment Board within the Assessment Process.....	11
1.18 Responsibilities of the Chair at Assessment Boards.....	11
1.19 Relationship between Award Boards & SPBs.....	11
1.20 Return of Marks and Feedback to Students.....	12
1.21 External Examiners.....	12
1.22 Internal Examiners.....	14
1.23 Moderation Policy.....	14
Section 2 – General Regulations	17
2.1 Scope.....	17
2.2 Applicability.....	17
2.3 Attendance and Participation.....	17
2.4 Award of Academic Credit.....	17
2.5 Deferral.....	17
2.6 Student-Initiated Withdrawal.....	18
2.7 College-Initiated Withdrawal.....	18
2.8 Revocation of Awards.....	19
2.9 Coursework.....	19
2.10 Practical Assessment.....	20

2.11	Oral Examinations	20
2.12	Dissertations & Projects.....	20
2.13	Extensions.....	20
2.14	Mitigating Circumstances.....	21
2.15	Mitigating Evidence Committee.....	23
2.16	Outcome.....	23
2.17	Appeal.....	24
2.18	Academic Offences	24
2.19	Stage I: Informal	26
2.20	Stage II: Formal (Minor Offence).....	26
2.21	Stage III: Formal (Major Offence).....	27
Section 3 – Undergraduate Regulations.....		29
3.1	Scope	29
3.2	Applicability	29
3.3	Academic Credit Accumulation Scheme	29
3.4	Minimum & Maximum Period of Registration.....	29
3.5	Module Passes, Re-Sits & Re-Takes	30
3.6	Number of Attempts	30
3.7	Failure of a Module.....	30
3.8	Re-sits	30
3.9	Re-takes	31
3.10	Progression & Awards	32
3.11	Failure to Meet Progression Requirements.....	32
3.12	Compensation.....	32
3.13	Award Requirements	33
3.14	Credits & Named Awards	33
3.15	Honours Classification.....	33
3.16	Named Awards.....	35
3.17	Aegrotat Awards	35
3.18	Revocation of Awards	36
Appendix 1: Glossary		37
Appendix 2: BIMM Complaints & Appeals Procedures.....		39
Appendix 3: BIMM/University of West London Year Abroad Procedure.....		49

Section 1 – Framework & Governance

1 Framework

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 The *Academic Regulations* incorporate both the general regulations that apply to students of BIMM Institute enrolled on courses leading to awards of the University, and the regulations for assessment, progression and award. The *Academic Regulations* regulate the principal institutional mechanisms for the articulation and management of the University's academic standards for taught and research awards.

1.2 Applicability

1.2.1 These regulations shall take effect from the academic year 2016-17, and shall supersede all previous regulations and policies for the areas detailed within, except where it is specifically stated that the regulations in force at the time of a student's enrolment apply.

1.3 Scope

1.3.1 The *Academic Regulations* apply to all undergraduate and postgraduate courses leading to awards of the University or the award of academic credit and to the students registered on those courses.

1.3.2 All references to the *Academic Regulations* include course regulations, module regulations and special regulations.

1.3.3 The University reserves the right to amend the *Academic Regulations*. If the details of the regulations should change, the University will determine the extent to which the changes apply and students will be consulted and advised by direct communication to their UWL live e-mail addresses and via Student Portal. Prospective students will be contacted directly via the University website. All concerns raised by students will be considered and agreed by the University's Academic Board before communicated to students.

1.4 Approval of Regulations, Courses & Modules

1.4.1 The University's Academic Board is ultimately responsible for the management of the academic standards and quality of the courses leading to awards of the University. BIMM Institute is responsible for internal quality assurance which may make up part of the University's quality assurance process.

1.4.2 The *Academic Regulations* shall be approved by the University's Academic Board and, subsequently, by BIMM Institute's Academic Board.

1.4.3 The University's Academic Board shall approve courses of study and individual modules, including any amendments and withdrawals. All courses of study shall lead to awards of the University.

- 1.4.4 BIMM Institute and the University reserve the right to amend any course of study or module, and to withdraw any course of study or module, at any time, as it deems necessary. Normally, amendments to courses of study and modules shall be enacted for the next cohort to join the course, or group to take the module. Where an amendment has an effect on students currently registered for the course or module, students will be consulted through the academic committee structure and will have an opportunity to object. Once approved, course withdrawals shall not be enacted until no students remain registered on the course.

1.5 Designation of Special Regulations

- 1.5.1 Special regulations are academic regulations for individual courses of study that diverge from the standard Academic Regulations for the University. Where there is a legitimate academic rationale, or a specific requirement set down by a Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body (PSRB), or a joint or collaborative course requires it, the course regulations may vary from the standard Academic Regulations. Special regulations shall be designated as such through the course approval process, and approved by the University's Academic Board, or its delegated authority.
- 1.5.2 Special regulations may apply to some courses and modules. Such regulations shall be detailed in the appropriate course and module regulations.

1.6 Assessment & Award Boards

- 1.6.1 Assessment Boards operate with authority vested in them by the University's Academic Board and ensure that the following functions are carried out in the interests of maintaining academic standards:
- i) by reference to the University's commitment to equality and diversity to consider all matters relating to the assessment and award of individual students;
 - ii) to assure the academic standards of all courses leading to a University award;
 - iii) to determine accurate and fair marks for individual students and apply professional judgement as to the appropriateness of any moderation or mitigation by taking into account the circumstances of students and the judgements made by assessors;
 - iv) to determine whether students are required to be re-assessed, progress or receive an award;
 - v) with the contribution from External Examiners, to analyse the performance of students within and across academic courses, with a view to ensuring academic standards are consistent within the University and comparable to standards in other universities.
- 1.6.2 Assessment Boards for students studying with the University within an academic partnership arrangement follow the same principles as those stated above and operate under the same rubrics and regulations as those stated in the *Academic Regulations*, unless Special Regulations have been approved.
- 1.6.3 Assessment Boards consist of University staff and External Examiners only. The sole exception will be for Assessment Boards for Academic Partnerships, where representatives of a partner institution are required to attend where University students within an Academic Partnerships are being considered.

1.7 Module Assessment Boards (MAB)

- 1.7.1 A Module Assessment Board is established by the relevant School/College Board for each subject area which is concerned with modules that are assessed by the University.
- 1.7.2 The MAB is responsible for determining the assessment results for each module within its remit. This responsibility extends to **all** modules whether within the modular scheme, Edexcel provision or under the purview of a PSRB.
- 1.7.3 The MAB should seek to use the meetings with its External Examiner(s) or Edexcel moderator(s), if appropriate, to assess comparability of standards and achievements in the subject from year to year and across the whole range of modules within the remit of the MAB.
- 1.7.4 A MAB is required to:
- i) consider the results of assessment and examination of modules, including the performance in supervised work experience where applicable, and decide, in accordance with the approved module regulations, on the results of the assessment;
 - ii) ensure that the marks and the recommendations for re-assessment are recorded accurately and reported to the Award Boards/Student Progress Boards (SPB);
 - iii) ensure, where this is required by the regulations, that the External Examiner(s) or Edexcel moderator(s) are fully associated with its deliberations and concur in its decisions of the Module Assessment Board;
 - iv) ensure that any matters of policy which arise from its deliberations are referred to the School/College Board;
 - v) ensure that the marks recorded as correct by the MAB are not changed by the Award Board/SPB, unless the Board is in possession of information affecting the assessment of an individual student or a whole module cohort, in which case it can exercise discretion in regard to the agreed marks.

1.8 Membership of MABs

- 1.8.1 The members of each MAB shall comprise:
- i) The Module Leader or nominee for each module within the remit of the MAB. Attendance by staff at the MAB, as required, shall be given the highest priority;
 - ii) In the case of Level 5 and Level 6 modules (and, where appropriate, Level 4 modules), the External Examiners having interest in the subject area;
 - iii) The Chair shall normally be the Head of School/College. The Head of School/College may authorise a small number of experienced academics to act as designate Chairs in exceptional cases. All Chairs **must** have completed the requisite training;
 - iv) Representatives from BIMM as follows:
 - College Principal;
 - Head of Education;
 - Deputy Head of Student Services;
 - Member of BIMM's Academic Development & Quality Assurance team.
- 1.8.2 Note on quoracy: In order for a MAB to be quorate the following attendees **must** be present:
- i) The Head of School/College (or authorised designate) as Chair. The Chair **cannot** act as a nominee for a Module Leader;

- ii) *At least one External Examiner (unless only Level 4 modules are being considered);
- iii) A Module Leader or nominee for each module being considered.

1.8.3 If no Module Leader or nominee is present, consideration of the module **must** be deferred. No person may represent more than two modules unless they are the designated Module Leader for more than two modules.

*In the case of re-sit boards the board may proceed in the absence of the External Examiner provided always that:

- i) The External Examiner has viewed and commented on an appropriate sample of assessments;
- ii) The External Examiner has provided written authorisation for the MAB to proceed in his/her absence;
- iii) The External Examiner subsequently signs off the relevant matrices.

1.9 Award Boards

1.9.1 Award Boards will be established by the School/College Board for each set of courses in the University. The School/College Board will determine the timings of Award Boards, together with the academic courses covered by each board. An Award Board may meet in more than one session with a variable membership to cover the range and volume of results to be considered.

