

Summary of all changes to the Academic Regulations and Procedures 2016/2017

Academic Services August 2016

Regulation	Amendments for 2016/17
A1.3 Amendment	Change reference to 'secretary to Academic Board' to 'Academic Regulations and Policy Manager'
A1.4 Amendment	Change reference to 'secretary to Academic Board' to 'Academic Regulations and Policy Manager'
A7.1 Amendment	Change references to UWESU to 'Students' Union at UWE'
B3.2 Amendment	<p>Clarification of the approved approach to changing an award title. Change this to a regulation.</p> <p>Current text: Where changes are approved to the title of an award after students have registered but before some or all students have completed the programme and taken an award, any student who has not taken an award may choose either the original title or the new title. Faculties should ensure that all students able to choose are given the opportunity to do so and exercise that opportunity to confirm which title they would prefer to have conferred.</p> <p>New text: An approved change to an award title should normally be introduced on a phased basis so it does not impact upon current students. Exceptionally, if a change is deemed to be desirable for existing cohorts all students must be consulted with and give their unanimous consent to the change in writing.</p>
B4.2R Amendment	Addition of 'Master of Business (MBus) to the list of Integrated bachelor/masters degrees.
B6.2R Amendment	Addition of text to clarify that a Foundation Certificate is available to students at UWE Bristol's International College only.
D9.1R	<p>Removal of the word 'normally' from the maximum credit enrolment regulation for undergraduate full time students. This is due to the removal of additional fees for students who complete their award within the normal period of study (or within the parameters for an extra year of funding).</p> <p>New text: Except on postgraduate taught awards, or undergraduate awards that are delivered in an accelerated mode of delivery, students on a full time mode of delivery may enrol for a maximum of 150 credits, including placement credits, in one academic year. Students in a part time mode of study may normally enrol on a maximum of 90 credits in one academic year.</p>
E1.5R Amendment	Addition of 'normally' with reference to the regulation regarding when students are eligible to apply for extenuating circumstances (to reflect changes due to 2015/2016 operation of changes to extenuating circumstances regulations)

	<p>New text: If a student has chosen to submit an assessment or attend an exam, the implication will be that there were no extenuating circumstances present which could have adversely affected them and so it will not normally be possible to submit an application (but see Appendix E2 E16.62R – E16.67R).</p>
<p>E7.2R Amendment</p>	<p>Clarification of the conditions under which a student may or may not be required to resit a component of a standard module (single component)</p> <p>To pass a standard, project module/masters dissertation module at the first sit, resit or retake, students must achieve a mark of not less than 40% (levels 0-3/FHEQ levels 3-6) or 50% (level M / FHEQ level 7). Where the component includes element(s) which must be passed, a mark of 40% (levels 0-3/ FHEQ levels 3-6) or 50% (level M/FHEQ level 7) must be achieved in those elements. Where a module has only one component and the outcome is less than 40% at levels 0-3 (FHEQ levels 3-6) or less than 50% at level M (FHEQ level 7) the student must resit the whole component.</p>
<p>E7.7R Amendment</p>	<p>Clarification of the conditions under which a student may or may not be required to resit a component of a standard module (single component)</p> <p>Within an attempt, a student is not permitted to resit a component for which the mark already achieved is 40% (levels 0-3/FHEQ levels 3-6) or 50% (level M/FHEQ level 7) or above. Where a standard module at levels 0-3 (FHEQ levels 3-6) has two components of assessment, if a student achieves a mark between 35% and 39% inclusive for each component, they must resit both components. At level M (FHEQ level 7) this applies to marks between 45% and 49% (inclusive).</p>
<p>E8.5R Amendment</p>	<p>Clarification that a mark cannot be carried forward from one attempt to the next</p> <p>The outcome for a component may not be carried forward from one attempt to the next.</p>
<p>E11.3R Amendment</p>	<p>Clarification that a partially capped mark does not become fully capped at the resit for degree classification purposes</p> <p>Current text: For the purposes of classification for honours or a differential level of award, a partially capped mark achieved at the resit where no extenuating circumstances have been accepted will be capped at 40% (levels 0-3/FHEQ levels 3-6) or 50% (level M/FHEQ level 7).</p> <p>New text For the purposes of classification for honours or a differential level of award, where a module is achieved at the resit with a partially capped mark, it is this mark that is used in the calculation.</p>

