

SENATE REGULATIONS

1	GENERAL FRAMEWORK.....	3
11	Regulations, policies and Handbooks	3
12	Definition of academic terminology	4
13	Transitional regulation.....	6
2	GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR STUDENTS.....	7
21	Rights and responsibilities	7
22	Dignity at study and right to equal treatment	8
23	Copyright, intellectual property and publication of student work	9
24	Student conduct and discipline.....	10
25	Academic misconduct and penalties	12
26	Student complaints and redress	14
27	Conferment of awards and graduation	16
3	ACADEMIC PROVISION OF THE UNIVERSITY	18
31	Academic governance structures.....	18
32	Academic distinctions awarded by the University	20
33	Partnerships involving academic provision.....	22
34	Appointment of staff to manage academic provision	24
4	MANAGEMENT OF STUDENTS	25
41	General definitions	25
42	Offers of admission	27
43	Initial registration	29
44	Changes in registration	31
45	Suspension of study	33
46	Early termination of registration.....	35
47	Appeals against registration decisions	37
5	POSTGRADUATE TAUGHT PROGRAMMES OF STUDY	40
51	Programme approval, monitoring and review	40
52	General requirements	41
53	Academic management.....	42
54	Boards of examiners.....	43
55	Conduct of assessment	45
56	Authorisation of the conferment of awards	47
57	Academic appeals.....	50
6	PROGRAMMES OF SUPERVISED RESEARCH.....	53
61	Definitions of programmes of supervised research	53
62	General requirements	54
63	Management of research supervision and student progress	55
64	Assessment regulations and practices	57
65	Authorisation of the conferment of awards	59
66	Academic appeals.....	61
67	Staff candidature	64
7	DEGREES CONFERRED BY SUBMISSION OF A PORTFOLIO OF WORK	65
71	Degree of Doctor of Science [DSc]	65
72	Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (by portfolio of published works) [PhD].....	67
73	Professional Postgraduate Certificate [PgCert]	69
8	JOINT DEGREE REGULATIONS.....	71
81	MSc and EngD in Sustainable Materials and Manufacturing: joint degrees with University of Exeter and University of Warwick.....	71

9	UNDERGRADUATE AWARDS	75
91	Undergraduate awards.....	75
92	General requirements of undergraduate awards	76
93	Assessment of undergraduate students.....	77
94	Undergraduate award criteria.....	78
95	Maximum periods of registration	79
96	Conduct of assessments	80
97	Boards of examiners	82
98	Authorisation of the conferment of awards	83
99	Academic appeals	86

Changes to this document since version 3.5 (March 2022):

- Amended intellectual property ownership of student work (23)
- Updated investigation processes for academic misconduct cases (25)
- Amendment that all terminations of registration are enacted immediately (47)

1 GENERAL FRAMEWORK

11 Regulations, policies and Handbooks

- 11.1 The right of Senate to make, add to, amend or revoke Regulations is granted by Ordinance 4. Regulations govern the academic provision of Cranfield University and the experience of students before, during and after their formal periods of registration with the University.
- 11.2 Regulations are approved by Senate, and may be supplemented with policies, Handbooks or other documents that articulate in more detail policy, custom and practice as reviewed and amended from time to time. Senate does not delegate its authority to approve changes to Regulations, but policies, Handbooks and other documents are approved on Senate's behalf either by officers or standing committees, as Senate decides from time to time.

12 Definition of academic terminology

In these Regulations the following terms have the meaning indicated, except where the context requires otherwise:

- 12.1 "**Academic distinction of the University**" includes all degrees of the University and other academic awards of the University as defined in Regulation 32, which are awarded to students subsequent to a defined period of student registration and a **programme of study**. (Specifically, therefore, the term does not apply to honorary degrees, or to degrees awarded by submission of a portfolio of recognised work, unless this is explicitly stated.)
- 12.2 "**Academic Registrar**" means a person appointed to undertake the responsibilities of the post, as outlined in Senate Regulations, or a person or persons to carry out one or more of the responsibilities assigned to the Academic Registrar.
- 12.3 "**Candidate**" means a person who is undergoing (or is to undergo) examination and/or assessment with a view to the award of an **academic distinction of the University or learning credits**.
- 12.4 "**Course Director**" means a person or persons appointed to undertake the responsibilities of the post, as outlined in Regulation 53.
- 12.5 "**Director of Education**" of a School means the person appointed to lead and manage the School's provision of taught programmes of study, or a person or persons deputed by him or her to carry out one or more of the responsibilities assigned to the Director of Education.
- 12.6 "**Director of Research**" of a School means the person appointed to lead and manage the School's provision of supervised programmes of research, or a person or persons deputed by him or her to carry out one or more of the responsibilities assigned to the Director of Research.
- 12.7 "**Director of Theme**" means the person appointed to lead and manage the School's academic provision (of both education and research) relating to a key thematic area approved by the University Executive.
- 12.8 "**Full-time**" in relation to a **programme of study** means that the programme of study is one which demands all of a **student's** normal working time, throughout the duration of the programme of study.
- 12.9 "**Head of School**" means the Pro-Vice-Chancellor appointed to lead and manage a School, or a person or persons deputed by him or her to carry out one or more of the responsibilities assigned to the Head of School.
- 12.10 "**Learning credits**" are the units of achievement within the University, and are awarded on the successful completion of a **taught programme of study**.
- 12.11 "**Part-time**" in relation to a **programme of study** means that the programme of study is one which demands less than all of a **student's** normal working time. It may take the form of either:
 - (a) a series of full-time elements of a programme of study which are studied discontinuously, but which in total meet the requirement for the award of an **academic distinction of the University**, or
 - (b) continuous part-time study carried out either in association with or independently of the students' other activities.

- 12.12 **"Partnership involving academic provision"** means a **programme of study** that is delivered or supported substantially in partnership with an external organisation.
- 12.13 **"Programme of study"** means a defined body of academic provision, leading to either an **academic distinction of the University** or **learning credits** to recognise achievement, or designed to equip apprentices with the Knowledge, Skills and Behaviours required by an apprenticeship standard. Programmes of study are further defined as:
- (a) a **"taught programme of study"**, which is a defined curriculum of learning, teaching and assessment under the sponsorship of one or more members of staff of the University, and approved by the relevant authority within the University. Taught programmes of study may include short periods of supervised research;
- or
- (b) a **"programme of supervised research"** includes a defined area of research activity pursued on an individual basis under the sponsorship of one or more members of staff of the University, and approved by the relevant authority within the University;
- or
- (c) a **"non-award-bearing programme of study"** which is a programme aligned with an apprenticeship standard, which is designed to equip apprentices with the required Knowledge, Skills and Behaviours prior to completion of an End Point Assessment (EPA).
- 12.14 **"Published portfolio of work"** means a body of work not specifically produced for assessment as part of a programme of study, but which may be submitted as evidence for the recognition of an award of the University.
- 12.15 **"Recognised Teacher"** means a person who is not a member of academic staff, but has been approved by the University to undertake teaching and assessment as if they were a member of academic staff.
- 12.16 **"Recognised UK degree"** means any degree conferred by a body recognised by the relevant Secretary of State as within Sections 214(2) of the Education Reform Act 1988.
- 12.17 **"Registration"** is a defined period of time, where a student is considered subject to the terms and conditions applied to them as members of the University.
- 12.18 **"School"** means a Constituent Unit which has been designated as academic in accordance with Ordinance 11: a person is designated as the **Head of School** to lead and manage the Constituent Unit.
- 12.19 **"Student"** means a student of the University who, as defined in Statute 1, is registered as undertaking a **programme of study** recognised by the University.
- 12.20 **"Supervisor"** means a person or persons appointed to undertake the responsibilities of the post, as outlined in Regulation 63.
- 12.21 **"Thesis"** means a piece of unpublished written work (which may or may not include parts previously published) presented by a **candidate** for examination for an **academic distinction of the University**, where the piece of work represents either the entirety of the work submitted for assessment, or a single piece of work representing 30% or more of the assessment overall.

13 Transitional regulation

- 13.1 The Regulations apply to all students initially registered on or after 1 August 2015, and supersede all previous Regulations and associated guidance.
- 13.2 For students whose initial date of registration was before 1 August 2015, the Regulations will only apply to those students whose period of study extends beyond 30 September 2015); otherwise, the Regulations (version 2.3) shall apply.
- 13.3 For student whose initial date of registration was before 1 August 2013, the Academic Registrar reserves the right to apply Regulations that were in force before 1 August 2013, providing that this is not to the detriment of the student or students concerned.

2 GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR STUDENTS

21 Rights and responsibilities

21.1 Senate defines from time to time the rights and responsibilities of all students. It also articulates general levels of expectations on the Schools and their academic staff in supporting all aspects of student learning. In addition, Senate recognises that students are required to abide by other policies and rules laid down by non-academic areas of the University, which relate to the provision of services by the University, including:

- (a) membership and use of the Library;
- (b) use of University IT facilities;
- (c) use of University buildings, facilities and residential accommodation;
- (d) membership of the Cranfield Students' Association.

21.2 Any student may opt out of the use of any of the facilities listed above, or from membership of the Cranfield Students' Association. Such a request will be put into place by written notice of the student to the Academic Registrar, and take immediate effect. Should a student wish to rescind their "opt out", this is given by written notice to the Academic Registrar and normally takes effect from the next academic year. The Academic Registrar provides at least annually to the staff of relevant services, and to the Cranfield Students' Association, a list of all students who have opted out of the relevant services or membership. The Cranfield Students' Association provides on request a list of the benefits of membership of which an opted out student is deprived.

.....
The following documents supplement this Regulation:

- *Postgraduate Students' Handbook*
- *Undergraduate Students' Handbook*
- *Rules of the Library*
- *IT Users Policy*
- *Residential contract (Cranfield campus)*
- *Health and Safety information (campus-specific)*

22 Dignity at study and right to equal treatment

- 22.1 Senate is committed to providing a working and learning environment that is free of intimidation or discrimination, and recognises that the contribution of staff and students will be most effective in conditions which are free of unnecessary anxiety, stress and fear. These conditions are likely to flourish in an environment which respects the rights of individuals and is concerned with maintaining their dignity at all times.
- 22.2 In order to foster such an environment, Senate defines the responsibilities of the University in providing such an environment, including the rights of students to study and live in an environment free from any form of harassment. Senate articulates mechanisms of redress for students, including complaints procedures and disciplinary procedures.
- 22.3 Senate recognises that freedom of speech within established law is a fundamental right to equal treatment. No premises of the University are denied to any individual or group of people on the grounds of his or her or their beliefs or views or expressions of such, except where there are clear risks to either health or safety, or where there is a clear intent to express such beliefs or views in such a way as to incite an audience to violence, extremism or to a breach of the peace.

.....

The following documents supplement this Regulation:

- *Senate Handbook: Student Welfare*

23 Copyright, intellectual property and publication of student work

- 23.1 The copyright and other intellectual property rights in relation to theses and other work prepared and submitted by a student as part of his or her programme of study are assigned to the student themselves, except where specifically agreed otherwise by the University in writing. This Regulation does not apply to theses and other work completed before 1 September 2023.
- 23.2 In cases where copyright or intellectual property rights are not assigned to a student, a request from a student to publish his or her work requires the permission of the Director of Education, the Director of Research or the Head of School concerned.
- 23.3 Where student work is the result of publicly-funded research, it is an expectation that the reports, publications or other outputs will be placed in the public domain. Senate outlines procedures for the proper recording and management of such publications.
- 23.4 Senate also outlines procedures to restrict the publication of student work for commercial or national security reasons.

24.1 Senate exercises a right to discipline a student where it can be proven that he or she has:

- (a) failed to abide by one or more Senate Regulations, including the further guidance and advice outlined in supplementary Handbooks, or other formal rules and policies approved by the University;
- (b) been disorderly or otherwise disruptive to the proper functioning of the University;
- (c) acted inappropriately or prejudicially to other members of the University, or to the general public whilst engaged in student-related activities, including but not limited to acts of harassment, harmful or threatening behaviour, verbal or physical abuse, or acts of violence;
- (d) caused harm or damage to University property, including University halls of residence; or
- (e) otherwise brought, or potentially brought, the University into disrepute.

24.2 Any member of the University has the right to bring forward an allegation on the grounds of any of the above to the attention of the Head of School to which the student is assigned.

24.3 Where an allegation against a student has been made, Senate defines procedures to investigate such allegations, which as a minimum include:

- (a) Stage 1 investigation (*informal investigation and resolution*)
 - i. The Head of School to which the student is assigned appoints one or more persons to make preliminary enquiries into the allegation, and to endeavour to find a rapid solution.
 - ii. The range of outcomes that may apply are limited to: dismissal of the allegation, an informal verbal warning to any party involved, a formal written warning to any party involved, or a recommendation to escalate the allegation to a Stage 2 investigation.
- (b) Stage 2 investigation (*formal investigation and resolution*)
 - i. The Head of School to which the student is assigned appoints one or more persons (who may be the same as the Stage 1 investigation) to make detailed enquiries and undertake a full and documented investigation into the allegation.
 - ii. The assigned investigator(s) provides a full and complete report to the Head of School, along with recommendations for any penalty that he or she or they deem appropriate, up to and including the early termination of the registration of the student. The report will address all elements of the allegation and recommend whether each element should be dismissed or upheld.
 - iii. The Head of School confirms the recommendations and penalties or otherwise dismisses the allegation, confirming the decision to all parties in writing.