1.9.2 The Award Board will receive the modular marks, duly attested by the MAB, for all courses for which it is responsible. It will interpret the performance of individual students according to the rubrics of the relevant assessment regulations.

1.9.3 The board will:

- i) consider the results of assessment and examination of an individual student's work, including the performance in supervised work experience, where applicable, and decide, in accordance with the approved regulations and the relevant policies of the University's Academic Board, in the case of successful final year students, the Award to be made or to be recommended to external awarding bodies;
- ii) receive recommendations concerning exit awards for any students who have withdrawn, and/or any whom the School/College has withdrawn, and decide upon the award to be made or to be recommended to external awarding bodies;
- iii) receive, consider, and accept or reject mitigation recommendations;
- iv) receive and record report(s) from Academic Offences Panel(s);
- v) reconsider its decisions, either as the full board, or part thereof acting as a review panel, if it is required to do so by the appeals procedure, acting on the authority of the University's Academic Board in accordance with the agreed procedures of the Academic Board;
- vi) ensure that External Examiners are fully associated with its deliberations and concur in its decisions or those of any formally constituted sub-committee of the Award Board.

1.10 Membership of Award Boards

1.10.1 The members of each Award Board shall comprise at any time:

- i) the Course Leader (or designate) of each course within the remit of the board;
- ii) the Head of School/College responsible for modules which contribute significantly to courses within the remit of the board or designate;

- iii) The Chair shall normally be the Head of School/College. The Head of School/College may authorise a small number of experienced academics to act as designate Chairs in exceptional cases. All Chairs **must** have completed the requisite training;
- iv) External Examiner(s);
- v) Representatives from BIMM as follows:
 - College Principal;
 - Head of Education;
 - Deputy Head of Student Services;
 - Member of BIMM's Academic Development & Quality Assurance team.

1.10.2 Note on quoracy: In order for an Award Board to be quorate the following attendees **must** be present:

- i) Head of School/College (or authorised designate) as Chair. The Chair **cannot** act as a designate for a Course Leader;
- ii) At least one External Examiner;
- iii) A Course Leader or designate for each award being considered. If no Course Leader or designate is present, consideration of the student results **must** be deferred. No person may represent more than two courses unless they are the Course Leader for more than two courses.

1.11 Student Progress Boards (SPBs)

1.11.1 A SPB will be established by the School/College Board for each set of courses in the University. The School/College Board will determine the timings of SPBs, together with the academic courses covered by each board. A SPB may meet in more than one session with a variable membership to cover the range and volume of results to be considered. An interim SPB is one held when students have not reached a progression point. The purpose of an interim SPB is to provide a "health-check" for students and identify those who are failing or not submitting to assessment.

1.11.2 The SPB will:

- i) consider all continuing students and confirm their right to progress where relevant; (not applicable to Interim SPB);
- ii) consider all continuing students who have not achieved the level of credit appropriate to their stage of study and agree actions to support students who may be considered to be at risk of not continuing;
- iii) recommend to the Award Board a suggested exit award for any students who have withdrawn, or those whom the School/College has withdrawn;
- iv) receive, consider, accept or reject mitigation recommendations;
- v) receive and record report(s) from Academic Offences Panel(s);
- vi) determine the next study pattern for individual students seeking an alternative route to a named award and recommend to the Award Board the title of the award to be conferred in accordance with the regulations;
- vii) reconsider its decisions, either as the full board, or part thereof acting as a review panel, if it is required to do so by the appeals procedure, acting on the authority of the University's Academic Board in accordance with the agreed procedures of the Academic Board.

1.12 Membership of Student Progress Boards (SPB)

1.12.1 The members of each SPB shall comprise at any time:

- i) the Course Leader or designate of each course within the remit of the board;
- ii) the Personal Tutor(s) responsible for students whose results the board is considering;
- iii) the Head of School/College or designate responsible for modules which contribute significantly to courses within the remit of the board;
- iv) the Chair shall normally be the Head of School/College. The Head of School/College may authorise a small number of experienced academics to act as designate Chairs in exceptional cases. All Chairs **must** have completed the requisite training;
- v) the External Examiner must be present for at least one meeting of the SPB per annum. They must attend the inaugural SPB for a new course. Other than as specified above, they may at their request or that of the Course Leader be in attendance, but their presence is not a requirement of the SPB;
- vi) Representatives from BIMM as follows:
 - College Principal;
 - Head of Education;
 - Deputy Head of Student Services;
 - Member of BIMM's Academic Development & Quality Assurance team.

1.12.2 Note on quoracy: In order for a SPB to be quorate the following attendees **must** be present:

- i) Head of School/College (or authorised designate) as Chair. The Chair **cannot** act as a designate for a Course Leader;
- ii) an External Examiner must be present for at least one (full not interim) meeting of the SPB per annum. They must attend the inaugural SPB for a new course;
- iii) a Course Leader or designate for each course being considered. If no Course Leader or designate is present, consideration of the student results **must** be deferred. No person may represent more than two courses unless they are the Course Leader for more than two courses.

1.13 Joint Assessment Board (JAB)

1.13.1 A Joint Assessment Board (JAB) may be established by the relevant School/College Board for sets of modules and courses where this board is appropriate. The JAB can take place only when a course comprises modules that are not taught on any other course of study within the University or for courses of study at collaborative partnerships where it may be best practice to hold the MAB, SPB and Award Board on the same day.

1.13.2 The School/College Board will determine the timings of the JAB, together with the academic courses covered by each board. A JAB may meet in more than one session with a variable membership to cover the range and volume of results to be considered.

1.13.3 The JAB will initially convene as a MAB to:

- i) consider the results of assessment and examination of modules – including the performance in supervised work experience where applicable – and decide, in accordance with the approved module regulations, on the results of the assessment;
- ii) ensure that the marks and the recommendations for re-assessment are reported accurately;
- iii) ensure that its duties are fulfilled within the schedule agreed by the School/College Board.

- 1.13.4 If the JAB is in possession of information affecting the assessment of a whole module group, then it may exercise discretion in regard to the agreed list of marks.
- 1.13.5 Marks established as correct at this time cannot be changed.
- 1.13.6 The JAB will then reconvene as an Award Board to:
- i) consider the results of assessment and examination of an individual student's work, including the performance in supervised work experience, where applicable, and decide, in accordance with the approved regulations and the relevant policies of the University's Academic Board, in the case of successful final year students, the Award to be made or to be recommended to external awarding bodies;
 - ii) receive, consider, accept or reject mitigation recommendations;
 - iii) receive and record report(s) from Disciplinary Panel(s).
- 1.13.7 The JAB may then reconvene as a SPB to:
- i) consider all continuing students who have not achieved the level of credit appropriate to their stage of study and agree actions to support students who may be considered to be at risk of not continuing;
 - ii) receive, consider and accept or reject mitigation recommendations;
 - iii) receive and record report(s) from Disciplinary Panel(s);
- 1.13.8 The JAB will:
- i) reconsider its decisions if it is required to do so by the University's Academic Board;
 - ii) ensure, where this is required by the regulations, that the External Examiner or Edexcel moderator(s) are fully associated with its deliberations and concur in its decisions or with those of any formally constituted sub-committee of the JAB;
 - iii) ensure that any matters of policy which arise from its deliberations are referred to the School/College Board (in the first instance);
 - iv) ensure that its duties are fulfilled within the schedule agreed by the
 - v) School/College Board.
- 1.13.9 The final list of marks will be signed by the Chair of the JAB and, where appropriate, External Examiner(s).

1.14 Membership of Joint Assessment Boards

- 1.14.1 The members of the JAB shall comprise:
- i) a Module Leader or nominee for each module within the remit of the board;
 - ii) the Course Leader or designate for each Course within the remit of the board;
 - iii) attendance by staff at the JAB shall be given the highest priority;
 - iv) in the case of Level 5 and 6 Modules (and where appropriate Level 4 Modules) and in the case of courses, the External Examiners having interest in the subject /course area;
 - v) In the case of modules forming part of an Edexcel course, the Edexcel moderator is entitled to be present and to be consulted about the arrangements. The Edexcel moderator shall have the right to attend the board, but their attendance is not a requirement when convened as an Award Board;

vi) The Chair shall normally be the Head of School/College. The Head of School/College may authorise a small number of experienced academics to act as designate Chairs in exceptional cases. All Chairs **must** have completed the requisite training.

vii) Representatives from BIMM as follows:

- College Principal;
- Head of Education;
- Deputy Head of Student Services;
- Member of BIMM's Academic Development & Quality Assurance team.

1.14.2 The JAB encompasses elements of the MAB, Award Board and SPB. As the agenda suggests, it may be advisable to allow the elements of the SPB to be considered last, to allow the External Examiners and Module Leaders to leave to board if appropriate

1.14.3 Appropriate University regulations should be applied to the relevant section of the board.

1.14.4 The JAB will receive both module matrices and course matrices for all students for all courses within its remit.

1.14.5 In the presence of the External Examiner, the board will confirm all module marks are accurate and all awards for finalists, i.e. those who have achieved their award destination. It will also award any exit qualifications to students who have formally withdrawn from the course.

1.14.6 The JAB will confirm the current award entitlement of all continuing students. This can be achieved through a statement from the Chair asking the board to acknowledge the credit accumulated by all continuing students included in the matrix and stating that in the event of any of these students subsequently withdrawing from their course of study they would be entitled to one of the interim qualifications depending on their credit status. In such circumstances the award would be made through Chair's action.