E14.1R Amendment	<p>Clarification that it is not possible to submit work using e-mail and an authorised method should be used.</p> <p>New text: Where electronic submission is required, work submitted in any other format will not be accepted, except where the University has authorised the use of a different method (e.g. Reasonable Adjustments, five working day extensions). Electronic submission means a system approved and designated for this purpose (for example, Blackboard, PebblePad), work submitted by email will not be accepted.</p>
E19.26R Amendment	<p>Update to the regulations to clarify that mobile devices should not be used during controlled conditions assessments</p> <p>Candidates must not have in their possession at their place in the examination room or nor make use of any book, manuscript, calculator, personal computer, electronic organiser, smartwatch or similar device or any other aid which is not specifically allowed in the rubric of the examination paper. Candidates are not permitted to use their mobile phone/mobile device during the duration of their exam or other controlled conditions assessment unless otherwise stated in the assessment brief/examination rubric.</p>
G8.10 Amendment	<p>Addition of a cross reference between sections</p> <p>See section K17 for details of assessment offences relating to MPhil and doctoral level awards.</p>
H5.3R Amendment	<p>Clarification of the regulations relating to the classification of BEng awards in Mechanical Engineering, Automotive Engineering and Motorsport engineering</p> <p>The classification for the 360 credit honours degrees: BEng (Hons) Mechanical Engineering, BEng (Hons) Automotive Engineering and BEng (Hons) Motorsport Engineering (or 480 credit honours degrees with an integrated foundation year) is based upon the best marks achieved for 100 credits at level 3 and the best marks achieved for the next 100 credits at level 2 or above. The calculation at level 3 must always use the full credit and mark for the level 3 project followed by the best marks associated with the remaining level 3 credits. Where the credit size of the best marks associated with the remaining level 3 credits would give a credit total greater than 100, only the relevant portion of credit is counted. The unused credit may be counted towards the set of best marks at level 2 or above. Marks achieved for the 100 level 3 credits are weighted three times the value of the marks for the 100 credits at level 2 or above.</p>
H9.3 – H9.5 moved to H5.10 – H5.12 Amendment	<p>Text relating to the contribution of foundation degrees to the honours degree calculation moved from foundation degree section to the honours degree section.</p>

H9.3 Amendment	Clarification of the method of calculation of foundation degrees H9.3 Where a programme has 120 credits at level 2, all 120 credits are used in the calculation.
I. 6. Chief external examiners: responsibilities	Removal of text relating to programme external examiners (no longer applies)
I 15.1R Amendment	<p>Update to the regulations on absence of assessment marks as a consequence of significant disruption</p> <p>Previous text: This regulation will only be in force if it has been formally invoked by the Chair on behalf of Academic Board in circumstances in which the University's academic business has been significantly disrupted by force majeure. Such action will be reported to the first subsequent meeting of Academic Board. Unless stated otherwise, this regulation will cover all programmes delivered under the UWE regulations. In the case of variant regulations, the Chair of Academic Board will decide which regulations will prevail.</p> <p>New text: The Chair of Academic Board may formally invoke mitigating processes in response to circumstances where University's business has been significantly disrupted by force majeure. Such action will be reported to the first subsequent meeting of Academic Board.</p>
I 15.2R Amendment	<p>Update to the regulations on absence of assessment marks as a consequence of significant disruption</p> <p>Previous text: In case of doubt this regulation takes precedence over other regulations relating to student classification and progression and over the regulations governing the quoracy for meetings of Boards of Examiners. Regulations relating to appeals processes remain in force during periods of disruption caused by force majeure.</p> <p>New text: Unless stated otherwise, I.15.1R will cover all programmes delivered under the UWE regulations. In case of doubt, this regulation takes precedence over other regulations relating to student classification and progression and over the regulations governing the quoracy for meetings of Boards of Examiners. Regulations relating to appeals processes remain in force during periods of disruption caused by force majeure. In the case of variant regulations, the Chair of Academic Board will decide which regulations will prevail.</p>
I 25.2R – I. 28.1R Amendment (renumbered from I. 25.1R – I. 25.4R)	<p>Streamlining the existing regulations on the annulment of a decision of an examining board (for clarity)</p> <p>Current text: I. 25.1R Academic Board may annul a decision of an examining board without previously requiring reconsideration where there has been procedural or other irregularity or it is not possible to reconvene an examining board. If the error or irregularity is found to have affected</p>