(c) Stage 3 investigation (review)

- i. The grounds for review at Stage 3 are limited to:
 - A. that the decision of the investigating officer(s) at Stage 1 or Stage 2 was based on incomplete or inaccurate evidence, to the extent where it is reasonable to conclude that the decision may have been different;
 - B. that the investigating officer(s) has not made clear recommendations on each element of the initial allegation;
 - C. that the investigating officer(s) was prejudiced or biased against one or more persons connected with the allegation, including any undisclosed conflicts of interest.
- ii. The Academic Registrar may summarily dismiss a Stage 3 investigation if he or she does not believe that sufficient evidence exists to support the stated grounds of review.
- iii. Otherwise, he or she appoints at least two members of Senate to investigate the review. The appointed officers review in full the conduct of the Stage 2 investigation, the original and revised evidence, and decide whether to dismiss the review or refer the matter back to the relevant Head of School, who authorises a re-investigation of the matter by different persons.
- iv. Any re-investigation is conducted in the same manner as a Stage 2 investigation, save that the recommended outcomes of the re-investigation are considered as final, with no recourse to a second Stage 3 investigation.

(d) External complaint

- i. If the matter is not resolved finally by a Stage 3 investigation, or if one or more of the parties involved remains dissatisfied with the outcome, he or she or they may submit a complaint to the external complaints regulator for the UK higher education sector.

24.4 At all internal stages (Stages 1, 2 and 3), all investigating persons abide by general good practice in the conduct of investigations, which includes:

- (a) timeliness of the investigation, taking into account the issues under investigation and the need for any persons to prepare appropriately for an interview;
- (b) for the student being investigated, open access to key documents that will influence the final decision, and a right to rebut or dispute such evidence;
- (c) the right of any person being interviewed to be accompanied by a person of his or her choosing, provided that any such accommodation is confirmed in advance of the interview, and that the accompanying person shall not represent the person being interviewed;
- (d) at the resolution of either a Stage 2 or Stage 3 investigation, a full written report is provided to the student under investigation.

.....
The following documents supplement this Regulation:

- *Senate Handbook: Student Disciplinary Procedures*

- 25.1 Senate exercises a right to penalise a candidate where it can be proven that he or she has attempted to gain an unfair advantage over others in the assessment associated with a programme of study, either by cheating or by plagiarising, with or without the intention to deceive.
- 25.2 Any member of the University has the right to bring forward an allegation of academic misconduct to the attention of the relevant Course Director or Supervisor, or to the relevant Director of Education or Director of Research. If the candidate is not registered for an academic distinction of the University, he or she will nevertheless be considered as such for the purposes of reviewing the allegation.
- 25.3 Where an allegation of academic misconduct against a candidate has been made, Senate defines procedures to investigate any such allegations, which as a minimum include:

(a) Stage 1 investigation (informal investigation and resolution)

- i. The relevant Course Director or Supervisor makes preliminary enquiries into the allegation, and decides whether there is evidence to support the allegation.
- ii. The range of outcomes that may apply are limited to: dismissal of the allegation, or a recommendation to escalate the allegation to a Stage 2 investigation.

(b) Stage 2 investigation (formal investigation and resolution)

- i. The relevant Director of Education or Director of Research receives a body of evidence from the Course Director or Supervisor, and appoints an Academic Conduct Officer, or for complex cases an Academic Conduct Panel made up of at least three persons appointed to the role of academic conduct officer to make detailed enquiries and undertake a full and documented investigation into the allegation.
- ii. The Director of Education or Director of Research receives and reviews a recommendation from the Academic Conduct Officer or Panel, and provides a written statement to the student(s) confirming any penalty that they deem appropriate, up to and including the result of failure of all or part of the programme of study.
- iii. The outcome is reported to the examiners.

(c) Stage 3 investigation (review)

- i. The grounds for review at Stage 3 are limited to:
 - A. that the decision of the Director of Education, Director of Research or Academic Conduct Panel was based on incomplete or inaccurate evidence, to the extent where it is reasonable to conclude that the decision may have been different;
 - B. that the Director of Education, Director of Research or Academic Conduct Panel were prejudiced or biased against the candidate, including any undisclosed conflicts of interest.

- ii. The Academic Registrar may summarily dismiss a Stage 3 investigation if he or she does not believe that sufficient evidence exists to support the stated grounds of review.
- iii. If there are valid grounds for a review, the Academic Registrar refers the case to an Academic Conduct Panel for consideration (consisting of different academic conduct officers to those involved at Stage 2). The investigation includes the review in full of the conduct of the Stage 2 investigation, the original and revised evidence. The outcome is either to dismiss the review or recommend an alternative outcome.
- iv. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor Education or Pro-Vice-Chancellor Research receives and reviews a recommendation from the Academic Panel and provides a written statement to the student(s) confirming any penalty that they deem appropriate, up to and including the result of failure of all or part of the programme of study.
- v. The outcome is reported to the examiners.

(d) External complaint

- i. If the matter is not resolved finally by a Stage 3 investigation, or if the candidate remains dissatisfied with the outcome, he or she may submit a complaint to the external complaints regulator for the UK higher education sector.

25.4 At all internal stages (Stages 1, 2 and 3), all investigating persons abide by general good practice in the conduct of investigations, which include:

- (a) timeliness of the investigation, taking into account the issues under investigation and the need for any persons to prepare appropriately for an interview;
- (b) for the student being investigated, open access to key documents that will influence the final decision, and a right to rebut or dispute such evidence;
- (c) the right of any person being interviewed to be accompanied by a person of his or her choosing, provided that any such accommodation is confirmed in advance of the interview, and that the accompanying person shall not represent the person being interviewed;
- (d) at the resolution of either a Stage 2 or Stage 3 investigation, a full written report is provided to the student under investigation.

25.5 To facilitate the management of allegations of academic misconduct, the Directors of Education and Research are authorised by Senate to appoint one or more members of academic or research staff to act as academic conduct officers in the consideration of cases on their behalf, and to serve on Academic Conduct Panels.

.....
The following documents supplement this Regulation:

- *Senate Handbook: Academic Misconduct*

26.1 Senate, recognises that, from time to time, students may feel dissatisfied with some aspect of their interaction with the University and, in consultation with Council, defines informal and formal processes for students to raise comments, concerns or complaints, and to request an appropriate form of redress.

26.2 Senate defines which procedures apply to various different complaints. Unless specifically excluded or directed to alternative mechanisms of redress, Senate defines procedures for the management of student complaints, which as a minimum include:

(a) Stage 1 investigation (*informal investigation and resolution*)

- i. The student should try to resolve their concern or complaint informally and at the local level in the first instance. It is expected that every reasonable attempt will be made by the student to discuss their concerns or complaints with the person or department whose actions are the cause of his or her dissatisfaction, following published local procedures where they exist.

(b) Stage 2 investigation (*formal investigation and resolution*)

- i. The student submits a formal complaint to the Academic Registrar, who normally communicates the complaint to the relevant Head of School or Director of Professional Service Unit (referred to hereafter as the "Lead Investigator"), in a specified format. The Lead Investigator appoints one or more persons (who may include persons involved in the Stage 1 investigation) to make detailed enquiries and undertake a full and documented investigation into the allegation, and ensures all relevant parties are made aware of the formal complaint and its nature.
- ii. The assigned investigator(s) provides a full and complete report to the Lead Investigator, along with recommendations for redress, if appropriate. The report will address all elements of the formal complaint and recommend whether each element should be dismissed or upheld.
- iii. The Lead Investigator confirms the recommendations or otherwise dismisses the complaint, confirming the decision to all parties in writing. He or she will also confirm the decision to the Academic Registrar.

(c) Stage 3 investigation (*review*)

- i. The grounds for review at Stage 3 are limited to:
 - A. that the evidence provided to the Lead Investigator, or to the assigned investigator(s) was incomplete or inaccurate, to the extent where it is reasonable to conclude that the outcome may have been substantially different;
 - B. that the investigator(s) had summarily dismissed significant pieces of evidence in coming to his or her or their decision;
 - C. that the investigator(s) had not made clear recommendations on each element of the formal complaint;
 - D. that the investigator(s) were prejudiced or biased against the complainant(s), including any undisclosed conflicts of interest.

- ii. The Academic Registrar may summarily dismiss a Stage 3 investigation if he or she does not believe that sufficient evidence exists to support the stated grounds of review.
- iii. Otherwise, he or she appoints one or members of Senate to investigate the review. The appointed officer(s) reviews in full the conduct of the Stage 2 investigation, the original and revised evidence, and decides whether to dismiss the review or refer the matter back to the relevant Lead Investigator, who authorises a re-investigation of the matter by different persons.
- iv. Any re-investigation is conducted in the same manner as a Stage 2 investigation, save that the recommended outcomes of the re-investigation is considered as final, with no recourse to a second Stage 3 investigation.

(d) External complaint

- i. If the matter is not resolved finally by a Stage 3 investigation, or the complainant remains dissatisfied with the outcome, he or she may submit a complaint to the external complaints regulator for the UK higher education sector.

26.3 At all internal stages (Stages 1, 2 and 3), all investigating persons abide by general good practice in the conduct of investigations, which includes:

- (a) timeliness of the investigation, taking into account the issues under investigation and the need for any persons to prepare appropriately for an interview;
- (b) for the student being investigated, open access to key documents that will influence the final decision, and a right to rebut or dispute such evidence;
- (c) the right of any person being interviewed to be accompanied by a person of his or her choosing, provided that any such accommodation is confirmed in advance of the interview, and that the accompanying person shall not represent the person being interviewed;
- (d) at the resolution of either a Stage 2 or Stage 3 investigation, a full written report is provided to the student under investigation.

.....
The following documents supplement this Regulation:

- *Senate Handbook: Student Complaints*

27 Conferment of awards and graduation

- 27.1 A student is considered to be a graduate of the University once his or her academic distinction has been conferred by a board of examiners (taught awards) or thesis examiners (research awards).
- 27.2 The achievement of an academic distinction is celebrated at a formal ceremony presided over by the Chancellor, or by someone acting on his or her behalf, conducted at a location approved by Senate.
- 27.3 The Chancellor may, on the recommendation of Senate, overturn an authorised decision to confer an award, or revoke an award already made, of any academic distinction of the University if Senate has received evidence to warrant such a decision, on the basis of either failure in the processes of assessment of the student, or proven fraud or cheating, or other good reasons. This authority cannot be delegated. No revocation is made until after the student has been informed and given a reasonable opportunity to present his or her case, if relevant. This excludes circumstances whereby a student voluntarily relinquishes his or her award through transferring the associated learning credits of an award to a different award of the University.
- 27.4 Senate approves the formal academic dress for all academic distinctions of the University. In articulating these specifications:
- (a) unless otherwise specified, “silk” includes ottoman silk or silk substitute,
 - (b) the following colours are British Colour Council reference Codes (BCC):

royal blue	royal blue BCC 197
neuron rose	neuron rose BCC 35
spectrum green	spectrum green BCC 100
guardsman red	guardsman red BCC 126
 - (c) all other colours are specified at the Secretary’s discretion.
- 27.5 The academic dress of the Chancellor is a robe of blue ottoman silk, old gold velvet collar, facing and collar trimmed with gold lace, four gold lace flashes at the bottom of each sleeve; blue velvet bonnet with red feather.
- 27.6 The academic dress of the Pro-Chancellor is a robe of blue ottoman silk, facing trimmed with gold lace, three gold lace flashes on the bottom of each sleeve; blue velvet bonnet with gold cord and tassel.
- 27.7 The academic dress of the Vice-Chancellor is a robe of blue ottoman silk, blue velvet collar, facing trimmed with gold lace and two gold lace flashes on each sleeve; blue velvet bonnet with gold cord and tassel.
- 27.8 The academic dress of the Pro-Vice-Chancellors is a robe of blue ottoman silk, blue velvet collar, facing trimmed with gold lace; blue velvet bonnet with gold cord and tassel.
- 27.9 The academic dress of the graduates of the University being Doctors of Science is a gown of neuron rose superfine cloth with facing and sleeves lined with royal blue silk; a hood, full shape, of neuron rose superfine cloth lined with royal blue silk; black velvet bonnet with gold cord and tassel.