1.14.7 The quoracy requirements for the MAB, SPB and Award Board shall apply to the relevant elements of the JAB.

1.15 Administrative Arrangements

1.15.1 Conduct of meetings and minutes will be in accordance with University practice. Guidance will be published and circulated to relevant staff regarding operational details such as data entry requirements.

1.15.2 Any matters affecting policy or giving cause for concern about academic standards or assessment practice, should be forwarded to the Chair of the Academic Quality and Standards Committee (AQSC).

1.15.3 The following are excluded from formal membership of boards but shall be entitled to attend and speak and to receive agenda items and minutes on request:

- i) the Vice-Chancellor;
- ii) the Head of Quality Assurance (or nominee);
- iii) the University Secretary (or nominee).

1.16 Responsibilities of the Head of School/College within the Assessment Process

- 1.16.1 The Head of School/College, or equivalent, will be responsible for:
- i) ensuring that draft examination papers are properly vetted before being finalised;
 - ii) ensuring that re-sit papers are set;
 - iii) ensuring that marking is completed on time by colleagues so that (i) External Examiners have proper time for scrutiny and (ii) information is fully available to the appropriate assessment board.

1.17 Responsibilities of the Secretary to Assessment Board within the Assessment Process

- 1.17.1 The Secretary to the Assessment Board will be responsible for:
- i) ensuring that the continuous collation of marks for all modules occurs throughout the academic year and is completed in good time for material to be sent out to External Examiners;
 - ii) ensuring that papers and lists of marks are ready for assessment board meetings;
 - iii) ensuring that full lists of module marks are completed promptly after MAB meetings.

1.18 Responsibilities of the Chair at Assessment Boards

- 1.18.1 The Chair of the board will be responsible for:
- i) ensuring that the board proceeds only if it is quorate;
 - ii) ensuring that the correct regulations are available and are explained to the board;
 - iii) ensuring that the board is conducted properly;
 - iv) ensuring that appropriate debate takes place (see below);
 - v) seeking the views of the External Examiner;
 - vi) ensuring that the matrices are signed off by the External Examiner;
 - vii) checking and signing off the minutes as an accurate record;
 - viii) taking action in respect of deferred students.
- 1.18.2 Under the agenda item “Overview of results and performance indicators”, the board may wish to consider some of the following:
- i) Achievement;
 - ii) Withdrawal;
 - iii) Patterns of performance;
 - iv) Comparison of results with those from the previous year;
 - v) Comparison across modules by level (MABs);
 - vi) Identification of any areas for concern;
 - vii) Identification of topics for discussion at review;
 - viii) Actions or further investigations required.

1.19 Relationship between Award Boards & SPBs

- 1.19.1 Award Boards and SPBs can be held consecutively in either order. The Award Board will receive matrices for all students.
- 1.19.2 In the presence of the External Examiner the Award Board will:
- i) confirm the award for all finalists, i.e. those who have achieved their award destination;

- ii) award interim exit qualifications to students who have formally withdrawn from the course;
- iii) confirm the current award entitlement of all continuing students. This can be achieved through a statement from the Chair asking the board to acknowledge the credit accumulated by all continuing students included in the matrix and stating that in the event of any of these students subsequently withdrawing from their course of study they would be entitled to one of the interim qualifications depending on their credit status. In such circumstances the award would be made through Chairs action.
- iv) confirm that all continuing students will be (or have been) considered by the SPB.

1.19.3 The minutes of the Award Board will be distinct from those of the SPB. The matrices presented at the Award Board will be the same as those considered at the SPB although students who have achieved sufficient credit for their award will not be considered at the SPB.

1.19.4 The External Examiner need not be present at the SPB although would not be prevented from attending should that be considered appropriate. For example, Faculties may wish to invite the External Examiner to be present at the SPB when finalist students (who have not gained sufficient credit for their award) are being considered. This may help in considering the performance of the whole cohort.

1.20 Return of Marks and Feedback to Students

1.20.1 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.

1.20.2 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.

1.20.3 Please be aware 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.

1.21 External Examiners

1.21.1 External Examiners are appointed by the University's Academic Board, or its delegated authority, in accordance with the approved processes and criteria. These processes and criteria pay due regard to the *Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) UK Quality Code for Higher Education: Chapter B7: External Examining*.

1.21.2 External Examiners are appointed to either a course of study or a group of connected courses and exceptionally for specific modules only. They are members of the Assessment Board for that course. In some cases, multiple External Examiners may be appointed, while in others one External Examiner may cover a number of cognate courses.

- 1.21.3 External Examiners are full members of the appropriate Module Assessment Board and will perform their role in agreeing with the final list of module marks to be forwarded to the relevant Assessment Board.
- 1.21.4 External Examiners have the right to view and comment upon all work submitted by students for all forms of assessment for which they are contracted.
- 1.21.5 The period of appointment for External Examiners shall be four years. Exceptionally, this may be extended to a fifth year. External examiners who have completed terms cannot be reappointed until five years have elapsed.
- 1.21.6 An External Examiner cannot be replaced by another from the same institution unless the External Examiner has not completed the term of office, in which case a replacement from the same institution shall be appointed for the remainder of the original term of office; or, in exceptional circumstances, where the curriculum area to be examined is highly specialised.
- 1.21.7 External Examiners do not have the authority to unilaterally change marks, External Examiners are asked, however, to be especially vigilant in ensuring that judgements made by assessors and Boards about the academic standards of students are acceptable.
- 1.21.8 The duties of External Examiners are:
- i) to comment upon the assessments for each module for which they are responsible, the extent to which the assessments cover the syllabus, and whether they enable students to demonstrate achievement of the learning outcomes;
 - ii) to consider, comment upon, and approve (or otherwise) all assessments, including examination question papers, and to comment upon marking schemes for individual papers, assessment criteria, and model answers;
 - iii) to confirm whether or not the standard of marking is satisfactory by scrutinising a sample of assessed work for each module (sample size to be agreed between the Board and the Examiner(s));
 - iv) to comment upon the standards of achievement of students, and the comparability of this achievement to standards elsewhere;
 - v) to comment upon the standards of proposed awards, and their comparability to similar awards made elsewhere;
 - vi) to make known any causes for concern in relation to academic standards achieved by students, the standards of modules, and the standards of awards to be made;
 - vii) exceptionally, upon written request, to provide independent opinion where there is a significant, unresolved difference between marks awarded by first and second markers on any script or piece of work;
 - viii) to advise the Assessment Board on appropriate actions where the marks for a module are significantly outside the normal pattern, and to endorse (or not) recommendations by markers for actions where the marks for a module are significantly outside the normal pattern;
 - ix) to attend meetings of the Assessment Board, and to participate fully in decision making;
 - x) to endorse (or otherwise) decisions on results and progression, and recommendations for awards;
 - xi) to submit a full written report, including an optional confidential report to the Vice-Chancellor.

- 1.21.9 By agreement with the Assessment Board, external examiners may also carry out other duties, including the approval of project topics and essay titles, interviewing students on their courses of study and experiences, commenting informally on proposed curriculum changes, commenting upon proposed changes to assessment methods.
- 1.21.10 External examiners shall normally be replaced only upon completion of their terms of office. There may occasionally be cause for the University to terminate the appointment of an external examiner before the end of a term subject to approval from the University's Academic Board, or its delegated authority. Reasons for termination include:
- i) resignation by the examiner;
 - ii) failure to perform the duties of the examiner;
 - iii) breakdown in the relationship with the University.

1.22 Internal Examiners

- 1.22.1 Internal examiners are members of the Assessment Board by virtue of their status as academic staff of the University who teach on a module and are responsible for setting and marking of assessments of a module.
- 1.22.2 Hourly paid lecturers (HPLs) involved in assessment shall be members of the MAB where they have sole responsibility for the delivery and assessment of a module. HPL staff who contribute to a module or its assessment shall not be considered members of the SPB or AB, but may attend as assistant examiners. In such cases, the module is represented by the member of academic staff with overall responsibility for it.
- 1.22.3 The duties of internal examiners are:
- i) to attend all Assessment Boards and to participate in decision making;
 - ii) to present the results of modules to the Assessment Board;
 - iii) to comment upon factors related to the module for which they are responsible, for example levels of performance, or any problems with the examination;
 - iv) to respond to queries on individual students, marking, or other relevant matters;
 - v) to meet with the students in practice who are enrolled on

1.23 Moderation Policy

- 1.23.1 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.
- 1.23.2 In keeping with the expectations of our awarding partners, all assessments that contribute to the assessment of the award (levels 5 and 6) are subject to moderation. Any assessment of modules, which do not contribute to the assessment of the award (levels 3 and 4) will not be subject to verification and will be marked by one Tutor*.
- 1.23.3 N.B. 'Scripts' refers to all submitted student work whether practical, written or project-based.

Level	Moderation Requirements
3 & 4	None required.

5	25% of scripts (minimum of two) 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, 25% of scripts (minimum of two) 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.

1.23.4 The moderation procedure is as follows:

- i) 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.
- ii) 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.
- iii) 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.
- iv) 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.
- v) 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.
- vi) 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.
- vii) Upon completion of double marking, both tutors agree a final mark. Only this mark will be returned to students.