	<p>more than one student, the Academic Board may annul all or part of the assessment.</p> <p>I. 25.2R Academic Board may annul a decision of an examining board that has been reviewed but which, in its opinion the examining board did not take proper account of the factors for review specified either by the Director of Academic Services or a review panel.</p> <p>I. 25.3R Where a decision has been annulled, Academic Board shall appoint an examining board with the power to make decisions on students' progress and/or awards, including, if necessary, the appointment of new external examiners.</p> <p>I. 25.4R Where an examining board for an award of the University, which is offered in an affiliated institution, is required to review a decision and it does not modify its decision, the Principal of the affiliated institution may recommend to the Academic Board that the decision of the examining board be annulled, if in their opinion the examining board did not take proper account of the factors specified in the requirement for the review. The recommendation of the Principal shall be made in writing to the University.</p> <p>New text: I. 25. Annulment of a decision of an examining board where there has been a material and significant administrative error or other material irregularity</p> <p>I. 25.1R Academic Board may annul a decision of an examining board where there has been a material and significant administrative error or other material irregularity, or where it is not possible to reconvene an examining board. If the error or irregularity is found to have affected more than one student, the Academic Board may annul all or part of an assessment.</p> <p>I. 26. Annulment of a decision of an examining board following an application for review by a student (appeals)</p> <p>I.26.1R Following consideration of an appeal by an examining board, if Academic Board is of the opinion that the examining board did not take proper account of the factors for review, it may annul the decision of the board.</p>
--	---

	<p>I. 27. Annulment of a decision of an examining board for an award of the University offered at an affiliated institution</p> <p>I. 27.1R If the original decision has not been modified following review (either due to an irregularity or student appeal), the Principal of the institution may recommend to the Academic Board that the decision of the examining board be annulled if in their opinion, the examining board did not take proper account of the factors for review. The recommendation of the Principal must be made in writing to the University.</p> <p>I. 28 Appointment of an examining board following the annulment of a decision</p> <p>I. 28.1R Where a decision has been annulled, the Academic Board shall appoint an examining board with the power to make decisions on students' progress and/or awards, including, if necessary, the appointment of new external examiners.</p>
K17 Amendment	<p>Reinsertion of text removed previously which clarifies the process for managing Assessment Offences allegations for students registered on research programmes</p> <p>K17.7 Assessment offences relating to taught elements of the award</p> <p>K17.7.1 Allegations against candidates registered on programmes leading to MPhil and doctoral level awards of the University shall be investigated in accordance with the University's assessment offence procedures (G1 – G9) where the allegation relates to the assessment of taught elements of the award for which UWE credit is awarded.</p> <p>K17.7.2 All allegations relating to research study undertaken by candidates for the purpose of an MPhil or doctoral level award shall be investigated in accordance with procedures as set out in section K17 of the regulations.</p>
Appendix E2 E16.2R Amendment	<p>Clarification of the regulations relating to eligibility for the submission of extenuating circumstances applications.</p> <p>Current text: An extenuating circumstances application may be submitted in the following circumstances:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • where a student has been prevented from submitting an assessment. • where a student has been prevented from attending an