- 27.10 The academic dress of the graduates of the University being Doctors other than Doctors of Science is a black gown with long sleeves shaped on the bottom (Cambridge style), inverted 'T' arm opening and old gold cord and button on yoke, faced with 4 inches of neyron rose superfine cloth; a hood, simple shape, of old gold cord lined with neyron rose superfine cloth, with neckband of old gold; black velvet bonnet with gold cord and tassel.
- 27.11 The academic dress of the graduates of the University being Masters is a black gown with long sleeves shaped on the bottom (Cambridge style), inverted 'T' arm opening and old gold cord and button on yoke; a hood, simple shape, of old gold cord lined with royal blue, with neckband of old gold; a black cloth mortar board with a black tassel.
- 27.12 The academic dress of the graduates of the University awarded Postgraduate Diplomas, Postgraduate Certificates or Postgraduate Awards is a black gown with long sleeves shaped on the bottom (Cambridge style), inverted 'T' arm opening and old gold cord and button on yoke; a hood, simple shape, of old gold cord outer and lining, with the cowl edge faced inside with 75 mm royal blue, with a 25 mm old gold ribbon placed in the centre; a black cloth mortar board with a black tassel.
- 27.13 The academic dress of the graduates of the University conferred with a Certificate of Membership of Cranfield University is a black gown with pointed sleeves (Oxford style). No hood is worn: a black cloth mortar board with a black tassel.
- 27.14 The academic dress of the graduates of the University awarded the Fellowship of Manufacturing Certificates is a black gown with long sleeves shaped on the bottom (Cambridge style), inverted 'T' arm opening and old gold cord and button on yoke of black Russell cord with long square-ended sleeves, inverted 'T' arm opening, old gold cord and button on yoke; a hood, simple shape, of old gold cord outer and lining, with the cowl edge faced inside with 75 mm royal blue and 25mm old gold; a black cloth mortar board with a black tassel.
- 27.15 The academic dress of the graduates of the University being Bachelors is a black gown with pointed sleeves (Oxford style); a hood of simple shape, of old gold lined throughout of either spectrum green (Faculty of Agricultural Engineering, Food Production and Rural Land Use) or guardsman red (Faculty of Military Science, Technology and Management); a black cloth mortar board with a black tassel.
-

The following documents supplement this Regulation:

- *Senate Handbook: Rescinding Awards*

3 ACADEMIC PROVISION OF THE UNIVERSITY

31 Academic governance structures

- 31.1 For each School of the University, and on the recommendation of at least two Pro-Vice-Chancellors, Senate appoints Directors of Education and Directors of Research.
- 31.2 Directors of Education are appointed to manage the provision of a School relating to taught programmes of study. They are authorised, on behalf of Senate, subject to Regulations and other guidance issued on behalf of Senate to:
- (a) provide input to the University's Learning and Teaching Strategy, working with the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education), and to implement that strategy within his or her own School;
 - (b) monitor and enhance the quality of the learning, teaching and assessment, disseminating best practice, and developing and promoting innovative androgogic practices;
 - (c) assess the sustainability of the education capabilities and practices within the School and to work with the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (School) to ensure they are strong;
 - (d) assure the delivery of all learning, teaching and assessment, including the appointment of examiners, markers and invigilators;
 - (e) engage with Senate over the development of its Regulations and other guidance;
 - (f) raise with Senate any issues or concerns relating to the provision of the School's taught programmes of study;
 - (g) review the overall progress of students on taught programmes of study, in conjunction with the Academic Registrar;
 - (h) undertake other roles and duties assigned to the post either by Senate or by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (School).
- 31.3 A Director of Education manages the above roles and duties directly, or through delegation, or through committees, boards and other groups, as agreed and approved by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (School) from time to time. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (School) is entitled to define for such groups their membership, remit and powers, and duration.
- 31.4 Directors of Research are appointed to manage the provision of a School relating to research activity and programmes of supervised research. They are authorised, on behalf of Senate, subject to Regulations and other guidance issued on behalf of Senate to:
- (a) provide input to the University's Research Strategy, working with the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research), and to implement that strategy within his or her own School;
 - (b) monitor and enhance the quality of the research supervision and assessment, disseminating best practice, and developing and promoting innovative androgogic practices;
 - (c) assess the sustainability of the research capabilities and practices within the School and to work with the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (School) to ensure they are strong;
 - (d) appoint the examiners for individual research students of the School;

- (e) lead the activities of relevant doctoral training centres, and to ensure the achievement of an excellent research environment;
- (f) engage with Senate over the development of its Regulations and other guidance;
- (g) raise with Senate any issues or concerns relating to the provision of the School's programmes of supervised research;
- (h) review the overall progress of research students, in conjunction with the Academic Registrar;
- (i) undertake other roles and duties assigned to the post either by Senate or by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (School).

31.5 A Director of Research manages the above roles and duties directly, or through delegation, or through committees, boards and other groups, as agreed and approved by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (School) from time to time. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (School) is entitled to define for such groups their membership, remit and powers, and duration.

32 Academic distinctions awarded by the University

32.1 Unless agreed otherwise by Council, all academic distinctions awarded by the University shall be conferred solely by the University, which shall retain all responsibilities for the quality and integrity of the distinctions and the corresponding programmes of study.

32.2 Senate approves the academic distinctions awarded by the University, and whether those distinctions are the outcome of the submission of an acceptable portfolio of work or publications (P), the successful completion of a programme of supervised research (R), the successful completion of a postgraduate taught programme of study (T) or the successful completion of an undergraduate programme of study (U). Awards designated R or T require the candidate to have been registered with the University.

32.3 The current academic distinctions of the University are:

MBA	The Degree of Master of Business Administration	T
MDes	The Degree of Master of Design	T
MSc	The Degree of Master of Science	T
PgDip	The Postgraduate Diploma of Cranfield University	T
PgCert	The Postgraduate Certificate of Cranfield University	T
PgAward	The Postgraduate Award of Cranfield University	T
DBA	The Degree of Doctor of Business Administration	R
EngD	The Degree of Doctor of Engineering	R
PhD I	The Degree of Doctor of Philosophy with Integrated Studies	R
PhD	The Degree of Doctor of Philosophy	R
MPhil	The Degree of Master of Philosophy	R
MSc	The Degree of Master of Science (by Research)	R
DSc	The Degree of Doctor of Science	P
PhD	The Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (by portfolio of published works)	P
PgCert	The Professional Postgraduate Certificate of Cranfield University	P
BA	The Degree of Bachelor of Arts	U
BBA	The Degree of Bachelor of Business Administration	U
BEng	The Degree of Bachelor of Engineering	U
BSc	The Degree of Bachelor of Science	U
DipHE	The Diploma of Higher Education	U
CertHE	The Certificate of Higher Education	U

32.4 Conferment of an award through the successful completion of a postgraduate taught programme of study (T) and undergraduate programme of study (U) recognises a candidate's ability to fulfil the defined intended learning outcomes of the taught programme of study as assessed by the examiners and is evidenced by the satisfactory completion of formal examinations, the submission of work to demonstrate the achievement of the intended learning outcomes or a combination of both.

32.5 Conferment of an award through the successful completion of a programme of supervised research (R) recognises a candidate's original contribution of knowledge and his or her ability to conduct research as assessed by the examiners and is evidenced by a thesis or other substantive piece(s) of work. Conferment of doctoral-level awards is evidenced by a substantial and original contribution to knowledge.

32.6 Awards may be conferred based on assessment of an acceptable portfolio of work (P).

- (a) Conferment of the degree of Doctor of Science, DSc a Higher Doctorate, recognises a coherent body of work that demonstrates a sustained, original and substantial contribution to the advancement of knowledge, and which has given the candidate international distinction in their field. This is generally evidenced by a portfolio of high quality publications that provide evidence of the candidate's original and authoritative contribution to knowledge, and an exposition on the work and its value and impact. In general it is anticipated that the majority of the publications will take the form of papers published in peer reviewed journals. For applicants who have extensive industrial experience, where it is not usual to publish their work in journals, other outputs in the form of books, papers in conference proceedings or of patents where the applicant is a named inventor will be considered, with increased weight given to evidence of the standing of the candidate in their field, which may include esteem indicators and testimonials. The assessment process is described in regulation 71.
- (b) Conferment of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (by portfolio of published works) recognises a candidate's original contribution to knowledge in his or her subject as assessed by the examiners and evidenced by work and/or publications of high distinction which have resulted from research or design, development or management studies, which represent a coherent body of work, and that demonstrate a substantial and original contribution to knowledge. The assessment process is described in regulation 72.
- (c) Conferment of the Professional Postgraduate Certificate [PgCert] recognises the completion of a taught program of study in Academic Practice Learning or Teaching and Assessment in Higher Education.

32.7 All programmes of study are delivered and examined in English, unless specifically and exceptionally approved otherwise by Senate prior to the commencement of the registration of the student or students concerned.

32.8 The University has also previously awarded the following academic distinctions:

DM	The Degree of Doctor of Medicine
MA	The Degree of Master of Arts
MDA	The Degree of Master of Defence Administration
MEng	The Degree of Master of Engineering
MTech	The Degree of Master of Technology
MRes	The Degree of Master of Research
CMCU	The Certificate of Membership of Cranfield University

33 Partnerships involving academic provision

- 33.1 Senate defines policies governing all academic provision leading to formal awards of the University that is delivered or supported in partnership with an external organisation (including but not limited to other higher education institutions, research institutes, charities and businesses).
- 33.2 Senate categorises all partnerships involving academic provision as follows:
- (a) Validated external provision, where the academic provision includes one or more programme(s) of study delivered in its entirety by persons who are not permanent members of the University, or by another higher education institution or other partner, and where the student achievement on the programme(s) is “recognised” or validated for credit by Cranfield University.
 - (b) Joint provision, where the academic provision is shared in an established arrangement between the University and another higher education institution or other partner(s) with an established educational record, and where the management of the programme of study may or may not be shared between the University and the other partner(s).
 - (c) Partial award recognition, where the academic provision includes clearly-defined parts of a programme of study delivered by another higher education institution or other partner, and where the student achievement (both marks and credits) on these parts of the programmes is “recognised” by the University.
 - (d) Partner support, where a significant proportion of the academic provision is provided by persons who are not members of the University, and/or where the teaching resources or learning support that is integral to the programme of study is provided by or contracted out to a partner organisation (providing that where the off-campus provision is limited strictly to providing facilities for classroom-based teaching and assessment, the provision is not considered as a “partnership involving academic provision”).
- 33.3 For each of the four categories above, Senate articulates procedures for the approval of partnerships involving academic provision leading to:
- (a) single degrees, where the awards are conferred only by Cranfield University;
 - (b) joint degrees, where a single award is conferred by a consortium of partners, of which Cranfield University is a member;
 - (c) dual degrees, where students may be conferred separate awards from both Cranfield University and an academic partner.
- 33.4 All partnerships involving academic provision are scrutinised by Senate prior to their approval, either before or alongside scrutiny of new programmes of study. Partnerships involving academic provision which is categorised as a “validated external provision” or leads to a joint degree require the prior approval of both Senate and Council.
- 33.5 Senate scrutiny of proposals including partnerships involving academic provision includes:
- (a) assessing the suitability of the partner(s), including sufficient research and other checks to assure Senate of the appropriateness of collaboration with any proposed partner and the quality of any learning and teaching services and facilities to be provided by the partner;

- (b) considering the appropriate level of contractual protection for the University, and for the academic provision, including mechanisms to manage the cessation of the partnership and any current students associated with the partnership at that time;
- (c) reviewing the extent of prior contact and relationship-building with the partner(s);
- (d) assessing the proposed mechanisms for annual and periodic review of the partnership arrangements, and of the associated programmes of study, including when and how partnership agreements will be renewed, extended or ended.

33.6 Where a joint degree arrangement is agreed, this includes the formation of a partnership management board, which will have clearly-defined membership, powers and responsibilities, and which will have links to at least one School of Cranfield University. All partnership management boards report to Senate at least annually.

33.7 Partnership management boards define regulations to govern the management, delivery, assessment and award of such joint degrees, which require the approval of Senate: such regulations take precedence of other Senate Regulations for students registered for the joint degree.

33.8 Senate maintains a register of all academic provision which falls into the categories outlined above.

.....
The following documents supplement this Regulation:

- *Senate Handbook: Partnerships involving academic provision*
- *Register of partnerships involving academic provision*

34 Appointment of staff to manage academic provision

- 34.1 Senate defines criteria for the appointment of persons to positions of responsibility relating to learning, teaching, assessment and student support, in line with the Regulations of the University. The authority to approve such appointments is made by Senate, unless stated otherwise elsewhere in the Regulations.
- 34.2 Heads of Schools appoint any persons they see fit to support the delivery of programmes of study, subject to restrictions outlined in this Regulation and its supplementary guidance. This may include persons not employed on a permanent basis by the University.

Recognised Teachers

- 34.3 Recognised Teachers are entitled to undertake teaching and examining on the same basis as a member of academic staff, subject to supplementary guidance approved by Senate, and providing that:
- (a) a student on a programme of supervised research may not be supervised only by Recognised Teachers;
 - (b) a Recognised Teacher may not be appointed as a Course Director.
- 34.4 Nominations for the status of Recognised Teacher are made by any of the following, who agrees subsequently to sponsor the Recognised Teacher: a Head of School, a Director of Theme, A Director of Education or a Director of Research. Sponsorship includes:
- (a) a commitment to the Recognised Teacher to provide proper induction and support to carry out his or her duties;
 - (b) responsibility for ensuring that the conduct and quality of the activities of the Recognised Teacher are of an appropriate standard.
- 34.5 The status of Recognised Teacher is confirmed by the Academic Registrar on receipt of a valid nomination, is normally conferred for a period of three years, and may be renewed subject to the presentation of a suitable case by a sponsor.

Visiting Professors

- 34.6 The title of Visiting Professor may be conferred by Senate, on the recommendation of a Head of School, upon persons of standing equivalent to that of a Professor of the University.
- 34.7 The role of Visiting Professor carries with it no right to remuneration or to the use of University facilities.

Emeritus Professors

- 34.8 The title of Emeritus Professor may be recommended by a full meeting of Senate to Council and Court, on the presentation of an appropriate case by a Head of School, upon persons of standing outlined in Ordinance 12.4.1.