1.23.5 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.

- 1.23.6 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.
- 1.23.7 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 and 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 West London courses. Additional moderation may be carried out if, for whatever reason, a Head of Education deems it appropriate to do so.

Section 2 – General Regulations

2 Framework

2.1 Scope

2.1.1 These regulations shall apply to all students enrolled and registered for undergraduate courses of study at BIMM.

2.2 Applicability

2.2.1 These regulations shall take effect from the academic year 2016-17, and shall supersede all previous regulations and policies for the areas detailed herein, except where it is specifically stated that the regulations in force at the time of a student's enrolment apply.

2.3 Attendance and Participation

2.3.1 Attendance refers to the expectations of the University in regard to a student's engagement with the learning, teaching and assessment requirements of their course of study.

2.3.2 BIMM shall specify and publish term and examination dates and hours of operation.

2.3.3 Each student shall ensure that their particular course and modules are acceptable to them prior to enrolment, and shall ensure that they can meet the attendance, learning and assessment requirements.

2.3.4 Each student shall regularly attend all forms of learning activity associated with their course of study, and shall participate in their course as required by the [BIMM Student Engagement Policy](#). Tier 4 students have additional stipulations in relation to attendance which are detailed in their contract.

2.3.5 Each student is required to complete all assessment for the modules for which they are registered, as prescribed in the relevant course specifications.

2.4 Award of Academic Credit

2.4.1 The award of academic credit relates to achievement in individual modules. Academic credit shall be awarded to a student who meets the requirements to pass the module in question.

2.4.2 The academic credit awarded shall be that approved for the module; the amount of academic credit awarded shall not vary in accordance with the level of achievement. The level of achievement shall be reflected by the module mark.

2.5 Deferral

2.5.1 Where a student is unable to attend their module and/or submit for assessment but will be able to submit at the next assessment point, these are covered by *Mitigating Circumstances*, under Section 2.14.

- 2.5.2 Where a student is unable to attend their module or course and/or submit for assessment and will not be able to submit at the next assessment point, this will be considered as a potential module or course deferral.
- 2.5.3 The student may defer up to a maximum period of two calendar years, subject to the period of registration and UKVI sponsorship.
- 2.5.4 Students who need to defer their course for a period of more than two calendar years shall be withdrawn and, where applicable, receive an exit award. These students may apply for APL to re-join the course.
- 2.5.5 Circumstances that could be grounds for deferral shall be the same as those for mitigation and shall include the following:
- i) physical or mental ill-health;
 - ii) severe financial hardship;
 - iii) emotional/personal difficulties – e.g. bereavement;
 - iv) disability i.e. where student's disability comes to light for the first time at the assessment;
 - v) unavoidable absence from BIMM – e.g. requirements of employer;
 - vi) unavoidable absence from domicile – e.g. eviction;
 - vii) loss of immigration status;
 - viii) other serious circumstances which could not be foreseen by the student.
- 2.5.6 The student must discuss any deferral request with their Course Leader who will ensure that the request is properly processed and that deferral is the most appropriate option. The student must be referred to Student Services for advice on any financial implications of deferring their studies.
- 2.5.7 The Course Leader should approve or reject any request for deferral. Where the request is approved, the Course Leader must ensure that a return date is agreed and the deferral form completed and sent to the Administrative Officer for Collaborative Partners. If the student is subsequently unable to return on the agreed date, the student must notify their Course Leader.
- 2.5.8 A student may defer at any time, with the following consequences:
- i) the result for any module – either pass or fail – for which all assessments have been completed, will be retained;
 - ii) the result for any module that has not been completed, e.g. the student has submitted to Assessment 1 but not Assessment 2, will not be retained. The student will re-register on the module on their return, will not be charged again for the module, and the module will not count as a re-take and will therefore not be capped.

2.6 Student-Initiated Withdrawal

- 2.6.1 A student may initiate a withdrawal in line with the BIMM HE withdrawal process – (See [BIMM Student Engagement Policy](#)).

2.7 College-Initiated Withdrawal

- 2.7.1 BIMM may withdraw a student for a range of reasons including:

- i) Failure to progress
- ii) Non-attendance – (See [BIMM Student Engagement Policy](#))
- iii) Failure to return from period deferral;
- iv) Expiration of the maximum registration period
- v) Following the outcome of student disciplinary procedures – (See [BIMM Disciplinary Procedure](#));
- vi) Failure to (re-)enrol;
- vii) Non-payment of tuition fees.

2.7.2 The decision to withdraw a student will be based on evidence in one or more of the above categories and will be processed in line with the appropriate BIMM Institute Policy or Procedure.

2.8 Revocation of Awards

2.8.1 Where any Degree, Diploma, Certificate or other academic distinction ('the Qualification') has been granted to or conferred on a person by the University in accordance with its powers under the Further and Higher Education Act 1992 s76 (5), the University's Academic Board shall have the power in accordance with the Further and Higher Education Act 1992 s76 (5) (c) to deprive that person of the qualification, having determined that there is good cause to do so.

2.8.2 Good cause includes, but is not limited to, subsequent to the grant or conferment of the qualification the discovery of: academic misconduct in work submitted for the qualification, or other misconduct, which indicates that the person should be deprived of the qualification; the discovery subsequent to the grant or conferment of the qualification that the person provided false information to obtain admission to BIMM.

2.8.3 Deprivation of the qualification also includes deprivation of all privileges connected with the qualification.

2.9 Coursework

2.9.1 The design and setting of coursework assessment shall be the responsibility of the relevant Course and Module Leaders, in accordance with the approved module specifications and regulations. Where required, coursework shall also be subject to the approval of the relevant Assessment Board and External Examiner.

2.9.2 Students shall be informed of the arrangements, dates, and deadlines for coursework assessment at the start of each term. Students must adhere to all published dates and deadlines for coursework assessment.

2.9.3 BIMM shall inform students of any penalties applied to the late submission of coursework and to assignments that go over a specified word limit.

2.9.4 'Assessed Coursework' shall include all pieces of assessments that must be submitted by set deadlines (essays, reports, etc.), and assessments taken on specific dates (tests, orals excluding language orals, etc.). The term 'non-completion' therefore refers both to non-submission and non-attendance.

- 2.9.5 A student unable to complete coursework by, or on, the specified date due to medical or other reasons beyond their control, shall submit a request for extension of deadline to the Course Leader in the first instance. If the extension is not practical, or the request is being made past the deadline, then the student must submit a claim for mitigating circumstances supported by appropriate documentary evidence.

2.10 Practical Assessment

- 2.10.1 The design and setting of practical assessment shall be the responsibility of the relevant Course and Module Leaders, in accordance with the approved module specifications and regulations. Where required, practical assessment shall also be subject to the approval of the relevant Assessment Board and External Examiner.
- 2.10.2 Students shall be informed of the arrangements and rules under which practical assessments shall be conducted at least two weeks in advance, or otherwise, as specified by the College. Students must adhere to any published dates and deadlines for practical assessments.
- 2.10.3 A student unable to participate in any practical assessment on the specified date due to medical or other reasons beyond their control shall submit a claim for mitigating circumstances, supported by appropriate documentary evidence.

2.11 Oral Examinations

- 2.11.1 Oral examinations shall normally only be used where they form part of the formal, approved assessment for modules. They must be conducted by at least two examiners or otherwise, as specified by the College. Students may only bring authorised materials to oral examinations. The possession or use of unauthorised material shall constitute an academic offence.

2.12 Dissertations & Projects

- 2.12.1 The design and setting of dissertation and project assessment shall be the responsibility of the relevant, Course and Module Leaders in accordance with the approved module specifications and regulations. Where required, dissertation and project assessment shall also be subject to approval of the relevant Assessment Board and External Examiner. Definitions of 'dissertations and projects' are given in the glossary of the *Academic Regulations*.
- 2.12.2 Students shall be informed of the arrangements, dates, and deadlines for dissertation and project assessment at the start of each academic year. Students must adhere to any published deadlines for dissertation and project submissions.
- 2.12.3 A student unable to submit a dissertation or project on the specified date due to medical or other reasons beyond their control shall submit a claim for coursework extension to the Course and/or Module Leader, if the request is made prior to the published deadline. All retrospective requests for extension to the deadline must be made via the procedures outlined under the *Mitigating Circumstances*, supported by appropriate documentary evidence.

2.13 Extensions

- 2.13.1 A student may apply to the Course Leader for an extension in response of any element of assessment, with the exception of an examination. The application must be made prior to the applicable deadline and must be made in writing.
- 2.13.2 The Course Leader may grant an extension or vary the date of presentation up to a maximum of ten working days to the original published deadline for submission of any assessment. In considering the grant of an extension, the Course Leader shall take into account the reasons for the request for extension and ensure that the circumstances were genuine and would prevent the student to meet the deadline or attend the allotted time. This shall be done by establishing the strength of the supporting evidence.
- 2.13.3 If the student fails to meet the original or extended deadline, the following penalties shall apply:
- i) If the assessment is late up to a maximum of five working days from the original or agreed extended deadline, the assessment mark shall not exceed the pass mark for the assessment;
 - ii) If the assessment is late over five working days from the original or agreed extended deadline, the piece of work will receive a mark of zero for the assessment;
 - iii) If the assessment is late over ten working days from the original or agreed extended deadline, the piece of work will not be marked and be deemed as non-submission.