	<p>examination or other controlled conditions assessment such as a presentation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • where a student attended an examination or other controlled conditions assessment but was taken ill during the event. In such cases an application must still be made by the student but corroboration may be provided by the examination invigilator or academic staff responsible for the assessment (<i>any mark achieved for the affected assessment will be removed</i>). • where a student has submitted an assessment or attended an examination or controlled conditions assessment but due to having a certified condition or circumstance (or is subsequently diagnosed), which would have meant they were unable to exercise the judgement necessary at the time to deem themselves well enough to take an assessment (e.g. mental health difficulties, bereavement or chronic medical condition) (<i>any mark achieved for the affected assessment will be removed</i>). <p>New text: A student may apply for extenuating circumstances if they do not submit an assignment or do not attend an examination or other controlled conditions assessment such as a presentation.</p> <p>If a student has chosen to submit an assessment or attend an exam, it will be assumed that they have made a judgement they were fit to do so and the implication will be that there were no extenuating circumstances present which could have adversely affected them. Any extenuating circumstances applied for before or after the exam or assessment will be rejected.</p>
Appendix E2 E16.11R Amendment	<p>Change of terminology relating to 'time outs' to reflect agreed approach for the University</p> <p>Replacement of the phrase 'time out' with 'suspending their studies'.</p> <p>Update also applies to E16.40 and E16.42</p>
Appendix E2 E16.15 Amendment	<p>Update to extenuating circumstances deadlines for 2016/2017</p> <p>Postgraduate Dissertation modules (for students completing their award)</p> <p>14:00 on 14 October 2016</p> <p>Health and Applied Sciences (November 2016 exam boards)</p> <p>14:00 on 18 November 2016</p> <p>Modules completed by the end of assessment period 1</p> <p>14:00 on 3 February 2017</p> <p>Health and Applied Sciences (March 2017 exam boards)</p> <p>14:00 on 17 March 2016</p> <p>Modules completed by the end of assessment period 2</p> <p>14:00 on 2 June 2017</p> <p>Modules completed by the end of assessment period 3</p>

	<p>14:00 on 28 July 2017</p> <p>Modules completed by the end of assessment period 4</p> <p>14:00 on 18 August 2017</p>								
Appendix E2 E16.33R Amendment	<p>Update to the extenuating circumstances regulations to reflect the changes to using self-certification as evidence</p> <p>Current text: The requirements for the supporting evidence are the same as would be expected for an extenuating circumstances application (see E16.61R).</p> <p>New text: The requirements for the supporting evidence are the same as would be expected for an extenuating circumstances application (see E16.61R). However, self-certification will not be accepted as evidence for a five working day extension request.</p>								
Appendix E2 E16.40	<p>New suspension of studies deadlines</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <th>Programme start date</th><th>Suspension of Studies</th></tr> <tr> <td>September 2016</td><td>07 April 2017</td></tr> <tr> <td>January 2017</td><td>04 August 2017</td></tr> <tr> <td>April 2017</td><td>10 November 2017</td></tr> </table>	Programme start date	Suspension of Studies	September 2016	07 April 2017	January 2017	04 August 2017	April 2017	10 November 2017
Programme start date	Suspension of Studies								
September 2016	07 April 2017								
January 2017	04 August 2017								
April 2017	10 November 2017								
Appendix E2 E16.60 Amendment	<p>Change existing process to a regulation to reflect changes regarding self-certification</p> <p>Current text: Students are expected to plan their work, so that they can complete their assessments even if they lose a day or two through illness or other disruption. Therefore, self-certification will not be accepted as evidence to support any application.</p> <p>New text: Students are expected to plan their work so that they can complete their assessments, even if they lose a day or two through illness or other disruption. However, in exceptional circumstances where they have been prevented from submitting or attending an individual assessment, students may use self-certification for an extenuating circumstances application if they cannot provide any other form of evidence. Self-certification may only be used once for one assessment during each academic year (a period determined by the programme start date). The table of acceptable extenuating circumstances provides details on the circumstances in which self-certification can be accepted. Self-certification will not be accepted as evidence for absence from a group assessment or as evidence for a five working day extension request.</p>								
Appendix E2 E16.61R Amendment	<p>Table of acceptable and unacceptable circumstances</p> <p>The table of acceptable extenuating circumstances and evidence will show where self-certification can be included as an acceptable form of evidence to cover non-submission / absence from one assessment only per year. For example:</p>								