.....

The following documents supplement this Regulation:

- *Senate Handbook: Positions of responsibility in learning, teaching and assessment*

4 MANAGEMENT OF STUDENTS

41 General definitions

- 41.1 Senate recognises several different categories of “Student”, all of whom who are registered as undertaking a programme of study recognised by the University. These include:
- (a) “Registered taught students”, who are persons registered for a taught programme of study leading directly to the award of a degree or other academic distinction of the University;
 - (b) “Registered research students”, who are persons registered for a programme of supervised research leading directly to the award of a degree or other academic distinction of the University;
 - (c) “Registered non-award-bearing students”, who are persons registered for a non-award-bearing programme of study as part of an apprenticeship course which does not lead to a formal academic distinction of the University.
 - (d) “Associate students”, who are persons registered for a taught programme of study leading to the accumulation of learning credits by an individual;
 - (e) “Visiting students”, who are persons registered for any form of supervised tuition (which may include taught programmes of study and/or programmes of supervised research) which enhances the knowledge, skill or capacity of the student, and which leads or contributes to the award of an academic distinction of another institution or body;
 - (f) persons otherwise recognised by Senate as “Students” and declared to be subject to Regulations.
- 41.2 Any person wishing to be registered as a student of the University applies to the Academic Registrar for admission in the manner prescribed by him or her; and if accepted registers as a student prior to, and as a condition of, undertaking the programme of study concerned.
- 41.3 No person may be registered with the University simultaneously on more than one programme of study without the explicit written permission of the Academic Registrar. A programme of study may, in certain circumstances, lead to more than one academic distinction of the University.
- 41.4 Admission and registration in respect of an externally-validated programme of study is the responsibility of the institution offering the provision, but is subject to any conditions which may be agreed between the University and that institution.
- 41.5 The “registration” of a student is a period of time which includes:
- (a) the normal duration of the relevant programme of study; and
 - (b) any approved periods of extension of the time a student is required to undertake supervised study, in accordance with Regulation 44; and
 - (c) for registered taught students and registered research students, any approved periods of time relating to the deferment of the prescribed date for the presentation, re-presentation or correction of a thesis in accordance with Senate guidelines; and
 - (d) for registered taught students and registered research students, the period of time between the submission of the final piece of work for assessment and receipt of

confirmation of an academic distinction of the University, or confirmation of failure to achieve an academic distinction, under the corresponding regulations and other criteria for the programme of study for which he or she has been registered.

- 41.6 The “period of study” associated with a student’s registration is a period of time which includes only sub-paragraphs (a) and (b) above.

42 Offers of admission

42.1 Acceptance of an application to the Academic Registrar to register as a student for a programme of study is made in the form of an “offer of admission”.

42.2 Such offers are made by the Academic Registrar only if:

- (a) an application for admission has been lodged in the manner prescribed; and
- (b) the offer of admission has been agreed by the Head of School concerned, who confirms that the applicant has been judged by him or her to be qualified appropriately to undertake the course of study proposed; and
- (c) the applicant has provided evidence that he or she possesses an acceptable proficiency in the English language to undertake the proposed course of study, and
- (d) the requisite academic entry qualifications are held, or are required to be obtained as a condition of acceptance; and
- (e) the programme of study to be followed has been approved in accordance with the Regulations; and
- (f) any additional procedures and requirements relating to admission prescribed by the relevant School have been followed or met;

save that:

- i. an offer of admission may be made to an applicant not meeting sub-paragraph (d) above, providing the Academic Registrar has received alternative documentary evidence to demonstrate that the applicant has the ability and experience to replace the requisite academic entry qualifications; and
- ii. sub-paragraphs (c) and (d) above need not apply to associate students; and
- iii. sub-paragraphs (c), (d) and (e) above need not apply to visiting students.

42.3 An offer of admission specifies:

- (a) the particular programme of study to be embarked upon and, where applicable, the academic distinction or distinctions of the University for which the student may in due course become eligible; and
- (b) the start and finish dates of the period of study and (if different) the start and finish dates of the period for which the person may initially or temporarily be registered; and
- (c) the terms and conditions of the offer and subsequent registration, which may include special conditions or dispensations for the individual offer.

42.4 The Academic Registrar may authorise the withdrawal of an offer under the following circumstances:

- (a) if the information and evidence outlined in the application for admission at the point of offer is found to be incorrect or incomplete to the extent that additional or revised information or evidence would have led to a different outcome of judgment; or

- (b) if the Academic Registrar receives information or evidence which confirms that the applicant will be unable to meet any terms and conditions specified in the offer of admission; or
- (c) if the University unexpectedly is unable to offer the specified programme of study within the dates specified in the offer of admission.

.....

The following documents supplement this Regulation:

- *Senate Handbook: Admissions*

43 Initial registration

- 43.1 Registration as a student of the University is accepted on behalf of the University by the Academic Registrar. Where an offer of admission has been made, the Academic Registrar approves a registration only if the student has demonstrated the right and ability to attend the specified location(s) for the programme of study and that the conditions stated in the offer of admission have been met in full, providing that he or she may either amend the conditions of offer and/or register the student temporarily to allow those conditions to be met within a reasonable timescale.
- 43.2 Registration specifies:
- (a) the full name of the student and any contact details required by the University, as defined by the Academic Registrar; and
 - (b) the programme of study to be undertaken and, where applicable, the academic distinction or distinctions of the University for which the student may in due course become eligible; and
 - (c) the School to which the student is assigned; and
 - (d) the date of commencement of the period of registration and the expected end date of the period of registration, based initially on the period of study associated with the programme of study.
- 43.3 Registration by a student signifies that he or she:
- (a) accepts the terms of his or her offer of admission; and
 - (b) will comply with the Laws of the University and such other rules properly issued by or on behalf of the University as may be in force from time to time; and
 - (c) will advise the Academic Registrar of all and any changes to his or her full name and/or contact details held by the University, through procedures and mechanisms outlined by the Academic Registrar; and
 - (d) considers himself or herself fit to undertake the proposed programme of study and will pursue his or her study with due application and diligence; and
 - (e) will advise the Academic Registrar if his or her circumstances change in such a way to affect the ability to continue appropriately and diligently in his or her study; and
 - (f) will submit to medical examination relevant to the undertaking of his or her programme of study if and when required by the University; and
 - (g) will access at regular intervals the email account provided to them by the University and ensure that it remains within its permitted capacity and able to receive mail.
- 43.4 It is also a condition of registration that all tuition fees due at the time of registration shall either have been paid or satisfactory guarantee of payment shall have been given.
- 43.5 Acceptance of registration by the University signifies that, subject to the Laws of the University and to any particular conditions specified, the University undertakes to use all reasonable endeavours to fulfil the offer made for the period of registration and in due course arrange the examination of the student in a way appropriate to the award of the academic distinction of the University specified.

- 43.6 Registration is for the full period of study, except where the course is arranged in stages with students only permitted to proceed to the next stage if academic performance or progress in the previous stage has been deemed satisfactory by the appointed examiners.

44 Changes in registration

44.1 Changes in the details of a student's registration are communicated to the Academic Registrar. These include changes to:

- (a) personal details, including contact details, put forward by the student; and/or
- (b) the programme of study and/or changes to the mode of study and/or the academic distinction or distinctions of the University for which the student may in due course become eligible, put forward by the relevant Course Director(s) or Supervisor(s), with the consent of the student, and subject to the relevant paragraphs below; and/or
- (c) the School to which the student is assigned, put forward by the relevant Course Director(s) or Supervisor(s), with the consent of the student, and subject to the relevant paragraphs below; and/or
- (d) the formal period of registration and/or period of study for the student (including extensions, suspensions and early terminations of registration), put forward by the relevant Course Director(s) or Supervisor(s), with or without the consent of the student, depending on the circumstances and subject to the relevant paragraphs below and other relevant Regulations.

44.2 The Academic Registrar accepts changes to registration only if he or she is satisfied that the proposed changes to registration:

- (a) have the approval of the relevant authorities and, where relevant, the consent of the student; and
- (b) do not contravene the Laws of the University; and
- (c) would result in a new registration that complies with the Laws of the University.

44.3 Any request for a retrospective approval of a change to registration is authorised by the Academic Registrar only with appropriate justification.

44.4 Changes to the elements of a taught programme of study are approved by the Course Director in discussion with the student, but are communicated to the Academic Registrar.

44.5 Changes to the programme of study requiring changes to the intended academic distinctions for which the student may become eligible and/or changes to the mode of study (i.e. full-time to part-time or *vice versa*) are approved by the Academic Registrar following a recommendation from the relevant Course Director(s) or Supervisor(s). The recommendation includes:

- (a) a clear indication of the changes to the programme of study, and other associated changes; and
- (b) a clear indication of any additional fees or fee rebate associated with the changes; and
- (c) a supporting case by the relevant Course Director or Supervisor, which includes an agreed plan of study or research.

Such changes may or may not also include changes to the dates of registration for the student, where the relevant paragraphs below also apply.

- 44.6 Changes to the programme of study requiring an extension to the period of study are approved by the Academic Registrar following a recommendation from the Course Director or Supervisor. The recommendation includes:
- (a) a clear indication of the new end date of the period of study; and
 - (b) a clear indication of the fees that will accompany the extension to the period of study; and
 - (c) an indication of whether or not the extension includes a period of “suspension of study” by the student; and
 - (d) a supporting case by the relevant Course Director or Supervisor, which includes an agreed plan of study or research.
- 44.7 If a request for a change to the programme of study is not agreed, the student retains the right to appeal against this decision through the formal appeals procedure outlined in Regulation 47.

.....

The following documents supplement this Regulation:

- *Senate Handbook: Managing Postgraduate Taught Courses*
- *Senate Handbook: Managing Research Students*
- *Senate Handbook: Managing Undergraduate Courses*
- *Senate Handbook: Changes to Registration*

45.1 Where a student is still within his or her period of study, his or her registration may be suspended by the Academic Registrar, only in one or more of the following circumstances:

- (a) if the student so requests on account of special circumstances, and the Course Director or Supervisor so recommend.

In such cases the period of suspension is for a defined period no greater than one year: the suspension may subsequently be renewed for up to one year at a time, but the overall period of suspension cannot exceed three years in total, unless approved specifically by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) or Pro-Vice Chancellor (Research) on behalf of Senate and only under exceptional circumstances.

- (b) if the Academic Registrar has received evidence that supports the view that the student is absent from the University (including circumstances where a third party has prevented him or her from attending the specified location(s) for the programme of study) or has taken steps to exclude himself or herself from his or her course of study or programme of supervised research.

In such cases the Academic Registrar approves a period of suspension, which cannot last for more than two months, to allow him or her time to establish the status and intentions of the student. At the end of this period, the Academic Registrar may reinstate the student with or without changes to his or her registration, or take steps to put in place an early termination of registration.

- (c) if the Academic Registrar has received evidence that supports the view that the student is likely to endanger the health or safety of themselves or other students or members of the University.

In such cases the Academic Registrar determines an appropriate period of suspension, which normally cannot last for more than one year. He or she may seek the advice of staff of the University and external medical practitioners to determine an appropriate period of suspension. The Academic Registrar may impose certain conditions upon the student, which are (wherever reasonably possible) agreed by the student prior to approval of the suspension of study.

- (d) if a Head of School excludes a student from the University pending the outcome of disciplinary proceedings in accordance with the Laws of the University;

In such cases, the period of suspension is normally the time required to conclude any disciplinary proceedings.

- (e) if a period of suspension is imposed as a penalty resulting from disciplinary proceedings in accordance with the Laws of the University.

In such cases, the period of suspension is the time determined by the relevant Head of School. If the period of suspension exceeds twenty working days, the suspension is not put into effect unless the student has been afforded a full appeal of the decision in accordance with the Laws of the University.

- (f) where ESFA Funding rules dictate that a suspension must be put place.

- 45.2 In all cases, the student is not normally allowed to recommence his or her study unless a plan to return to study has been agreed between the Director of Education or Director of Research and the student, which may include a health and safety risk assessment of the student and a requirement to put in place adjustments (by the University or by the student) to support such a return to study. The Academic Registrar retains the right to authorise a further suspension of study, or an early termination of registration, if such a plan cannot be devised and/or implemented in reasonable timescales.
- 45.3 The period of the student's registration will automatically be extended to account for the period of suspension of study. No additional fees are charged for this adjustment to the period of registration. Access to the University and its facilities may be withdrawn during any period of suspension of study at the discretion of the Academic Registrar.
- 45.4 Where a period of suspension is authorised by the Academic Registrar under Regulation 45.1(b) or 45.1(c) above, the student retains the right to appeal against this decision through the formal appeals procedure outlined in Regulation 47.

.....