2.14 Mitigating Circumstances

- 2.14.1 Mitigating circumstances are circumstances that are outside a student's control which may have an adverse impact on a student's ability to undertake or complete any assessment so as to cast doubt on the validity of the assessment as a measure of the student's achievement.
- 2.14.2 Students shall be responsible for submitting assessments on time, presenting themselves for assessment and examinations at the appropriate times and venues, and submitting relevant information on mitigating circumstances. Events relating to human error, such as misreading timetables, forgetting to set alarm clocks, computer failure or misjudging the time needed to revise shall not be considered mitigating circumstances.
- 2.14.3 The occurrence of multiple examinations in close succession shall not be considered mitigating circumstance.
- 2.14.4 Students are encouraged to consult with their Course Leader before requesting mitigation, as a ten-day extension might be appropriate in the first instance. Students must present mitigating circumstances requests in writing, using the correct form before the due date of the assessment or coursework, or the attendance date of the examination, practical or performance. If the circumstances are not known in advance, mitigating circumstances must be submitted no more than ten working days after the incident. Submissions by staff or other students cannot be accepted on behalf of a student. All applications, including supporting evidence, are regarded as highly confidential.
- 2.14.5 Late submissions shall not be considered unless there are genuine grounds for lateness. Students must explain in their application the reasons for late submission. Late submissions on

the grounds that the student was unwilling to disclose the information at an earlier date shall not be accepted.

- 2.14.6 Submissions must be supported by supporting evidence; where evidence is awaited, a Mitigating Evidence Committee may defer decisions, and authorise their Chairs to act on their behalf without calling a further panel.
- 2.14.7 Where a student is presenting medical evidence in support of their application, they must present certification by a registered medical practitioner. Such evidence must be directly relevant to the circumstances and the timing of assessments as appropriate even if concerning a long term medical condition.
- 2.14.8 Evidence of personal problems must also be documented, and supported by appropriate independent professional statements. Any costs incurred in supplying evidence are the responsibility of the student.
- 2.14.9 BIMM Institute reserves the right to contact any person named in an application for mitigation to seek clarification or further information including checking the authenticity of the evidence submitted. This is not done to remedy omissions in the completion of the documentation by the student, or to seek supporting evidence when not supplied.
- 2.14.10 Where a student is taken ill during a timetabled assessment such as an examination or in-class test, the Chief invigilator shall record this in their report. In such cases, the student must submit a mitigating circumstances request with supporting documentary evidence in the normal manner if they wish the circumstances to be considered. Such claims shall only be accepted if the student was fit to sit on entering the examination venue, but – for unforeseen reasons - became ill during the examination.
- 2.14.11 The College does not normally consider as mitigating circumstances permanent or long standing disabilities, i.e. those that have lasted or are likely to last for a period of more than 12 months. This is because such students would normally have registered with and been assessed by the Student Services team and, where appropriate, will have an Individual Support Plan (ISP) to support their studies. Failure to disclose a disability and seek the support of the Student Services team will not be accepted as reason for not pursuing this support.
- 2.14.12 Where an investigation has been undertaken and it has been recognised that the student's performance will be affected over more than one assessment period, an application for an ISP can be considered. This also applies where a student is unexpectedly placed in a situation whereby they are the sole carer for a disabled dependent. ISPs are only effective once they are agreed by the student, signed off by the Student Services team and notified to the relevant Head of Education/College Principal. Reasonable adjustments outlined in an ISP cannot be applied retrospectively.
- 2.14.13 Circumstances which could lead to a successful mitigation request may include the following:
- i) physical or mental ill-health;
 - ii) severe financial hardship, i.e. over and above that experienced by all students;
 - iii) emotional/personal difficulties – e.g. bereavement;
 - iv) disability i.e. where the student's disability comes to light for the first time at assessment;

- v) unavoidable absence from the College – e.g. unforeseen requirements of employer;
- vi) unavoidable absence from domicile – e.g. eviction;
- vii) loss of immigration status;
- viii) other serious circumstances which could not be foreseen by the student.
- ix) Note: The above examples are for illustration only and not intended to be definitive or exhaustive.

2.14.14 Claims shall not normally be considered or upheld where:

- i) the relevant form has not been appropriately completed or evidence is missing, or evidence is either illegible or not written in English;
- ii) there is a mismatch between the timing of the claimed circumstances and the period of assessment;
- iii) computer or technical failure in completing the assignment;
- iv) multiple assessment deadlines;
- v) other commitments outside of study, such as employment.

2.15 Mitigating Evidence Committee

2.15.1 Claims for mitigation will be considered by the Mitigating Evidence Committee. The membership shall include:

- i) Head of Student Services (Chair)
- ii) Deputy Head of Student Services (Deputy Chair)
- iii) Head of Education / Head of Higher Education or equivalent
- iv) Course Leader
- v) Administrator

2.15.2 A Course Leader for the student shall not be a member of the Mitigation panel.

2.16 Outcome

2.16.1 The Mitigation panel has authority to make a recommendation to the relevant Assessment Board. The Mitigation panel should come to a decision on whether the student's mitigation request is to be accepted or rejected. If accepted, the panel shall make a recommendation, in writing, to the Assessment Board.

2.16.2 Where a student cannot meet their progression requirements due to non-completion of assessment and there are valid, accepted mitigating circumstances, Assessment Boards may award uncapped first sits in the affected modules, which shall be taken at the next available opportunity or earlier at the discretion of the Head of Education/College Principal.

2.16.3 Non-completion of assessment refers both to absence from invigilated examinations, practical assessments, coursework assessments and assessments of professional capabilities, and to non-submission of coursework assessments, professional capability assessments, and dissertations and projects.

2.16.4 Where a student cannot meet their award requirements due to non-completion of assessment and there are valid, accepted mitigating circumstances, a Mitigation panel may recommend to

the Assessment Board to award uncapped re-sit of the assessment or re-take in the affected modules to be taken during the following academic year. The re-sit shall be taken at the next available opportunity or earlier at the discretion of the Head of Education/College Principal. The re-take shall not incur any additional costs to the student.

- 2.16.5 On review of a Mitigation Panel recommendation, an Assessment Boards may award uncapped re-sit or re-take in the affected modules to be taken during the following academic year. Where this is the case, the student's original mark for an assessment will no longer stand and the mark received post-mitigation will be recorded as their first attempt.
- 2.16.6 Where a student meets the requirements for award but, due to valid, accepted mitigating circumstances, was unable to sit or submit some or all of the final year assessments, the Mitigation panel may recommend to the Assessment Board (MAB or Award Board) that:
- i) the award shall be postponed, and uncapped first sit or re-take is permitted at the next available opportunity or earlier at the discretion of the Head of Education/College Principal. Where this is the case, the student's original mark for an assessment will no longer stand and the mark received post-mitigation will be recorded as their first attempt.
 - ii) Where permitted by the award regulations, the award shall be agreed but the module marks from the affected modules shall be discounted from the calculation of the final mark. The value of the discounted modules must not exceed 20 credits.
- 2.16.7 A student shall receive, in writing (via email to their student account), the recommendation of the Mitigation panel to the Assessment Board within 10 working days of the Mitigation panel meeting.

2.17 Appeal

- 2.17.1 The student may appeal against the recommendation of the Mitigation panel using the *Appeals Regulations*, in Appendix 2.

2.18 Academic Offences

- 2.18.1 Allegations of any of the following shall be dealt with according to the *Academic Offences Regulations*:

Offences relating to an invigilated examination, coursework and plagiarism:

- i) unauthorised access to an examination paper before an examination;
- ii) forgery of an examination timetable produced by BIMM;
- iii) removal of a question paper, answer script or other examination stationery from an examination venue or any other BIMM premises;
- iv) causing a disturbance during an examination, either physically, verbally, or through an electronic device;
- v) refusal to cooperate with an invigilator, or to follow an invigilator's instructions;
- vi) possession of unauthorised materials whilst under examination conditions, or leaving unauthorised material in an examination venue (including toilets);
- vii) access, possession or use of unauthorised material on a computer, mobile telephone, or other electronic device during an examination;

- viii) communicating with another candidate while under examination conditions;
- ix) copying, or attempting to copy, the work of another candidate;
- x) having writing on the body in an examination venue;
- xi) the fraudulent reporting of source material;
- xii) the fraudulent reporting of experimental results, research, or other investigative work;
- xiii) collusion in the preparation or production of submitted work, unless such joint or group work is explicitly permitted;
- xiv) use, or attempted use, of ghost writing services for any part of an assessment;
- xv) submission of work, or sections of work, for assessment in more than one module or assignment (including work previously submitted for assessment at another institution);
- xvi) impersonation of another student in an examination or assessment, or the employment of an impersonator in an examination or assessment;
- xvii) plagiarism.