	<p>Serious personal accident or injury of self or close family member:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • car (or other transport) crash; • an acute episode within a longer term medical condition. <p>Medical certification of serious accident (doctor's note, hospital letters, hospital appointments).</p> <p>Self-certification form (may be used for one assessment only during each academic year)</p>
<p>Appendix E2 E16.62R – E16.67R Amendment</p>	<p>Exceptional extenuating circumstances</p> <p>E16.62R Exceptionally, a student may apply for extenuating circumstances after attempting an assessment. This is permitted on only two grounds.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The student's circumstances impaired their judgement to the extent that they were unable to recognise or determine the impact on them at the time of the assessment. 2. The student attended an examination or other controlled conditions assessment but was taken ill during the event. <p>1. A student's judgement is impaired at the time of the assessment</p> <p>E16.63R Circumstances could include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chronic medical condition of self or close family member (including mental health), an incapacitating illness or unexpected deterioration in an ongoing illness or medical condition. • Death of close family member (e.g. partner, parent, child) • The definition of 'close' is not confined to partner, parent or child and might reasonably include significant others (e.g. primary carers, grandparents, or friends). • Acute personal crisis at the time of assessment • Due to a personal crisis the student was unable to exercise the judgement necessary at the time to deem themselves well enough to do an assessment (for example, relationship breakdown, anxiety). <p>E16.64R Applications on the grounds of impaired judgement must be supported by independent evidence which specifically covers the period of assessment and explains the impact on the student at the time.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evidence must relate directly to the student not a family member, friend etc. • Medical evidence must state the whole period when the student was unfit to study. • Providing evidence of an existing medical condition with hospital appointment letters, prescriptions or medicine boxes alone would not be deemed sufficient to demonstrate impaired judgement. • A doctor's note for a seriously ill relative would not allow a claim to be approved. Evidence confirming the impact on the student during the period relating to the assessment would be required. • Evidence for bereavement may include a death certificate an order of service or a newspaper announcement. In addition, regardless of the type of relationship the impact of the death on the student needs to be clearly explained. <p>Please note: self-certification will not be accepted as evidence to support any application made on the grounds of impaired judgement.</p> <p>2. A student attempts a controlled conditions assessment but is taken ill during the event</p> <p>E16.65R The application must be supported by written, verifiable, and independent evidence of their medical condition. The student evidence may be corroborated by the report of the examination invigilator or academic staff responsible for supervising the assessment.</p> <p>The process for considering exceptional extenuating circumstances applications</p> <p>E16.66 Applications made on these exceptional grounds will be considered by a review group specially convened to make decisions on these cases. The group is constituted of staff from across the University in order to ensure that that each case is treated equitably and includes at least one member of academic staff.</p> <p>Outcome if the exceptional application is accepted</p> <p>E16.67R If a student applies for extenuating circumstances under one of these two exceptional grounds after the assessment and the application is accepted by the review group, the mark for it will be removed and will be replaced by a non-submission. Where appropriate an Award Board may then use its discretion to act as per regulation I.17.1a-e.</p>
Appendix E3 Amendment	<p>Amendments to the acceptable circumstances for applying to resit an examination overseas (additions in bold)</p> <p>2.1 Students who are away from the UK on the date of the resit</p>

	<p>examination may exceptionally be permitted to take the examination off campus if:</p> <p>they are paying an international rate fee and are a final year student whose permanent home address is outside of the UK and who would need to return only to take a resit;</p> <p>they are on a University approved placement taking place outside of the UK which is linked to a credit bearing module and have been allowed to proceed to the placement with a requirement to complete the resits during the placement;</p> <p>they are an exchange student participating in an academic exchange arrangement.</p> <p>3. Non - acceptable circumstances</p> <p>3.1 Students will not be permitted to take an examination overseas in any of the following circumstances:</p> <p>they are resident in the UK but are out of the country on holiday or for domestic reasons;</p> <p>for individual convenience;</p> <p>they are undertaking an internship which does not fall into the criteria in 2.1b.</p>
Appendix H2	Section renumbered from H27 to H26
Appendix H3	Section renumbered from H28 to H27
Glossary Amendment	<p>Change to the definition of registration in order to align with the University's terms and conditions</p> <p>Following admission to the University, all students are required to register at the start of their studies and in each subsequent year of study. Registration is the procedure by which students confirm personal information about themselves, confirm their programme of study, agree to pay, or make arrangements to pay their tuition (and other university) fees. Registration leads to the creation of an individual student record to provide the student with access to university facilities and resources and to enable the University to record academic information against the student record for the duration of their registration. Registration is also the means by which students formally agree to abide by the University's terms and conditions, rules and regulations.</p>

Table 1. Amendments to Postgraduate Research (PGR) Regulations and Procedures for 2016/17