The following documents supplement this Regulation:

- *Senate Handbook: Managing Postgraduate Taught Courses*
- *Senate Handbook: Managing Research Students*
- *Senate Handbook: Managing Undergraduate Courses*
- *Senate Handbook: Apprenticeship Students' Handbook*
- *Senate Handbook: Changes to Registration*

46.1 The registration of a student can be terminated prior to its normal expiration date by the Academic Registrar only in one or more of the following circumstances:

- (a) if the student advises the Academic Registrar in writing that he or she wishes to withdraw;
- (b) if the student has received confirmation of an academic distinction of the University relating to his or her registered programme of study, or confirmation of failure to achieve such an academic distinction of the University;
- (c) if registration has been accepted only on a temporary basis, and the Academic Registrar has reasons to conclude that registration on this basis is no longer acceptable;
- (d) if the student is in debt to the University for his or her programme of study, and due warning has been given to the student that his or her registration will be terminated as a result of non-payment;
- (e) if it is found that the information given by the student when seeking admission was false or was incomplete to the extent that admission was obtained under false pretences (including instances where a student has co-registered on more than one programme of study without prior permission from the Academic Registrar);
- (f) if the Academic Registrar has received evidence that supports the view that the student is absent from the University (including circumstances where a third party has prevented him or her from attending the specified location(s) for the programme of study) or has taken steps to exclude himself or herself from his or her programme of study on a permanent basis, without formal confirmation from the student, providing that the University has taken reasonable steps to contact the student through their registered contact details;
- (g) if the Academic Registrar has received evidence that supports the view that the student is likely to endanger the health or safety of themselves or other students or members of the University. Early termination of registration in such circumstances is not put into effect unless the Academic Registrar has carried out a full health and safety risk assessment and has determined that reasonable adjustments (by the University or by the student) cannot be made to ensure that the registration of the student can continue. He or she may seek the advice of staff of the University and external medical practitioners in undertaking this assessment.
- (h) if the student is permanently excluded from the University by resolution of the procedures for disciplining students, after due process in accordance with the Laws of the University;
- (i) if the Academic Registrar has received evidence that supports the view that the student should be permanently excluded on the grounds of failure to maintain satisfactory academic progress or failure to show due diligence in his or her study.
- (j) Where ESFA funding rules dictate that you are no longer eligible to participate in the Apprenticeship programme.

46.2 In all cases, the Academic Registrar should be satisfied that the student has been given adequate warning of the likelihood of his or her exclusion and has been given adequate opportunity to address the circumstances to the satisfaction of the University. He or she sends

notification to the student in writing at his or her last known address that his or her registration is to be terminated.

- 46.3 Where an early termination of registration is authorised by the Academic Registrar under Regulation 46.1(b) above, the student retains the right to appeal against this decision through the formal appeals procedures outlined in Regulation 57 or 66. Where an early termination of registration is authorised by the Academic Registrar under Regulation 46.1(c)-(j) above, the student retains the right to appeal against this decision through the formal appeals procedure outlined in Regulation 47.

.....

The following documents supplement this Regulation:

- *Senate Handbook: Managing Postgraduate Taught Courses*
- *Senate Handbook: Managing Research Students*
- *Senate Handbook: Managing Undergraduate Courses*
- *Senate Handbook: Apprenticeship Students' Handbook*
- *Senate Handbook: Changes to Registration*

47 Appeals against registration decisions

47.1 All changes to registration are implemented with immediate effect: a student may appeal against such decisions within twenty working days of receipt of formal notification of the decision (including decisions where proposed changes to registration are not authorised).

47.2 Senate defines procedures for the appeal against changes to registrations made without the student's explicit consent, which as a minimum include:

(a) Stage 1 investigation (*informal investigation and resolution*)

- i. The grounds for appeal to Stage 1 (and therefore to Stage 2) are limited to:
 - A. that the evidence considered by the person who made the decision was inaccurate or incomplete, to the extent where the changes to registration would have been different;
 - B. that there were administrative errors in the Academic Registrar's processes, to the extent where the changes to registration would have been different;
 - C. that there was prejudice or bias against the candidate by the person who made the decision.
- ii. The person who made the decision normally undertakes a review of the original decision in the light of the new information (except in the case of appeals made under 47.2 (a).i.C above, where the review of the original decision is normally made by the Academic Registrar).
- iii. The appeal is either dismissed or upheld, with a new decision being made. The student retains a right to appeal to Stage 2.

(b) Stage 2 investigation (*formal investigation and resolution*)

- i. The grounds for appeal to Stage 2 are the same as those for Stage 1.
- ii. The student submits a formal appeal to the Academic Registrar, in a specified format. He or she allocates the appeal to a member of staff not involved in the original decision (who may be himself or herself) (the "assigned investigator") to make detailed enquiries and undertake a full and documented investigation into the appeal.
- iii. The assigned investigator provides a full and complete report to the Academic Registrar, along with a recommendation to either uphold the appeal, or dismiss the appeal, with reasons.
- iv. The Academic Registrar confirms the recommendations or otherwise dismisses the complaint, confirming the decision to the student in writing.

(c) Stage 3 investigation (review)

- i. The grounds for review at Stage 3 are limited to:
 - A. that the evidence provided to the assigned investigators was incomplete or inaccurate, to the extent where it is reasonable to conclude that the outcome may have been substantially different;
 - B. that the assigned investigators had summarily dismissed significant pieces of evidence in coming to his or her or their decision;
 - C. that the assigned investigators were prejudiced or biased against the student, including any undisclosed conflicts of interest.
- ii. The Academic Registrar may summarily dismiss a Stage 3 investigation if he or she does not believe that sufficient evidence exists to support the stated grounds of review.
- iii. Otherwise, he or she appoints one or more senior members of the University, from Schools other than the one to which the student is assigned, to investigate the review. The appointed officer(s) reviews in full the conduct of the Stage 2 investigation, the original and revised evidence, and decides whether to dismiss the review or refer the matter back to the Academic Registrar, with a clear reason for overturning any previous decision.
- iv. The Academic Registrar acts upon the decision of the Stage 3 investigation, outlining to the student any consequent changes to registration.

(d) External complaint

- i. If the matter is not resolved finally by a Stage 3 investigation, or the complainant remains dissatisfied with the outcome, he or she may submit a complaint to the external complaints regulator for the UK higher education sector.

47.3 At all internal stages (Stages 1, 2 and 3), all investigating persons abide by general good practice in the conduct of investigations, which includes:

- (a) timeliness of the investigation, taking into account the issues under investigation and the need for any persons to prepare appropriately for an interview;
- (b) for the student being investigated, open access to key documents that will influence the final decision, and a right to rebut or dispute such evidence;
- (c) the right of any person being interviewed to be accompanied by a person of his or her choosing, provided that any such accommodation is confirmed in advance of the interview, and that the accompanying person shall not represent the person being interviewed;
- (d) at the resolution of either a Stage 2 or Stage 3 investigation, a full written report is provided to the student under investigation.

- 47.4 At any stage of the investigation, the Academic Registrar may authorise the temporary suspension of registration, or absence from University premises, if he or she has received evidence that supports the view that the student is likely to endanger the health or safety of themselves or other students or members of the University. Such periods of suspension will be in force until the conclusion of the investigation in full.

.....

The following documents supplement this Regulation:

- *Senate Handbook: Managing Postgraduate Taught Courses*
- *Senate Handbook: Managing Research Students*
- *Senate Handbook: Managing Undergraduate Courses*
- *Senate Handbook: Changes to Registration*

5 POSTGRADUATE TAUGHT PROGRAMMES OF STUDY

51 Programme approval, monitoring and review

51.1 These regulations apply to postgraduate taught programmes of study leading to either the award of learning credits and/or one or more academic distinctions of the University. The relevant academic distinctions include:

- (a) The degree of Master of Business Administration [MBA]
- (b) The degree of Master of Design [MDes]
- (c) The degree of Master of Science [MSc]
- (d) Postgraduate Diploma [PgDip]
- (e) Postgraduate Certificate [PgCert]
- (f) Postgraduate Award [PgAward]

Other academic distinctions of the University relating to postgraduate taught programmes of study are not currently offered by the University.

51.2 The taught programmes of study, their schemes of assessment and the academic distinctions associated with them, are approved by Senate on the recommendation of a sponsoring School (including the relevant Pro-Vice-Chancellor and Director of Education), and conform to the principles outlined in the regulations and in other guidance issued by Senate. The Academic Registrar maintains a full list of current taught programmes of study and the requirements for the award of any associated academic distinctions.

51.3 Once approved, any changes to the taught programmes of study are approved by Senate, which defines appropriate delegation of approval.

51.4 Senate defines mechanisms for the regular monitoring, review and validation of the quality and standards of all taught programmes of study, and, where appropriate, the partnership arrangements involved in the delivery of such programmes.

.....
The following documents supplement this Regulation:

- *Senate Handbook: Setting Up a New Taught Course*
- *Senate Handbook: Managing Postgraduate Taught Courses*
- *Senate Handbook: Senate Reviews*
- *Senate Handbook: Partnerships involving Academic Provision*

52 General requirements

- 52.1 All taught postgraduate programmes of study, including short courses not leading to an academic distinction of the University, shall be described in terms of learning credits, where 1 learning credit is associated with 10 notional learning hours of study. A notional learning hour is defined as the time which it is expected that a diligent student will spend, on average, to study and then complete the work needed to achieve the intended learning outcomes.
- 52.2 Senate defines the standard minimum and maximum durations for all taught programmes of study, including different durations depending on the mode of study.

Intended award	Standard durations of periods of study for taught programmes of study			
	Full-time study		Part-time study	
	Min	Max	Min	Max
MSc	10 months	13 months	13 months	5 years
MDes	10 months	1 year	12 months	5 years
MBA	10 months	1.5 years	18 months	5 years
PgDip	6 months	1 year	10 months	4 years
PgCert	3 months	1 year	6 months	3 years
PgAward	-	-	1 month	12 months

Generally, it is expected that 20 learning credits requires approximately 1 month of full-time study.

- 52.3 Senate approves courses of study leading to academic distinctions of the University within the following expectations:
- (a) Masters awards shall include a minimum of 200 learning credits;
 - (b) Postgraduate Diplomas shall include a minimum of 120 learning credits;
 - (c) Postgraduate Certificates shall include a minimum of 60 learning credits.
 - (d) Postgraduate Awards shall include a minimum of 20 learning credits.
- 52.4 Postgraduate Diplomas and Postgraduate Certificates may be available as both entry (intended) awards and exit awards, where a student has not completed the requirements of a higher award. Postgraduate Awards shall only be available as entry (intended) awards, and not as exit awards from a higher award.

53.1 Each course of study arranged by the University is the overall responsibility of a Director of Education in a named School. Where two or more Schools contribute to a course of study, the Director of Education who assumes overall responsibility exercises this in consultation with the other Directors of Education concerned.

53.2 For each taught programme of study, the Head of School appoints one or more persons to fulfil the role of Course Director, for which the primary responsibilities include:

- (a) maintaining the quality of the academic provision for the taught programme of study and its constituent elements;
- (b) ensuring the taught programme of study is functioning within University- and School-level regulations and policies, relating to admissions, course operation and delivery, assessment arrangements, and student learning support, information and guidance;
- (c) overseeing the overall academic progress of students on the taught programme of study;
- (d) reviewing the development and content of the taught programme of study (and its constituent elements) on a regular basis, including the production of any formal review documentation in line with University procedures;
- (e) attending relevant School committees as required;
- (f) reporting to the Director of Education as required.

The Head of School may assign these duties between different people and/or assign additional duties to the role as he or she deems appropriate for the proper management of the course of study, and takes account of changes of personnel over time.

The appointed Course Director(s) may delegate his or her or their authority to manage these responsibilities, providing that ultimate responsibility for any decisions remains with the Course Director(s).

.....
The following documents supplement this Regulation:

- *Senate Handbook: Positions of responsibility in learning, teaching and assessment*
- *Senate Handbook: Managing Postgraduate Taught Courses*

54 Boards of examiners

54.1 A board of examiners is appointed for each taught programme of study, providing that a single board of examiners can be appointed to manage one or more taught programmes of study. The appointment of individuals to a board of examiners is made by the relevant Director of Education, on behalf of Senate. The Director of Education may suspend or remove an examiner from his or her duties, if he or she becomes incapable of fulfilling his or her role through illness or other circumstances, or if the Director of Education has received evidence to support a charge of conflict of interest, negligence or misconduct.

54.2 Unless explicitly specified otherwise in the University Laws, a board of examiners includes:

- (a) at least one internal examiner; and
- (b) at least one examiner external to and independent of the University.

Internal examiners are those members of the academic staff or Recognised Teachers of the University appointed to the board of examiners by the Director of Education. Appointments are renewed or reviewed on at least an annual basis.

External examiners are persons appointed in line with criteria approved by Senate, which shall take into account national expectations of the role, and the management of potential conflicts of interest and externality. Terms of appointment are made in line with criteria approved by Senate.

54.3 The quorum for a meeting of the board of examiners is the attendance of two thirds of the membership of the board: attendance includes those contributing to the meeting by remote means. External examiners normally attend all meetings of a board of examiners: where this is not possible, he or she is asked to provide comments in advance of the meeting, and is required to approve all decisions made by the board of examiners in his or her absence.

54.4 One of the internal examiners is appointed by the Director of Education to act as Chair. The Chair is responsible for:

- (a) ensuring that all examiners have been provided with sufficient information and support to undertake their duties;
- (b) chairing the meetings of boards of examiners;
- (c) ensuring that moderation of marks has taken place and is fair and transparent; and
- (d) overseeing all academic aspects of the assessment process.

54.5 The Academic Registrar appoints a member of the professional staff to act as Secretary. He or she is responsible for ensuring appropriate communications between the examiners, and between the board of examiners and the Academic Registrar. He or she is also responsible for ensuring that formal records of all meetings and decisions are kept.