- 2.18.2 The College defines plagiarism as the practice of taking someone else's work and/or ideas and passing it/them off as your own. It is, moreover, the action of presenting someone else's work as one's own irrespective of intention. Close paraphrasing, without adequate attribution; copying from the work of another person, including another student; using the ideas of another person without proper acknowledgement all constitute examples of plagiarism. In addition, the action of re-using work, whether in part or in whole that you have previously submitted for graded assessment – at BIMM or at another institution - without properly referencing yourself (known as 'self-plagiarism') shall also constitute plagiarism.
- 2.18.3 Invigilators, assessors or internal examiners who suspect a student of breaching the regulations shall immediately inform the Course Leader or their nominee, who shall be responsible for investigating the allegation.
- 2.18.4 A student accused of committing an academic offence in an invigilated examination or submitted piece of written work shall be invited to attend an interview with the Course Leader or their nominee, and shall be given copies of all evidence submitted in support of the allegation.
- 2.18.5 A student shall be considered to have admitted to an offence if they fail to attend this interview, or to contact the Course Leader or their nominee to make alternative arrangements within five working days of notification of the allegation.
- 2.18.6 Where the Course Leader concludes that there is no case to answer, s/he shall report this to the Chair of the appropriate Examination Board and notify the student that the matter is closed.
- 2.18.7 Where an investigation reveals evidence of a potential assessment offence, the Course Leader shall refer the matter to the Chair of the Academic Offences Panel, and notify the student to this effect.
- 2.18.8 Where a member of staff suspects that an academic offence has been committed, the case shall be dealt with in three stages:

Stage I: Informal

Stage II: Formal (Minor Offence) Where the case is dealt with by the Course Leader and is classified as a minor offence.

Stage III: Formal (Major Offence) Where the case is referred to the Head of Education/College Principle for further investigation by the Academic Offences Panel and/or may be classified as a major offence.

2.18.9 The internal examiner or assessor shall immediately notify the Course Leader or nominee responsible for the module or course.

2.19 Stage I: Informal

2.19.1 Where the Course Leader or the nominee concludes that it is poor academic practice they shall advise the student to obtain further support and guidance in good practice for referencing skills. A letter should be retained on their file to this effect. This process can be used at Level 3 and 4 only. Such cases will normally be concluded within 10 working days of the receipt of the case and be dealt with internally by the college.

2.20 Stage II: Formal (Minor Offence)

2.20.1 Where the Course Leader or their nominee invites the student for an interview and determines that a student attempted to acknowledge their sources fully and/or comply with the regulations for assessment, but a minor oversight or error has given cause for concern, this shall be deemed a minor offence. A minor offence is when the student has committed plagiarism (as defined above) inadvertently and could potentially benefit from further academic advice and referral for support.

2.20.2 As part of an interview, if the case warrants it, a student may be tested on subject knowledge by a *viva voce* examination. In such cases, the viva shall be conducted by a member of academic staff with knowledge of the subject being investigated and shall submit a report on the viva to the Course Leader or their nominee for consideration.

2.20.3 Where an interview with the student reveals that it is a minor offence, the Head of Education/College Principal or their nominee may decide one or more of the following actions:

- i) a formal reprimand, which will be retained on student file for a period of 12 months and a requirement for the student to resubmit a corrected version of the element of assessment by a specified deadline with the maximum mark uncapped;
- ii) a formal reprimand, which will be retained on student file for a period of 12 months and a requirement for the student to resubmit the relevant element of assessment by a specified deadline, with the maximum mark limited to the minimum pass mark.

2.20.4 Where the penalty involves resubmission of an element of assessment, this shall take place during the current academic year and/or by the deadline set by the College. Where a student does not resubmit, a mark of 0 shall be given for the element of assessment.

2.20.5 All cases referred to the Course Leader or their nominee will normally be concluded within 20 working days of the receipt of the case.

2.20.6 All offences and outcomes must be reported to the Academic Registry, where all the student records are maintained.

2.21 Stage III: Formal (Major Offence)

2.21.1 Where the Course Leader or their nominee determines that there is evidence of an academic offence that cannot be dealt with under Stage II, the Course Leader shall notify the Head of Education, who shall be responsible for investigating the case.

2.21.2 A student accused of committing an academic offence in an element of assessment, or of a second or subsequent offence, shall be invited to attend an interview with the Course Leader or their nominee and shall be given copies of all evidence submitted in support of the allegation.

2.21.3 An Academic Offences Panel shall be convened with responsibility for determining whether assessment offences have been committed and determining penalties.

2.21.4 The Academic Offences Panel shall comprise:

- i) a Chair, appointed by the authority of the College Principal from among the academic staff to hold office for a term of one academic year. If for any reason the Chair is unable to act, the College Principal shall appoint an Acting Chair;
- ii) a member of the academic staff from the same Course/Department to that of the student;
- iii) a member of the academic staff from another Course/Department to that of the student;
- iv) one student representative.

2.21.5 The quorum of the Panel shall be 75 per cent (three members).

2.21.6 The Chair of the Panel shall have authority to act on behalf of the Panel in cases where a student admits or does not deny an offence.

2.21.7 The Chair of the Academic Offences Panel may, at any point, decide to call a full meeting of the Panel for investigation.

2.21.8 The College Principal shall nominate a member of staff as Secretary to the Panel.

2.21.9 The Secretary is responsible for advising the Panel on the Regulations. In the event of the Panel being divided over a decision to be taken, the Chair shall have a second and casting vote to determine the decision.

2.21.10 As part of an investigation, a student may be tested on subject knowledge by a *viva voce* examination. In such cases, the *viva* shall be conducted by a member of academic staff, with knowledge of the subject being investigated, who shall submit a report on the viva to the Academic Offences panel for consideration.

2.21.11 A student shall be considered to have admitted to an offence if they fail to attend this interview, or to contact the Course Leader or their nominee to make alternate arrangements within five working days of notification of the allegation.

2.21.12 On completion of the investigation, the Course Leader or their nominee shall refer the matter to the Chair of the Academic Offences Panel and notify the student as to the outcome of the case.

- 2.21.13 All cases referred to the Head of Education or their nominee will normally be concluded within 20 working days of the receipt of the case.
- 2.21.14 If it is determined that a major offence has been committed, the Panel shall impose one or more of the following penalties, with the exception of students on courses with additional requirements placed by professional, statutory and regulatory bodies:
- i) a formal reprimand, which will be retained on student file for a period of 12 months;
 - ii) failure (a mark of 0) in the element of assessment in which the offence occurred, with the maximum mark of the resubmission limited to the minimum pass mark, irrespective of the regulations for that course of study;
 - iii) failure (a mark of 0) in the module of which the assessment forms a part, with the maximum mark on any re-sit or re-take of the module limited to the minimum pass mark, irrespective of the regulations for that course of study;
 - iv) failure (a mark of 0) in the module which the assessment forms a part, with no permission to re-sit or re-take the module;
 - v) failure (with mark of 0) of the whole diet of modules taken during the academic year in which the offence occurred, but with no limit on the mark that may be awarded on a re-sit, irrespective of the regulations for that course of study;
 - vi) failure (with mark of 0) of the whole diet of modules taken during the academic year in which the offence occurred, with the maximum mark on any re-sits of assessments or re-takes of modules limited to the minimum pass mark.
- 2.21.15 Where a penalty involves failure in a module but the student is not prohibited from re-sitting assessments or retaking the module, any reattempt/re-take shall be in the subsequent academic year with the exception of NMC requirements on the courses, which supersede these regulations.
- 2.21.16 Where a penalty involves the reworking or resubmission of an element of assessment, this shall take place during the current academic year. If the student does not resubmit, a mark of 0 shall be given for the element of assessment.
- 2.21.17 The Appeal Regulations provide a single process for students who wish to appeal against outcomes arising from the investigation of academic offences.
- 2.21.18 The outcome of all cases shall be communicated to the student in writing.

Section 3 – Undergraduate Regulations

3 Framework

3.1 Scope

- 3.1.1 These regulations shall apply to all students at BIMM Institute enrolled on courses leading to awards of the University.

3.2 Applicability

- 3.2.1 These regulations shall take effect from the academic year 2016-17, and shall supersede all previous regulations and policies for the areas detailed herein, except where it is specifically stated that the regulations in force at the time of a student's enrolment apply. These may include:
- students admitted with advanced standing to a subsequent year of study on a course. The regulations for the cohort joined shall apply;
 - students transferred from other courses within the University to a subsequent year of a different course. The regulations for the cohort joined shall apply;
 - students changing course duration (for example, from a four year course to a three year course). The regulations for the cohort joined shall apply;
 - where courses have existing and approved special regulations.

3.3 Academic Credit Accumulation Scheme

- 3.3.1 Courses are carefully constructed combinations of academically coherent core and optional modules whose successful completion leads to an award. A module worth 20 credits represents a sixth of one year of study for all undergraduate courses. Normally, students shall be enrolled with the College and registered on courses and modules in accordance with the requirements set out in these regulations.
- 3.3.2 A student must undertake an approved course of study, or approved combination of modules under the course regulations, and meet the compulsory and core elements for progression from one year of study to the next and for an award.
- 3.3.3 Students who have been awarded qualifications from the College may not subsequently present themselves for re-examination for that award in the same subject or branch of study.
- 3.3.4 A student may not study more than 200 credits in any one calendar year.

3.4 Minimum & Maximum Period of Registration

- 3.4.1 Each course of study shall have an approved normal duration related to the mode of study available for the course.