	Existing PGR Procedures/Regulations	Amendments for 2016/17
		Section K15 Progression examination and progress review
K15.1R	Faculties are required to ensure that they have in place appropriate processes for the review and monitoring of a candidate's progress.	<p>Faculties will adhere to published processes for the regular review and monitoring of each candidate's academic progress. Additional information and guidance can also be found in section 14 of the Postgraduate Research Degree Programmes Code of Practice, the Graduate School website and UWE Graduate School Handbook.</p> <p>The abbreviation FRDC is used for Faculty Research Degrees Committee throughout this section</p>
		<p><i>[Add an additional sentence to existing regulation clarifying arrangements for Professional Doctorate variants]:</i></p> <p>For Professional Doctorate awards candidates must complete their progression examination in accordance with the timetable set out in the relevant programme specification.</p> <p><i>[Accordingly delete: K15.2.4 which is duplicated at K15.2.1R – section renumbered between K15.2.4 and K15.2.25.]</i></p>
		Progression examination
K15.2.21	The Faculty Research Degrees Committee shall consider the examiners' report and agree an outcome decision. Where the Faculty Research Degrees Committee agrees a recommendation from the examiners to resubmit, a deadline for that	The Faculty Research Degrees Committee shall consider the examiners' report and agree an outcome decision. Where the Faculty Research Degrees Committee agrees a recommendation from the examiners to resubmit, a deadline for that resubmission will be set up to a maximum of 3 months for full-time and a maximum of 5 months for part-time candidates.

	resubmission will be set up to a maximum of 3 months for full-time and a maximum of 5 months for part-time candidates. The candidate shall only be exempt from further viva where the examiners agree that the work submitted provides sufficient evidence to show that the project is back on track. Where a further viva is required this shall normally be conducted by the same examiners.	<i>[second part of this proc relocated to K15.2.25]</i>
		Disagreement between examiners following the first progression examination
K15.2.24	When the examiners are unable to agree upon a recommendation a second viva voce examination will be held.	Where, following the first progression examination viva, the examiners are unable to agree upon a recommendation, each examiner will submit an independent outcome report to the FRDC. The FRDC will consider both reports and agree an outcome decision in accordance with procedures at K15.2.21. There will be no further viva voce examination of the candidate within this first attempt. The FRDC may, if it wishes, seek independent advice to inform this decision making process from an academic colleague who is unconnected with the project, supervisory team or candidate, but has subject or other appropriate expertise.
K15.2.25	Where a second viva voce examination is held, it shall be conducted solely by a third examiner nominated and appointed by the Faculty Research Degrees Committee. The third examiner shall not be informed of the recommendations of the other examiners. The examiner will communicate the recommended outcome to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee. On receipt of the recommendation of the third examiner, the Faculty	

	Research Degrees Committee will make a recommendation to the Research Degrees Award Board.	
		Resubmitted progression examination arrangements
K15.2.25		Where a resubmission outcome has been agreed, the candidate shall only be exempt from further viva where both examiners agree that the work submitted provides sufficient evidence to show that the project is back on track. Where a further viva is required this shall normally be conducted by the same examiners. In such cases the Director of Studies may request a copy of the examiners' resubmission preliminary reports from the Graduate School to assist the candidate's preparation for the resubmission viva.
		Disagreement between examiners following a resubmitted Progression Examination
K15.2.26		Where, following a resubmitted progression examination viva, the examiners are unable to agree an outcome recommendation each examiner will submit an independent outcome report to the FRDC. The FRDC will consider the reports and agree an outcome decision in accordance with procedures at K15.2.21 with the exception that no further resubmission opportunity will be granted. The FRDC may, if it wishes, seek independent advice to inform this decision making process from an academic colleague who is unconnected with the project, supervisory team or candidate, but has subject or other appropriate expertise. This may be the individual previously approached at K15.2.24 where appropriate. There will be no further viva voce examination of the candidate.