54.6 It is the duty of each internal examiner to present to the Chair of the board of examiners any potential conflict of interests in serving on the board. This includes declaring any personal, professional or familial relationship with any of the candidates. The Chair decides whether or not to exclude the examiner concerned from the relevant decision(s).

.....

The following documents supplement this Regulation:

- *Senate Handbook: Positions of responsibility in learning, teaching and assessment*
- *Senate Handbook: Managing Postgraduate Taught Courses*
- *Senate Handbook for External Examiners (Taught Courses)*

55 Conduct of assessment

- 55.1 The assessment prescribed for courses of study leading to distinctions of the University is approved by Senate, which at its discretion delegates such approval to a standing committee of Senate, or to individual Directors of Education.
- 55.2 Each piece of assessment (including examination papers, assignments and other instructions for work submitted for assessment) is the responsibility of a named member of academic staff or Recognised Teacher. He or she is accountable to both the Course Director and the board of examiners for the relevance and accuracy of the instructions to students.
- 55.3 The board of examiners takes into account any Senate policies relating to assessment, and may delegate its authority to manage the assessment or the consideration of individual students, providing that ultimate responsibility for any decisions remains with the board of examiners.

Conduct of written examinations

- 55.4 Written examinations arranged by the University are conducted in accordance with instructions issued by the Academic Registrar, and at the times and places prescribed by him or her.
- 55.5 For each written examination, the relevant Director of Education appoints one or more persons to act as invigilators. The invigilators supervise the candidates and control the conduct of the examination throughout the whole period of the examination, and ensure the maintenance of good order and compliance with the instructions issued by the Academic Registrar.
- 55.6 Each candidate at a written examination arranged by the University must comply with the instructions of the invigilators, who may expel him or her from the examination if he or she fails to do so.
- 55.7 Where a candidate fails to follow the rubric of a written examination, the board of examiners may at its discretion award a mark of zero for the whole examination, or discount one or more answers in order for the examination to be considered valid.

Submission of work for assessment

- 55.8 Candidates submit work for assessment in accordance with instructions provided to them by his or her Course Director in course documentation. Any thesis should comply with the prescribed form for theses issued by the University Librarian, on behalf of Senate. The instructions may include mark penalties for the late or incorrect submission of work. Failure to follow these instructions may result in a mark of zero for the associated piece of work.

Number of occasions of assessment

- 55.9 A candidate who has failed to satisfy the examiners in a written examination or a piece of work submitted for assessment may enter again for that assessment for a further attempt, only on the recommendation of the board of examiners, and in accordance with the pass criteria for the course of study approved by Senate. A second attempt will normally result in a maximum mark of 50%. No more than two attempts may be made in total, unless permitted to do so as the outcome of a formal appeal.
- 55.10 Where a candidate is permitted to undertake a piece of assessment for a second time as a result of an appeal or of exceptional circumstances, he or she may be deemed to be undertaking the assessment as if for the first time, at the discretion of the examiners.

55.11 A candidate who has satisfied the examiners in a written examination or a piece of work submitted for assessment may not enter again for that assessment, unless required to do so as the outcome of a formal appeal.

Anonymity of students

55.12 The Academic Registrar and boards of examiners consider how and when to implement mechanisms to allow for the anonymity of students during the marking process. This anonymity need not extend to consideration of students' overall performance by boards of examiners, although it is open to boards of examiners to approve schemes for extending anonymity if they see fit.

Moderation of assessment marks

55.13 Boards of examiners ensure that all elements of the examination are subject to moderation to ensure that examiners are applying assessment criteria consistently in line with guidance outlined by Senate.

.....
The following documents supplement this Regulation:

- *Senate Handbook: Positions of responsibility in learning, teaching and assessment*
- *Senate Handbook: Managing Postgraduate Taught Courses*
- *Senate Handbook: Assessment Rules (Postgraduate Taught Courses)*

- 56.1 The power of the Senate to authorise the conferment of distinctions of the University in relation to taught programmes of study, is delegated to the board of examiners appointed by the relevant Director of Education. Such conferment must include the accrual of the required number of learning credits and abide by the pass criteria for the course of study approved by Senate, except where specific circumstances have been invoked, as outlined below:

(a) accredited prior learning

This includes circumstances where a candidate has presented evidence to support the approval of accredited prior learning, from previous study either at Cranfield University or another higher education institution.

The Academic Registrar may instruct the board of examiners to approve the recognition of learning credits accrued outside of the period of registration, in accordance with the approved structure of the taught programme of study and with guidance issued by Senate.

(b) exceptional circumstances

This includes circumstances where, as soon as practicable after the assessment concerned, a candidate has presented a written account of circumstances that may have resulted in his or her performance being lower than that of which he would normally be capable or expected by his academic advisers to achieve.

The board of examiners, at its discretion, may choose to permit further opportunities for assessment.

The Director of Education, on the recommendation of the relevant board of examiners, may choose to discount the associated marks for the purpose of determining an overall assessment of the candidate, in accordance with the approved structure of the taught programme of study and with guidance issued by Senate.

(c) in-programme changes to the taught programme of study

This includes circumstances where a candidate has been unable to accrue the required number of learning credits for a particular award as a result of changes to the course of study approved by Senate within his or her period of registration.

The Director of Education may instruct the board of examiners to authorise the award with no fewer than 90% of the required number of credits associated with the award, providing he or she has received evidence to demonstrate that the intended learning outcomes of the course of study have been met in full.

(d) aegrotat degree

This includes circumstances where a candidate has been prevented from completing all or part of the assessment prescribed for his or her course for reasons restricted to serious illness or death, duly certified by a medical practitioner, or other cause deemed sufficient by Senate.

Senate may approve the award of the degree. "Serious illness" is defined as circumstances where there is conclusive evidence that there is no possibility that the candidate will be able to return to study at any future time.

In considering the authorisation of an award under these circumstances, Senate reviews evidence including:

- i. the personal circumstances of the candidate;
- ii. where work has been submitted for assessment, the extent to which the candidate has satisfied the examiners; and
- iii. any recommendation from the relevant Director of Education on whether the candidate, had he or she not been so prevented, would have satisfied the examiners in the assessment of his or her work.

Senate only authorises an aegrotat award where the candidate has completed a significant period of their course of study, which is normally evidenced by work submitted for assessment. Only in very exceptional circumstances is an award made where no work has been submitted for assessment, and only where compelling evidence of the required academic standard has been provided.

Where such an award is considered by Senate due to the death of the candidate, the award is only made on the explicit request of the next of kin of the candidate.

Where such an award is considered by Senate due to any other reason, including illness, the award is only made on the explicit request of the candidate or by his or her next of kin if evidence is presented to suggest that the candidate cannot reasonably submit such a request. If an award is made, the candidate will not be permitted to be considered for the same award on any future occasion.

- 56.2 The board of examiners, at its discretion, may request any candidate either to attend a meeting of the board of examiners for an oral examination or otherwise request further information to be presented, in order to clarify any questions over the quality, origin or completeness of written examination or work submitted for assessment.
- 56.3 The board of examiners comes to an agreement on each candidate presented to it for consideration, and retain records of any deliberations. All decisions of the board of examiners to confer awards are accompanied by the signatures of the Chair of the board of examiners and any external examiners. Boards of examiners choose either to:
- (a) confer a relevant academic distinction on the candidate, in accordance with the structure of the taught programme of study approved by Senate; or
 - (b) fail the candidate; or
 - (c) defer a decision on the outcome of assessment, requiring the candidate to undertake further work to demonstrate that he or she has met the intended learning outcomes of the course; or
 - (d) defer a decision on the basis that insufficient evidence has been provided in order to determine a clear outcome.

Any deferment of a decision shall be in accordance with guidelines approved by Senate.

56.4 In exceptional circumstances, should the board of examiners fail to agree on an outcome for an individual candidate, it may submit a report to the Director of Education (or, where the Director of Education is a member of the board of examiners, to the Head of School). The report provides a summary of the reasons for being unable to agree on an outcome and a recommendation agreed by the majority of the examiners. On receipt of a report, the Director of Education consults with at least two other members of the academic staff of the School who are not members of the board of examiners and either accepts the recommendation of the majority of the examiners, or otherwise refers the case to a newly constituted board of examiners.

56.5 Candidates may exercise a right of appeal in light of procedures outlined by Senate.

Communication of marks and outcomes of boards of examiners

56.6 Where the board of examiners recommends a formal and final outcome (i.e. the conferment of an award or a fail), formal communication of the decisions is made by the Academic Registrar, and includes an overall award outcome and a formal record of student achievement.

56.7 If a candidate is indebted to the University for his or her course of study, the decision of the board of examinations, and any formal confirmation of the result, is withheld by the Academic Registrar until such debts have been cleared. In addition, such candidates are not entitled to graduate, or to have any distinction of the University conferred upon them until all debts relating to the course are discharged.

56.8 Otherwise, Course Directors may provide informal confirmation of results (including provisional marks for assessments taken throughout the period of registration), but these must be communicated as provisional marks (where appropriate) and may not be recognised by the University as the final, official or formal record of the award.

.....
The following documents supplement this Regulation:

- *Senate Handbook: Admissions*
- *Senate Handbook: Managing Postgraduate Taught Courses*

- 57.1 Senate recognises that, from time to time, students may feel dissatisfied with the outcome of their studies, or with the conduct of the examiners in coming to their decisions about the academic standards attained by the student. It therefore defines informal and formal processes for students to appeal against the decisions of examiners, and to request a re-consideration of their academic performance.
- 57.2 Senate defines procedures which apply to students registered on taught programmes of study, which as a minimum include two procedures:

I Claims of exceptional circumstances

A procedure to consider claims by a student that the quality of his or her submitted work and/or examination performance was adversely affected by illness or other factors which he or she was unable or unwilling to declare prior to the assessment date or deadline.

II Claims of assessment irregularity

A procedure to consider claims by a student that the assessment of his or her work was not conducted fairly and/or within the University's published Regulations and other guidance. This procedure must include as a minimum:

(a) Stage 1 investigation (*informal investigation and resolution*)

- i. The grounds for appeal to Stage 1 are limited to:
 - A. that there were administrative errors in one or more parts of the assessment process, to the extent where the assessment outcome would have been different.
 - B. that the assessment of the taught programme of study was not carried out in accordance with the relevant regulations or published programme material.
 - C. that the assessment of the individual candidate was incomplete, resulting in an absence of marks.
 - D. that there was prejudice or bias against the candidate by one or more examiners.
- ii. For registered taught students, appeals can only be made against the decision to award or not award an academic distinction of the University. The appeal is investigated by the board of examiners. Registered taught students may in addition submit an informal (Stage 1) appeal against the assessment of an individual piece of work: such appeals cannot proceed to Stage 2 until a formal decision to award or not award an academic distinction of the University has been made.

For associate students, appeals can only be made against the decision to award or not award the learning credits associated with the registration. The appeal is investigated by the Course Director and ratified by the board of examiners.

- iii. Appeals are submitted formally to the Academic Registrar, who may dismiss summarily a Stage 1 investigation if he or she does not believe that sufficient evidence exists to support the stated grounds of appeal.

- iv. The assigned investigators provide a full and complete report to the Academic Registrar, along with a clear recommendation of whether the appeal is dismissed or fully or partially upheld, along with any proposed amendments to the student record and registration.
- v. The Academic Registrar confirms the decision to the student in writing.

(b) Stage 2 investigation (*formal investigation and resolution*)

- i. The grounds for appeal to Stage 2 are the same as those for Stage 1.
- ii. Appeals are submitted formally to the Academic Registrar, which must also include a commentary on the outcome of the Stage 1 investigation. The Academic Registrar may dismiss summarily a Stage 2 investigation if he or she does not believe that sufficient additional evidence has been provided to support the stated grounds of appeal.
- iii. Otherwise, he or she appoints one or more members of the relevant School not associated with the taught programme of study to investigate the appeal.
- iv. The assigned investigators review the conduct of the Stage 1 investigation, and the original and revised evidence, and decide whether to dismiss the appeal or refer the matter back to the board of examiners. They may also recommend an alternative outcome for the board of examiners to consider.
- v. The assigned investigators provide a full and complete report to the Academic Registrar, along with a clear recommendation of whether the appeal is dismissed or fully or partially upheld, along with any proposed recommendations to the board of examiners.
- vi. The Academic Registrar confirms the decision to the student, and to the board of examiners, in writing.
- vii. Any further review by the board of examiners as a result of a Stage 2 investigation is conducted in the same manner as a Stage 1 investigation, save that the recommended outcomes of the re-investigation are considered as final, with no recourse to a second Stage 2 investigation. The student still has the right to appeal to Stage 3.