- 3.4.2 A student must be registered for a minimum of one third of the normal duration of a course of study in order to be eligible for award. Normally, a student must not be registered for a course of study for a period longer than double the normal duration for the course of study. The maximum period of registration is calculated as below:

$$\frac{2 \times (\text{Total credit point requirement of the qualification})}{120} + 1$$

- 3.4.3 For example, an honours degree of 360 credits would have a maximum period of registration of seven years. Students who joined Level 5 as Direct Entrants would have a maximum period of registration of five years, and for Level 6 direct entrants a maximum period of registration is three years. Courses of less than one year's normal duration will have their own specific regulations regarding completion.
- 3.4.4 The period of registration is intended to allow students to move between full and part-time modes of study where that might be appropriate.

3.5 Module Passes, Re-Sits & Re-Takes

- 3.5.1 The pass mark for all forms of assessment of undergraduate modules shall be 40% for all undergraduate awards.
- 3.5.2 A module may comprise a number of elements of assessment and requirements that must be completed in order to pass. The module regulations shall specify the elements of assessment that must be passed, those that must be taken and those that are optional. Where a module comprises multiple elements of assessment, the marks for those elements shall normally be aggregated to one overall module mark, and may be weighted as specified in the approved module regulations. Where a student is required to pass individual elements of assessment, the pass mark shall match that of the module unless the approved module regulations specify otherwise.
- 3.5.3 A student may not re-take a module that has been passed.

3.6 Number of Attempts

- 3.6.1 The appropriate Examination Board must always agree failure, i.e. has not achieved 40%, before any re-sit occurs.
- 3.6.2 For all undergraduate awards there shall be a maximum of two permitted attempts within each registration to pass each module. The two attempts shall comprise one first attempt and one re-sit attempt, unless the approved module regulations specify otherwise.

3.7 Failure of a Module

- 3.7.1 A student who does not meet the requirements to pass a module shall fail that module normally because the module mark is lower than the pass mark, 40%.

3.8 Re-sits

- 3.8.1 Re-sits do not involve re-enrolment and attendance at classes and do not count towards the value of academic credit for which a student is registered during the academic year of the re-sit.
- 3.8.2 In accord with the recommendation of the Assessment Board, either the individual element assessment mark or the overall module mark will be capped at the minimum pass mark, 40%. The highest final mark shall be awarded to the student.
- 3.8.3 In the event of failure in all attempts, the highest module mark (best fail) shall stand and the Assessment Board may determine alternative forms of assessment for re-sits.
- 3.8.4 A student who has failed a module at Level 3, 4, 5 or 6, i.e. achieved a mark of 0% - 39.99%, including non-submission is entitled to a capped re-sit of that failed element(s) of assessment at the next available opportunity, as specified in the approved module regulations.
- 3.8.5 A student who has not achieved a pass mark of 40% in a re-sit attempt is entitled to one uncapped re-take of all assessments of that failed module in the next academic year. The re-take will require re-enrolment and registration and full attendance with a payment of tuition fees.
- 3.8.6 In exceptional circumstances, the Assessment Board may impose alternative forms of assessment for re-sits. Alternative assessment must test the same learning outcomes and be of comparable complexity to the original assessment.
- 3.8.7 A student due a re-sit shall re-sit the failed elements of assessment and the marks for any elements that were passed on the first attempt shall stand unless the course or module regulations state otherwise.
- 3.8.8 A student due to re-sit must do so at the next available opportunity or during the re-sit period, whichever is most suitable.
- 3.8.9 Students shall not normally be permitted to re-sit or re-take passed elements of assessment.
- 3.8.10 Where a student submits evidence of mitigating circumstances that impacted adversely upon their performance, and these are accepted, Assessment Boards may grant an uncapped further attempt in the affected element(s). The mark achieved shall stand. An uncapped further attempt will count as the first attempt permitted for a module, due to mitigating circumstances.
- 3.8.11 Where a student has failed a re-sit attempt they will be given the opportunity to re-take the module, as defined in Section 3.9 below.

3.9 Re-takes

- 3.9.1 Re-takes involve re-enrolment, registration, repayment and attendance at classes of a module, including the completion of all the assessments for that module. A student may be eligible for a re-sit of a module that they re-take, as specified in the approved module regulations.
- 3.9.2 The module mark for a re-take is not capped; the mark achieved shall stand, and shall replace the mark from the first attempt.

- 3.9.3 Where a re-take is granted, the student must normally attempt the same module that was originally attempted.
- 3.9.4 Where a student fails to sit a re-take at the next available opportunity, the missed re-take shall count as one permitted attempt.
- 3.9.5 Transcripts shall list all takes of modules, including both first attempts and re-takes.

3.10 Progression & Awards

- 3.10.1 To progress from one year of study to the next, a student must meet all course and module requirements.
- 3.10.2 Where a student has passed all modules worth 120 credits (including compensated passes), the student may progress to the next Level.

3.11 Failure to Meet Progression Requirements

- 3.11.1 Where a student has failed a re-sit attempt in one module, worth normally 20 credits or a maximum of 40 credits, the student may progress to the next Level with one re-take in that module as approved by the Assessment Board.
- 3.11.2 A student who fails up to a maximum value of 40 credits at Level 3 and 4 and 20 credits at Level 5 and 6 (excluding the Dissertation/Final Project) including APEL and APCL, may progress to the next Level under the *Compensation* rule, in Section 3.12 below.

3.12 Compensation

- 3.12.1 Students who fail up to a maximum of 40 credits at Level 3 and 4 and 20 credits at Level 5 and 6, excluding the Dissertation/Final Project and including APEL and APCL, will receive compensation at an Assessment Board for that failure provided that:
 - i) an average grade of 40% or more has been achieved across 120 credits at that Level; and
 - ii) the final grade for any individual modules not below 30%.
- 3.12.2 The compensation regulation is applied to all undergraduate courses, as specified in the approved course regulations.
- 3.12.3 A student who receives a compensated pass in a module shall be awarded the credit for the module.
- 3.12.4 Prior to the ratification of marks at the Assessment Board, students who fail the assessment(s) where module compensation is applicable shall be eligible for a re-sit attempt.
- 3.12.5 A student who receives a compensated pass in a module will not be entitled to re-sit or re-take that module.
- 3.12.6 Transcripts shall list the credits attained by compensation.

3.13 Award Requirements

- 3.13.1 To be eligible for an award, a student must:
- i) meet the requirements for the validated course for which they are registered;
 - ii) meet the requirements for the duration of the registration;
 - iii) take the required total credit value for the award;
 - iv) meet the minimum credit value at the level of the award;
 - v) meet the progression requirements at the end of each Level, and be in the final Level for the award

AWARD	Total Credits	Level 4 Credits	Level 5 Credits	Level 6 Credits
Certificate of Higher Education	120	120		
Diploma of Higher Education	240	120	120	
Ordinary Degree	300	120	120	60
Honours Degree	360	120	120	120

3.14 Credits & Named Awards

- 3.14.1 The naming of an award will depend on the combination of subjects studied and the amount of specialisation. The naming of awards is determined by a minimum proportion of credits being taken in a particular field of study and the requirements specified at the point of validation.
- i) an Ordinary and Honours Degree is normally determined by the proportion of credits at Level 5 and Level 6;
 - ii) a Diploma of Higher Education is normally determined by the proportion of credits at Level 4 and Level 5;
 - iii) Certificates of Higher Education may be named as determined by validation.

3.15 Honours Classification

- 3.15.1 To be eligible for the Honours Degree award, a student must:
- i) take and pass modules to a total value of 480 (with Foundation year at Level 3) or 360 credits (without Foundation year at Level 3), equivalent to 120 credits per Level, including a compensated pass for modules of up to 40 credits at Level 3 or 4 and 20 credits at Level 5 or 6;
 - ii) achieve a minimum average module mark of 40% for the course.
- 3.15.2 An award to a student shall be classified when the requirements for an award are met. The classification of the award shall be based on the average marks calculated up to two decimal points rounded to the nearest whole number.
- 3.15.3 An Award Board may permit the substitution of a higher level module for a lower level one. Excess credit at a higher level may be transferred to make good a deficit at a lower level. The transferred credit is weighted at the lower level into which it is transferred.
- 3.15.4 Modules awarded by the Accredited Prior Experiential Learning (APEL) process with marks are included.

- 3.15.5 Modules previously counted for an exit award are not included.
- 3.15.6 Where a student has achieved credit in excess of 120 at a Level then the modules providing the excess are disregarded and the calculation based on the remaining modules which provided the required 120 credits. Core modules may not be disregarded. Option modules are disregarded in the order:
- i) module(s) awarded by the APEL process without a mark;
 - ii) module(s) with the lowest marks.
- 3.15.7 Where the inclusion of a module gives more than 120 credits, but disregarding it gives less than 120 credits, the module is included in the calculation with its credit value reduced to that necessary to reach 120 credits.
- 3.15.8 The final mark is calculated by applying either of the two methods below, whichever produces a higher score:
- i) the weighted marks using best 200 credits at Level 5 and Level 6 (100 credits at Level 5 and 100 credits at Level 6), with Level 5 weighted as 0.5 and Level 6 weighted as 0.5 (Method of Calculation: Mark (%) x credit value of module x module level weighting)
- OR
- ii) the marks using best 100 credits at Level 6 alone (Method of Calculation: Mark (%) x credit value of module)
- Classification for students who join at Level 6 will be calculated by applying method B.
- 3.15.9 The classification of honours shall be made according to the following scale:

Mark	Classification
70.00% - 100.00%	First Class Honours
60.00% - 69.99%	Second Class Honours, Upper Division
50.00% - 59.99%	Second Class Honours, Lower Division
40.00% - 49.99%	Third Class Honours
0.00% - 39.99%	Fail (no award)

(Table 3.15.9)

- 3.15.10 Classification on profile of Level 5 and 6 marks.
- 3.15.11 A higher classification shall be awarded if the honours score is not more than 2% below the lower boundary of the classification to be awarded and/or has either:
- i) At least 60 Level 6 credits are from modules with marks in or above that classification;
- OR
- ii) At least 120 credits from Levels 5 and 6 are in or above the higher classification.