		Progress review in subsequent stages of the award
K15.3.1R	The University Graduate School shall publish procedures for the regular review of candidate's progress. The procedures shall provide for progress reports, forms and other evidence demonstrating progress to be in an approved format. The Graduate School shall advise the supervisory team, the principal independent reviewer and the candidate of the timing and process for both the review and reporting of progress to faculty research degree committees at the end of each stage of the candidate's registration. Guidance on the content, completion and format of progress review reporting shall be provided by the University Graduate School.	A review of progress shall be carried out at the end of each stage of the candidate's registration in accordance with published procedures available at http://www1.uwe.ac.uk/research/postgraduateresearchstudy/studysupport/progressreview.aspx and in the Graduate School Handbook
K15.3.4	<p>The candidate and their supervisory team will complete a progress review form and submit it, via the Graduate School Office, to the principal reviewer, together with appropriate evidence of progress comprising one from the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>At Stage 2</u> (max 24 months FT, 36 months PT, Prof Doc as per programme): a thesis outline, a synthesis of outputs / data / 	<p>The candidate working closely with their supervisory team will complete a progress review form in line with the following timings and submit it, via the Graduate School Office, to the principal reviewer, together with supporting evidence appropriate to their stage selected from the options specified at http://www1.uwe.ac.uk/research/postgraduateresearchstudy/studysupport/progressreview.aspx and published in the Graduate School Handbook:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>At Stage 2</u> : at 24 months FT, 36 months PT, Prof Doc as per programme • <u>At Stage 3</u> : at 36 months FT, 54 months PT, Prof Doc as per programme <p>Failure to submit both review form and supporting evidence in a timely fashion</p>

	<p>activities, a presentation on progress, a presentation of output or a draft thesis chapter;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>At Stage 3</u> (max 36 months FT, 54 months PT, Prof Doc as per programme): a draft thesis / part thesis, a presentation of findings, a published paper, or other evidence to demonstrate that timely completion will occur. 	<p>without good reason accepted by the FRDC will be deemed unsatisfactory (see K15.3.5) and will result in the loss of the submission opportunity. In such cases candidates will then be required to submit within a deadline and in a manner specified by the FRDC; failure to do so will lead to a recommendation for withdrawal of registration.</p>
K15.3.5	<p>The Principal Reviewer and the Director of Studies (or other member of the supervisory team) shall meet with the candidate to discuss the progress that has been made towards the timely completion of the project and shall complete a joint review report making one of the following recommendations to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • satisfactory progress, progress the candidate to the next stage; • unsatisfactory progress, refer the candidate for further work, in which case the report should also indicate the nature of the additional evidence needed to demonstrate that the project is back on a satisfactory footing. 	<p>The Principal Reviewer and the Director of Studies (or other member of the supervisory team) shall meet with the candidate to discuss the progress that has been made towards the timely completion of the project and shall complete a joint review report making one of the following recommendations to the Faculty Research Degrees Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • satisfactory progress, progress the candidate to the next stage; • unsatisfactory progress, refer the candidate for further work, in which case the report should also indicate the nature of the additional evidence needed to demonstrate that the project is back on a satisfactory footing. <p>Should reviewer and supervisor be unable to reach a unanimous recommendation, separate reports should be made to the FRDC.</p>

K15.3.6	<p>Faculty research degrees committees will consider the outcome of the progress review for each candidate. Where progress is confirmed as satisfactory the candidate's registration will continue to the next stage. Where progress is not deemed satisfactory, the Committee shall require the candidate to provide further evidence of a nature and to a deadline it deems appropriate to allow a final decision to be made. The Committee shall report decisions to the Research Degrees Award Board. Where a candidate is unable to satisfy the Committee that satisfactory progress has been resumed the Committee shall recommend to the Research Degrees Award Board that the candidate's registration be withdrawn.</p>	<p>Faculty research degrees committees will consider the recommended outcome of the progress review for each candidate. Where progress is confirmed as satisfactory the candidate's registration will continue to the next stage. Where progress is not deemed satisfactory, the Committee shall require the candidate to provide further evidence of a nature and to a deadline it deems appropriate to allow a final decision to be made. Where reviewer and supervisor are unable to reach a unanimous recommendation about a candidate's progress, the FRDC will consider both reports but will normally uphold the recommendation of the Principal Reviewer. The FRDC may, if it wishes, seek further independent advice to inform this decision making process from an academic colleague who is unconnected with the project, supervisory team or candidate, but has subject or other appropriate expertise.</p>
K15.3.7		<p>Where a candidate continues to be unable to satisfy the Committee that satisfactory progress has been resumed the Committee shall recommend to the Research Degrees Award Board that the candidate's registration be withdrawn.</p>
		Section K16 Final Assessment
K16.1.3R	<p>An Award Board may need to be established for Professional Doctorate awards, to be responsible for:</p> <p>a. any taught units which are not covered by the University's standard assessment regulations;</p>	<p>Regulation removed as not required. Taught units are taken to existing Examination Boards. Progression points are taken to the Research Degrees Award Board.</p> <p>Subsequent numbering amended (K16.1.4R – K16.1.12 are now K16.1.3R – K16.1.11)</p>