(c) Stage 3 investigation (*review*)

- i. The grounds for review at Stage 3 are limited to:
 - A. that the evidence provided to the Stage 2 investigators was incomplete or inaccurate, to the extent where it is reasonable to conclude that the outcome may have been substantially different;
 - B. that the Stage 2 investigators had summarily dismissed significant pieces of evidence in coming to their decision;
 - C. that the Stage 2 investigators had not made clear recommendations on each element of the appeal;
 - D. that the Stage 2 investigators were prejudiced or biased against the student, including any undisclosed conflicts of interest;

- E. that the recommendations from the Stage 2 investigation were not considered appropriately by the board of examiners.
- ii. The Academic Registrar may summarily dismiss a Stage 3 investigation if he or she does not believe that sufficient evidence exists to support the stated grounds of review.
- iii. Otherwise, he or she appoints two or more senior members of the University to investigate the review. The appointed officers review in full the conduct of the Stage 2 investigation, and the original and revised evidence, and decide whether to dismiss the review or uphold the review and direct the board of examiners to come to a new decision.
- iv. If a Stage 3 review is upheld, the board of examiners cannot issue the same outcome as that initially agreed upon.
- v. The assigned investigators provide a full and complete report to the Academic Registrar, along with a clear recommendation of whether the review is dismissed or fully or partially upheld, along with any proposed recommendations to the board of examiners.
- vi. The Academic Registrar confirms the decision to the student, and to the board of examiners, in writing.

(d) External complaint

- i. If the matter is not resolved finally by a Stage 3 investigation, or the student remains dissatisfied with the outcome, he or she may submit a complaint to the external complaints regulator for the UK higher education sector.

57.3 At all internal stages (Stages 1, 2 and 3), all investigating persons abide by general good practice in the conduct of investigations, which includes:

- (a) timeliness of the investigation, taking into account the issues under investigation and the need for any persons to prepare appropriately for an interview;
- (b) for the student being investigated, open access to key documents that will influence the final decision, and a right to rebut or dispute such evidence;
- (c) the right of any person being interviewed to be accompanied by a person of his or her choosing, provided that any such accommodation is confirmed in advance of the interview, and that the accompanying person shall not represent the person being interviewed;
- (d) at the resolution of either a Stage 2 or Stage 3 investigation, a full written report is provided to the student.

.....
The following documents supplement this Regulation:

- *Senate Handbook: Academic Appeals*

6 PROGRAMMES OF SUPERVISED RESEARCH

61 Definitions of programmes of supervised research

- 61.1 These regulations apply to programmes of supervised research leading to one or more academic distinctions of the University. The relevant academic distinctions include:
- (a) The degree of Doctor of Business Administration [DBA]
 - (b) The degree of Doctor of Engineering [EngD]
 - (c) The degree of Doctor of Philosophy with Integrated Studies (PhD I)
 - (d) The degree of Doctor of Philosophy [PhD]
 - (e) The degree of Master of Philosophy [MPhil]
 - (f) The degree of Master of Science [MSc by Research]
- 61.2 Conferment of a Doctoral degree recognises a student's authoritative standing in his or her subject and the ability to conduct future research without supervision, as assessed by the appointed examiners and evidenced by the work submitted for assessment, and which is the result of a programme of research, design, development or management studies, and which contributes significant original knowledge or the application of existing knowledge to new situations.
- 61.3 Conferment of the degrees of Doctor of Business Administration, Doctor of Engineering, Engineering and Doctor of Philosophy with Integrated Studies, in addition to the requirements of 61.2, also recognises the undertaking of a structured programme of learning and/or skills development related to the subject.
- 61.4 Conferment of the degrees of Master of Philosophy recognises a student's significant contribution to knowledge, or the application of existing knowledge to new situations, in his or her subject, as assessed by the appointed examiners and evidenced by the work submitted for assessment, and which is the result of a programme of research, design, development or management studies.
- 61.5 Conferment of the degree of Master of Science by Research recognises a student's ability to conduct research in his or her subject, as assessed by the appointed examiners and evidenced by the work submitted for assessment, and which is the result of a structured programme of research methods, design, development or management studies.

62 General requirements

- 62.1 Where programmes of supervised research include structured elements of taught provision, the curricula of such elements are approved by the Director of Research in the School to which the student is assigned and conform to the principles outlined in the regulations and in other guidance issued by Senate.
- 62.2 Senate defines mechanisms for the regular monitoring, review and validation of the quality and standards of research student support provision, and where appropriate the partnership arrangements involved in the delivery of such programmes.
- 62.3 Senate defines the expected minimum and maximum durations for all programmes of supervised research, including different durations depending on the mode of study.

Intended award	Standard durations of periods of study for research programmes of study			
	Full-time study		Part-time study	
	Min	Max	Min	Max
MSc by Research	1 year	1 year	2 years	2 years
MPhil	1 year	2 years	2 years	4 years
PhD	1 year	3 years	2 years	6 years
EngD/PhD I	1 year	4 years	2 years	8 years
Exec DBA	-	-	1 year	4 years

- 62.4 No student is registered for a period of study of more than eight years, unless exceptional permission is granted by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) on behalf of Senate. Senate outlines standard periods of study for students, depending on the intended award and mode of study. The period of study for each individual student is subject to confirmation from the Academic Registrar, including the period of study agreed at the point of initial registration and any further periods approved after that date.

.....

The following documents supplement this Regulation:

- *Senate Handbook: Partnerships involving Academic Provision*
- *Senate Handbook: Senate Reviews*
- *Senate Handbook: Managing Research Students*

63.1 Each programme of supervised research arranged by the University is the overall responsibility of a Director of Research in a named School. Where two or more Schools contribute to a programme of supervised research, the Director of Research who assumes overall responsibility exercises this in consultation with the other Directors of Research concerned.

63.2 For each student undertaking a programme of supervised research, the Head of School appoints:

- (a) one or more persons to fulfil the role of “Supervisor”, for which the primary responsibilities shall include:
 - i. maintaining the quality of the academic supervision for the student and his or her research;
 - ii. ensuring that the research facilities and supervision are appropriate for the conduct of any research by the student;
 - iii. producing any formal review documentation in line with University procedures;
 - iv. ensuring that the student is progressing through his or her research programme, within University- and School-level
 - regulations and policies;
 - review and assessment arrangements; and
 - expectations of appropriate levels of student learning support, information and guidance;
 - v. attending relevant School committees as required;
 - vi. reporting to the Director of Research as required.

Supervisors are either members of academic staff or Recognised Teachers. When two or more Supervisors are appointed, one is identified by the Head of School as the primary Supervisor. Senate issues guidelines to Heads of School outlining standard expectations for the appointment of the Supervisor(s), including the skills and subject knowledge required by those appointed.

- (b) two or more persons to fulfil the role of a “Progress Review Team”, for which the primary responsibilities shall include:
 - i. meeting with the student at regular intervals to review progress through his or her research programme;
 - ii. recommending to the Academic Registrar whether or not the student should remain registered on his or her intended degree, and advising on whether the scheduled registration period remains appropriate;
 - iii. producing any formal review documentation in line with University procedures;
 - iv. attending relevant School committees as required
 - v. reporting to the Director of Research and Academic Registrar as required.

All members of the progress Review Team are normally independent of the student’s day-to-day management.

- (c) one or more persons to fulfil the role of “Pastoral Adviser”, for which the primary responsibility is providing advice and support on matters not directly related to the programme of supervised research.

Advisers are appropriately-qualified members of staff.

- 63.3 For all of these roles, the Head of School may assign these responsibilities and duties between different people and/or assign additional responsibilities and duties to the roles as he or she deems appropriate for the proper management of the programme of supervised research, and takes account of changes of personnel over time.
- 63.4 Senate also defines minimum person specifications for Supervisors and other positions of responsibility relating to the delivery or management of programmes of supervised research.
- 63.5 Progress Review Teams meet in accordance with the timetables outlined by Senate, and determine student progress in line with guidance provided by Senate. They are entitled to receive and ask for evidence from the student, from the Supervisor and from other persons providing learning support to the student to determine whether or not the student is making appropriate academic progress. Progress Review Teams report to the Academic Registrar and Director of Research on the progress of individual students and recommend corresponding changes to registration.
- 63.6 A student is required to submit his or her work for assessment (normally in the form of a thesis) no later than the last date of his or her period of study. Where a student has completed his or her research (including experimental work) and requires limited access to University facilities, he or she can apply in advance of this date to the Academic Registrar for an extension to the date of submission for a period not exceeding twelve months. The Academic Registrar may decline such a request for good reasons: the student retains the right to appeal against this decision (through the formal appeals procedure outlined in Regulation 47). Any student who has not submitted his or her work by the agreed date of submission forfeits his or her right to examination.

.....

The following documents supplement this Regulation:

- *Senate Handbook: Positions of responsibility in learning, teaching and assessment*
- *Senate Handbook: Managing Research Students*
- *Senate Handbook: Research Students’ Handbook*

Examiners

- 64.1 Examiners are appointed on an individual candidate basis by the relevant Director of Research, on the recommendation of the Supervisor(s) and on behalf of Senate. The Director of Research may suspend or remove an examiner from his or her duties, if he or she becomes incapable of fulfilling his or her role through illness or other circumstances, or if the Director of Research has received evidence to support a charge of either conflict of interest, negligence or misconduct.
- 64.2 The examiners are appointed for each individual candidate and include:
- (a) at least one internal examiner; and
 - (b) at least one examiner external to and independent of the University;

Internal examiners are members of the academic staff or Recognised Teachers of the University. No Supervisor or Progress Review Team member can be appointed as an examiner for his or her student.

External examiners are persons who are appointed in line with criteria approved by Senate, which shall take into account national expectations of the role, and the management of potential conflicts of interest and externality. Terms of appointment are made in line with criteria approved by Senate from time to time.

At least one examiner is qualified to the level of degree for which the candidate is being examined.

- 64.3 One of the internal examiners is appointed by the Director of Research to act as Chair. The Chair is responsible for ensuring that all examiners have been provided with sufficient information and support to undertake their duties, for chairing the oral examination, for ensuring the examination is conducted in accordance with Senate guidelines, and for overseeing all academic and administrative aspects of the examination. He or she is also responsible for ensuring that formal records of all meetings and decisions are kept.
- 64.4 It is the duty of each examiner to present to the Director of Research any potential conflict of interests in serving as an examiner. This includes declaring any personal, professional or familial relationship with the candidate.

Conduct of assessment

- 64.5 Candidates submit work for assessment in accordance with instructions provided to them by his or her Supervisor in formal documentation. Any thesis should comply with the prescribed form for theses issued by the University Librarian, on behalf of Senate. On receipt of the work for assessment, the examiners may exceptionally advise the Director of Research that the work should be withdrawn if the quality of the work is deemed at first sight to fall significantly short of the required standard, without proceeding with a formal examination of the candidate: in such circumstances, the Director of Research will review with the candidate whether the work should be retracted, or whether the examination should proceed.

64.6 The examination of the candidate consists wholly or mainly of examination of a submitted thesis or other substantive piece(s) of work, which includes an oral examination of the candidate by the examiners. The oral examination may be waived on the agreement of all examiners in the case of the examination of a re-submitted thesis or other substantive piece(s) of work, and only if the examiners authorise the conferment of the intended award upon the student. Unless directed otherwise by the candidate, the Supervisor(s) may be in attendance for the oral examination.

.....

The following documents supplement this Regulation:

- *Senate Handbook: Positions of responsibility in learning, teaching and assessment*
- *Senate Handbook: Managing Research Students*
- *Senate Handbook: Research Students' Handbook*

65.1 The power of the Senate to authorise the conferment of distinctions of the University in relation to programmes of supervised research, is delegated to the examiners appointed by the relevant Director of Research. Such conferment must make reference to the pass criteria for the programme of supervised research, except where specific circumstances have been invoked, as outlined below:

(a) aegrotat degree

Where a candidate has been prevented from completing a small part of the programme of supervised research for reasons restricted to serious illness or death, duly certified by a medical practitioner, or other cause deemed sufficient by Senate, Senate may approve the award of the degree. "Serious illness" is defined as circumstances where there is conclusive evidence that there is no possibility that the candidate will be able to return to study at any future time.

In considering the authorisation of an award under these circumstances, Senate reviews evidence including:

- i. the personal circumstances of the candidate;
- ii. where work has been submitted for assessment, the extent to which the candidate has satisfied the examiners; and
- iii. any recommendation from the relevant Director of Research on whether the candidate, had he or she not been so prevented, would have satisfied the examiners in the assessment of his or her work.

Senate only authorises an aegrotat award where the candidate has completed a significant period of their course of study, which is normally evidenced by work submitted for assessment. Only in very exceptional circumstances is an award made where no work has been submitted for assessment, and only where compelling evidence of the required academic standard has been provided.

Where such an award is considered by Senate due to the death of the candidate, the award is only made on the explicit request of the next of kin of the candidate.

Where such an award is considered by Senate due to any other reason, including illness, the award is only made on the explicit request of the candidate or by his or her next of kin if evidence is presented to suggest that the candidate cannot reasonably submit such a request. If an award is made, the candidate will not be permitted to be considered for the same award on any future occasion.

65.2 The examiners reach an agreement on the candidate, and retain records of their individual views. All joint decisions of the examiners to confer awards are accompanied by the signatures of all the examiners.

65.3 For candidates of Doctoral degrees, the examiners choose either to:

- (a) confer the Doctoral academic distinction on the candidate, with or without a requirement to make amendments to the thesis or other work submitted for assessment to the satisfaction of the examiners; or
- (b) confer a Masters academic distinction on the candidate, with or without a requirement to make amendments to the thesis or other work submitted for assessment to the satisfaction of the examiners; or

- (c) fail the candidate; or
- (d) defer a decision on the outcome of assessment, requiring the candidate to undertake further work to demonstrate that he or she has met the required academic standard for the intended award.

Any requirement to make amendments, award of Masters distinction or deferment of a decision shall be in accordance with guidelines approved by Senate.