3.16 Named Awards

- 3.16.1 Students are registered on a course of study leading to a specified award(s).
- 3.16.2 The title (or titles) of the awards that may be achieved by a student following an approved course will be determined at the point of validation. The combination of the modules which lead to particular named award(s) will also be determined at the point of validation and recorded in the course regulations and in accordance with the framework in Section 3.17.6.
- 3.16.3 The title of the award achieved by students following assessments will be determined by the Award Board in accordance with the course regulations and the framework in Section 3.17.6.
- 3.16.4 Where awards are named this is normally determined by the proportion of subject specific credits. An unnamed Certificate of Higher Education is awarded to a student where they have achieved a minimum of 120 Level 4 credits (or equivalent) but do not meet the requirements for any other award. The titles of the modules of study undertaken and their credit value will be recorded on the transcript.
- 3.16.5 Pre-entry qualifications to the University undergraduate courses at Level 3 (HE Level 0) are named as determined by validation.
- 3.16.6 The minimum requirements for the naming of awards are outlined in the framework below:
- i) Specialist: at least 75% of module credits come from a coherent list of modules from a single field of study, e.g. Music;
 - ii) Joint: 50% of module credits come from a coherent list of modules from one field of study and 50% of module credits come from a coherent list of modules from a different field of study, e.g. Music and Media;
 - iii) Major/Minor: at least 50% of module credits come from a coherent list of modules from the major field of study and at least 25% of module credits come from a coherent list of modules from the minor field of study, e.g. Music Technology with Digital Arts.

3.17 Aegrotat Awards

- 3.17.1 An Assessment Board may recommend an aegrotat award to a student who has taken the full number of modules required for award but was absent from the final assessment for the course due to illness or other medical cause judged sufficient by the Assessment Board. Exceptionally, this may also apply to a student who was present at the assessments but considers that their performance was adversely affected by serious illness or other cause judged sufficient by the Assessment Board, or where a student has died. An aegrotat award shall only be made where there is no reasonable prospect of the student being able to return to complete the course of study.
- 3.17.2 A student who meets the requirements for the award for which they are registered cannot be considered for an aegrotat award. Assessment Boards shall recommend award classifications for such students in the normal manner.
- 3.17.3 Where a student has not taken the full quota of academic credit, Assessment Boards shall consider the evidence available from other assessments to determine the likelihood of the student achieving the required standard for award. Where an Assessment Board agrees that a

student would have achieved the required standard, a recommendation for an aegrotat award shall be made.

- 3.17.4 Where a student is offered an aegrotat award, the student may accept the offer and the award shall be conferred. Alternatively, the student may decline the offer and take the missed or failed assessments as re-sits, where applicable under the mitigating procedures. A student who elects to take the assessments ceases to be eligible for the aegrotat award. A student who elects to accept the aegrotat award ceases to be eligible to take the missed or failed assessments.

3.18 Revocation of Awards

- 3.18.1 The University may revoke an award made under these regulations, in accordance with the relevant procedures of the University. Such cases shall be considered on a case-by-case basis by the University's Academic Board, or its delegated authority.

Appendix 1: Glossary

Academic credit: An indicator of the amount and level of learning.

Academic level: The relative complexity, depth of study, and learner autonomy required in relation to a module in the context of its discipline. Each module shall be assigned a level from the following scale:

Level 3: Foundation or pre-degree level

Level 4: Introductory or Year 1

Level 5: Intermediate or Year 2

Level 6: Final or Year 3

Academic year: A period running from September to August. The years of study of most undergraduate courses follow academic years, and policies and regulations are normally written by academic year.

Advanced standing: Prior, certificated study from another institution deemed equivalent to the University modules from which exemption is sought.

Assessed coursework: Coursework that students are required to complete and submit, and which contributes in whole or in part to module marks and awards.

Award: Undergraduate, graduate, and postgraduate certificates, diplomas, bachelor's degrees, and undergraduate and postgraduate Masters degrees. The awards offered by the University are detailed in the *Academic Regulations*.

Average mark: The weighted average of a student's performance, calculated in accordance with the regulations for the award, on which the classification of the award is based. It is calculated to two decimal places.

Calendar year: A twelve-month period. Many Masters courses run for a full calendar year, which may cross two academic years.

Core module: A module that must be taken and passed to meet requirements for progression or award. Core modules cannot be compensated.

Course: A course is an approved and validated combination of modules leading to an award by the University of West London.

Delegated authority: Where the authority invested in an individual or body is delegated to another individual or body for a specified purpose.

Dissertation, project, research project: An extended piece of independent study assessed by an output report or extended essay.

Element of assessment: An individual item of assessment. The assessment for a module may comprise several elements of assessment.

Enrolment: A process by which individuals with offers of places to study become students of the University. New students must pre-enrol before enrolment, and returning students must re-enrol each year.

External Examiner: A senior professional academic from outside the University who monitors the assessment process for fairness and academic standards.

Field of study: The description of the group of modules in a particular discipline passed by a student. This is represented in the title of the award conferred upon a student.

Mitigating circumstances: Circumstances that are outside a student's control which may have an adverse impact on a student's ability to undertake or complete any assessment so as to cast doubt on the likely validity of the assessment as a measure of the student's achievement.

Module assessment: Assessment of the performance of a student on a module. This may include a variety of elements and forms, including coursework, dissertations, practical assignments and exams.

Module: An approved block of teaching and learning leading to the award of academic credit and forming part of a course of study or independent study.

Module mark: The overall module result. This may be an aggregate of marks from several elements of assessment, which may be weighted. It is calculated to two decimal places.

Notional study hours: The number of hours required to complete an academic credit, module, or course.

Prerequisite module: A specified module that must be taken before a second specified module can be taken.

Progression: The process of moving from one level of study to the next, or from the taught element to the dissertation, placement, or project element of a course.

Registration: A process by which a student signs up for modules of a course of study.

Re-sit: The repeat of all or part of a module's assessments, following failure at a previous attempt. Re-sits do not involve the repeat of attendance for the module. The assessment mark is normally capped at the pass mark.

Re-take: The repeat of a module following failure at a previous attempt. Re-takes involve attendance and completion of all elements of the module, and the submission of all assessments (summative and formative). They count towards the value of academic credit for which students must normally be registered in an academic year. The assessment mark(s) for a re-take of a module is not capped.

University: The University of West London, unless otherwise specified.

Appendix 2: BIMM 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 West London 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 UWL/BIMM, 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:

Scope

The appeal regulations described herein apply to all appeals against decisions that BIMM have taken. If a student wishes to appeal against a decision of the University, the appeal should be sent to BIMM but the case will be considered by the University directly under its [appeal regulations](#). This would include decisions taken by the exam boards as they are run directly by the University rather than BIMM. **It should be noted that these appeals should be submitted promptly as the University's deadline for submitting appeals is 10 days.**

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 3: BIMM/University of West London Year Abroad Procedure

1. Overview

This document outlines the process by which students studying on a BIMM course awarded by the University of West London may transfer between BIMM Colleges for their second year of study.

2. Eligibility

2.1. In order to be eligible for the Year Abroad Scheme a student must:

- Be enrolled on a course validated by the University of West London
- Be in their first year of study
- Have attendance above 80%
- Have returned the required Year Abroad Form before the deadline set by the destination college

2.2. Students must transfer to the same course in the destination college that they are currently studying.

3. Selection process

3.1. Students who meet the eligibility requirements will be selected on the basis of:

- Their personal statement
- Tutor recommendations
- Current performance and engagement with their course

3.2. Students with strong applications will be selected for interview. Applicants will need to show they have fully considered the implications of moving to a new college and understand the challenges involved.

3.3. Students will be informed in writing regarding the time and location of the interview. This will be done at least five working days before the date of the interview.

3.4. Interviews will be conducted by the College Principal (or nominee) of the destination college and may be conducted in person or via telephone or Skype.

3.5. Students will receive written confirmation regarding the success of their application within 1 month of the application deadline.

3.6. Students who are successful will receive an offer that is conditional on them meeting the progression requirements of their course.

4. Length of study abroad

4.1. Under the scheme a student may study at an alternate college for a maximum of one academic year.

4.2. This must be the students second year of study and once completed they must return to the original college where their degree was started.

5. Accessibility

5.1. Each year, colleges engaged in the scheme shall publish:

- The deadline for applying.
- The number of places available on each course.
- A return address for application forms.
- Financial information regarding the fees at that college and funding available.
- Any terms and conditions and academic regulations specific to that college.
- Information about living in the city in question.
- Any access restrictions that apply at any college site.

5.2. This shall be circulated via student email and posted on the College Homepage on Moodle.

5.3. Year Abroad forms shall be available from the College Homepage on Moodle.