	b. any progression points defined in programme-specific assessment regulations.	
		Reference to 'student' changed to 'candidate'. Reference to 'staff' changed to 'UWE Bristol staff'
K16.2.5R		Disagreement between examiners following a first viva examination
K16.7.3R	Where the examiners' recommendations are not unanimous, this shall be reported by the Independent Chair to the Research Degrees Award Board which may: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. uphold a majority recommendation (provided that the majority includes at least one external examiner); b. uphold the recommendation of the external examiner; or c. require the appointment of an additional external examiner, once only, to participate in the examination of the candidate as if for the first time. 	Where the examiners' recommendations are not unanimous, this shall be reported by the Independent Chair to the Research Degrees Award Board which may: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. uphold a majority recommendation (provided that the majority includes at least one external examiner); b. uphold the recommendation of the external examiner; or c. appoint an independent external assessor who shall review the thesis and make an independent report together with an outcome recommendation to the Award Board. No further viva voce examination of the candidate shall take place within the first attempt. The Award Board will consider all reports and agree an outcome decision in accordance with regulations at K16.7.2R.
		Referred for resubmission and re-examination
16.7.15	A candidate who is referred for resubmission and re-examination with or without a further viva shall only be exempt from the additional viva where the examiners unanimously agree after re-examining the resubmitted thesis, that	A candidate who is referred for resubmission and re-examination with or without a further viva shall only be exempt from the additional viva where the examiners unanimously agree after re-examining the resubmitted thesis, that there is no need for it, and that the degree can be awarded. However, a candidate may not be failed outright at resubmission and the degree not awarded (outcome K16.7.2R.D.) without the opportunity to undergo a further viva.

	there is no need for it, and that the degree can be awarded. However, a candidate may not be failed outright at resubmission and the degree not awarded (outcome K16.7.2R.D.) without the opportunity to undergo a further viva.	
K16.7.16		Where a resubmission viva is required the Director of Studies may request a copy of the examiners' resubmission preliminary reports from the Graduate School to assist the candidate's preparation for the resubmission viva.
K16.8.5R	In all other respects the re-examination shall be conducted as the first examination.	In all other respects the re-examination shall be conducted as the first examination excepting where examiners' recommendations following a resubmission viva are not unanimous.
		Disagreement between examiners following a resubmission viva
K16.8.7R	Where the examiners' recommendations are not unanimous, the Research Degrees Award Board may: a. uphold a majority recommendation (provided that the majority includes at least one external examiner); or b. uphold the recommendation of the external examiner.	Where, following a resubmission viva, the examiners' recommendations are not unanimous, the Research Degrees Award Board may: a. uphold a majority recommendation (provided that the majority includes at least one external examiner); or b. uphold the recommendation of the external examiner; or c. appoint an independent external assessor who shall review the resubmitted thesis and make an independent report together with an outcome recommendation to the Award Board. No further viva examination of the candidate shall take place. The Board will consider all reports and agree a final outcome as at K16.7.2R (save that option B shall not apply).

		Section K16.10 Final version of the thesis or collection of published works
		Third party copyright requirements
K16.10.2	<p>It is the candidate's responsibility to ensure that use of any third party intellectual property complies with the requirements of the University's intellectual property policy. The thesis or published work submission shall include the following copyright text:</p> <p><i>'This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis / commentary* may be published without proper acknowledgement'.</i></p> <p>*for awards by publication</p>	<p>It is the candidate's responsibility to ensure that use of any third party intellectual property complies with the requirements of the University's intellectual property policy. The thesis or published work submission shall include the following statement:</p> <p><i>'Material in this thesis/commentary* is the author's with the exception of third party material where appropriate permissions have been obtained and attributed. This copy has been supplied on the understanding that no use of material may be made without proper acknowledgement.'</i></p> <p>*for awards by publication</p>