65.4 For candidates of Masters degrees, the examiners choose either to:

- (a) confer the Masters academic distinction on the candidate, with or without a requirement to make amendments to the thesis or other work submitted for assessment to the satisfaction of the examiners; or
- (b) fail the candidate; or
- (c) defer a decision on the outcome of assessment, requiring the candidate to undertake further work to demonstrate that he or she has met the required academic standard for the intended award.

Any requirement to make amendments or deferment of a decision shall be in accordance with guidelines approved by Senate.

65.5 In exceptional circumstances, should the examiners fail to agree on an outcome, they may submit a report to the Director of Research (or, where the Director of Research is an examiner, to the Head of School). The report provides a summary of the reasons for being unable to agree on an outcome and, if one exists, a recommendation agreed by the majority of the examiners. On receipt of a report, the Director of Research consults with at least two other members of academic staff of the School who are not examiners for the research student and either accepts the recommendation of the majority of the examiners, or otherwise refers the case to a newly constituted team of examiners.

65.6 Candidates may exercise a right of appeal in light of procedures outlined by Senate.

Communication of the outcome of the examination

65.7 Where the examiners recommend a formal and final outcome (i.e. the conferment of an award or a fail), formal communication of the decision is made by the Academic Registrar.

65.8 If a candidate is indebted to the University for his or her programme of supervised research, the decision of the examiners, and any formal confirmation of the result, is withheld by the Academic Registrar until such debts have been cleared. In addition, such candidates are not entitled to graduate, or to have any distinction of the University conferred upon them until all debts relating to the course are discharged.

65.9 Supervisors may provide informal confirmation of the result, but these must be communicated as provisional and may not be recognised by the University as the final, official or formal record of the award.

.....

The following documents supplement this Regulation:

- *Senate Handbook: Managing Research Students*
- *Senate Handbook: Research Students' Handbook*

66.1 Senate recognises that students may feel dissatisfied with the outcome of their studies, or with the conduct of the examiners in coming to their decisions about the academic standards attained by the student. It therefore defines informal and formal processes for students to appeal against the decisions of examiners, and to request a re-consideration of their academic performance.

66.2 Senate defines procedures which apply to students registered on programmes of supervised research, which as a minimum include:

(a) Stage 1 investigation (*informal investigation and resolution*)

- i. The grounds for appeal to Stage 1 are limited to:
 - A. that the quality of submitted work and/or examination performance was adversely affected by illness or other factors which the student was unable or unwilling to provide to the examiners at the appropriate time.
 - B. that there were administrative errors in one or more parts of the assessment process, to the extent where the assessment outcome would have been different.
 - C. that the assessment of the programme of supervised research was not carried out in accordance with the relevant regulations or published programme material.
 - D. that the assessment of the candidate was incomplete.
 - E. that there was prejudice or bias against the candidate by one or more examiners.
- ii. Appeals can only be made against the decision to award or not award an academic distinction of the University. The appeal is investigated by the examiners, except for appeals citing ground E, which shall be investigated by the Director of Research.
- iii. Appeals are submitted formally to the Academic Registrar, who may dismiss summarily a Stage 1 investigation if he or she does not believe that sufficient evidence exists to support the stated grounds of appeal.
- iv. The assigned investigators provide a full and complete report to the Academic Registrar, along with a clear recommendation of whether the appeal is dismissed or fully or partially upheld, along with any proposed amendments to the student record and registration.
- v. The Academic Registrar confirms the decision to the student in writing.

(b) Stage 2 investigation (formal investigation and resolution)

- i. The grounds for appeal to Stage 2 are the same as those for Stage 1.
- ii. Appeals are submitted formally to the Academic Registrar, which must also include a commentary on the outcome of the Stage 1 investigation. The Academic Registrar may dismiss summarily a Stage 2 investigation if he or she does not believe that sufficient additional evidence has been provided to support the stated grounds of appeal.
- iii. Otherwise, he or she appoints one or more members of the relevant School not associated with the student's previous supervision or examination to investigate the appeal.
- iv. The assigned investigators review the conduct of the Stage 1 investigation, and the original and revised evidence, and decide whether to dismiss the appeal or refer the matter back to the examiners, or in the case of appeals citing grounds E, to the Director of Research. They may also recommend an alternative outcome for the examiners or Director of Research to consider, including whether to appoint a new team of examiners.
- v. The assigned investigators provide a full and complete report to the Academic Registrar, along with a clear recommendation of whether the appeal is dismissed or fully or partially upheld, along with any proposed recommendations to the examiners.
- vi. The Academic Registrar confirms the decision to the student, and to the examiners, in writing.
- vii. Any further review by the examiners as a result of a Stage 2 investigation is conducted in the same manner as a Stage 1 investigation, save that the recommended outcomes of the re-investigation are considered as final, with no recourse to a second Stage 2 investigation. The student still has the right to appeal to Stage 3.

(c) Stage 3 investigation (review)

- i. The grounds for review at Stage 3 are limited to:
 - A. that the evidence provided to the Stage 2 investigators was incomplete or inaccurate, to the extent where it is reasonable to conclude that the outcome may have been substantially different;
 - B. that the Stage 2 investigators had summarily dismissed significant pieces of evidence in coming to their decision;
 - C. that the Stage 2 investigators had not made clear recommendations on each element of the appeal;
 - D. that the Stage 2 investigators were prejudiced or biased against the student, including any undisclosed conflicts of interest;
 - E. that the recommendations from the Stage 2 investigation were not considered appropriately by the examiners.

- ii. The Academic Registrar may summarily dismiss a Stage 3 investigation if he or she does not believe that sufficient evidence exists to support the stated grounds of review.
- iii. Otherwise, he or she appoints two or more senior members of the University to investigate the review. The appointed officers review in full the conduct of the Stage 2 investigation, and the original and revised evidence, and decide whether to dismiss the review or uphold the review and direct the board of examiners to come to a new decision.
- iv. If a Stage 3 review is upheld, the examiners cannot issue the same outcome as that initially agreed upon. It may be open to the Director of Research to appoint a new team of examiners.
- v. The assigned investigators provide a full and complete report to the Academic Registrar, along with a clear recommendation of whether the review is dismissed or fully or partially upheld, along with any proposed recommendations to the board of examiners.
- vi. The Academic Registrar confirms the decision to the student, and to the board of examiners, in writing.

(d) External complaint

- i. If the matter is not resolved finally by a Stage 3 investigation, or the student remains dissatisfied with the outcome, he or she may submit a complaint to the external complaints regulator for the UK higher education sector.

66.3 At all internal stages (Stages 1, 2 and 3), all investigating persons abide by general good practice in the conduct of investigations, which includes:

- (a) timeliness of the investigation, taking into account the issues under investigation and the need for any persons to prepare appropriately for an interview;
- (b) for the student being investigated, open access to key documents that will influence the final decision, and a right to rebut or dispute such evidence;
- (c) the right of any person being interviewed to be accompanied by a person of his or her choosing, provided that any such accommodation is confirmed in advance of the interview, and that the accompanying person shall not represent the person being interviewed;
- (d) at the resolution of either a Stage 2 or Stage 3 investigation, a full written report is provided to the student.

.....
The following documents supplement this Regulation:

- *Senate Handbook: Academic Appeals*

- 67.1 A member of the academic or professional staff of the University, or an equivalent member of the staff of an associated institution approved by the Senate for this purpose, may apply to the Academic Registrar to register as a “staff candidate” to pursue a specified programme of supervised research leading to the degree of PhD or of MPhil.
- 67.2 Application for registration as a staff candidate is made in the manner outlined by the Academic Registrar. Any application must include:
- (a) the degree being sought;
 - (b) a research topic proposal;
 - (c) confirmation that the research undertaken is permitted to be submitted for a degree, if the research is funded by an external body or partner;
 - (d) an outline of any research conducted prior to the application which is intended to be submitted as part of the degree.
- 67.3 Initial and continued registration as a staff candidate is conditional on:
- (a) the recommendation of a Head of School, who will also undertake to arrange the necessary facilities and supervision;
 - (b) the agreement of the staff candidate’s line manager;
 - (c) the approval of the Director of Research;
 - (d) the possession of the required entry criteria for the programme of supervised research.
- 67.4 The period of registration as a staff candidate is for a maximum period of eight years. If the staff candidate ceases his or her employment with the University, his or her staff candidature may continue for no more than two years after his or her last date of employment.
- 67.5 The regulations and procedures for programmes of supervised research apply to staff candidates except that:
- (a) no first submission of a thesis shall be accepted until the candidate has been registered for at least twelve months.
 - (b) a minimum of two external examiners are appointed;
 - (c) subject to the agreement of the Director of Research in each case, work carried out prior to registration as a staff candidate may count in the assessment for the award of a degree.

7 DEGREES CONFERRED BY SUBMISSION OF A PORTFOLIO OF WORK

71 Degree of Doctor of Science [DSc]

- 71.1 These regulations apply to the award of a degree of Doctor of Science.
- 71.2 A person may be considered as an applicant for the degree of DSc if he or she is:
- (a) a current member of academic or professional staff of the University, who holds a postgraduate qualification;
 - (b) a graduate of the University, who holds a postgraduate qualification, and is of at least three years standing;
 - (c) the holder of a Diploma awarded by the former College of Aeronautics; or
 - (d) any other member of the University, who holds a postgraduate qualification, and is of at least ten years standing.
- 71.3 A preliminary application for consideration for the Degree of DSc is made to the Academic Registrar consisting of a covering statement, CV and publication list. A fee to cover the cost of the preliminary assessment process will be payable.
- 71.4 The Academic Registrar will consult the Director of Research of the school pertinent to the research that is the subject of the application. The Director of Research will select a senior member of academic staff with sufficient knowledge of the subject and together they will review the preliminary case and to determine if there is a prima facie case for the candidate to be invited to proceed to full scrutiny.
- 71.5 If the decision of the Director of Research and selected academic staff is that there is not a prima facie case, the Academic Registrar will communicate the decision to the candidate with a brief rationale. There is no right of appeal against this decision.
- 71.6 Should the outcome of this assessment be that there is a prima facie case, the Academic Registrar will contact the candidate and request the submission of a full application, which should consist of:
- (a) an exposition of up to 10,000 words of the applicant's work and its value and significance overall; and
 - (b) a portfolio of published work, including:
 - i. a complete list of his or her publications; and
 - ii. a list of the published work to be presented for examination; and
 - (c) a list of any other work or indicators of achievement to be presented for examination, which may consist of:
 - i. unpublished work;
 - ii. additional evidence of practical achievements; and
 - (d) the applicant's curriculum vitae; and

(e) a declaration by the applicant specifying:

- i. whether or not any part of the published or unpublished work to be presented has been or is being submitted for any other degree or other academic or professional distinction, and
- ii. the extent of the applicant's contribution to any work published or performed jointly with others.

- 71.7 If an applicant desires consideration to be given to work which is classified under national security regulations he or she may make reference to it in such form as national security regulations may permit.
- 71.8 On receipt of the full application and full examination fee, the relevant Director of Research nominates suitable examiners to Senate for appointment (including at least one internal examiner and two external examiners).
- 71.9 Senate appoints suitable examiners, designating one of the internal examiners to act as the Chair. After appointment, it is the duty of each examiner to present to the Chair any potential conflicts of interest in serving as an examiner. This includes declaring any personal, professional or familial relationship with the applicant. The Chair decides whether or not to exclude the examiner concerned from the examination.
- 71.10 Upon confirmation from the examiners that they are willing to act, the Chair of examiners arranges for the examination to take place. The examiners may require the applicant to provide additional information, or to present himself or herself for oral examination, or both. Where further requirements are proposed, the Chair of examiners ensures that all examiners agree to these further requirements before proceeding. Such requests shall be communicated clearly in writing by the Chair of examiners to the applicant.
- 71.11 The examiners have the authority, on behalf of Senate, to authorise the conferment of the degree of Doctor of Science. In exceptional circumstances, should the examiners fail to agree an outcome, or if one of the examiners fails to return their recommendation, they may submit a report to the Director of Research (or, where the Director of Research is an examiner, the Head of School). The report provides a summary of the reasons for being unable to agree on an outcome and, if one exists, a recommendation agreed by the majority of examiners. On receipt of the report, the Director of Research consults with at least two other academic staff of the School who are not examiners for the DSc candidate and either accepts the recommendation of the majority of the examiners on behalf of Senate, or otherwise recommend a new team of examiners to Senate.
- 71.12 Applicants have the right to appeal against the decision of the examiners, through the academic appeals procedures outlined for students registered on programmes of supervised research.
- 71.13 The University shall at its discretion retain all copies of the work presented for the degree of DSc and lend or grant access to such copies.

72 Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (by portfolio of published works) [PhD]

72.1 These regulations apply to the award of a degree of Doctor of Philosophy, whereby the submission results from a portfolio of published works, instead of the submission of a thesis that is the culmination of a body of supervised research.

72.2 A person may be considered as an applicant for the degree of PhD if he or she is

- (a) a current member of academic or professional staff of the University;
- (b) a current student, providing that the works submitted have been produced during his or her period of registration and relate to the programme of study that they were registered for, and providing that the relevant Director of Research approves of the submission.

Where an applicant submits a portfolio of published works and is currently registered on a programme of study leading to the award of a PhD, the submission may be deemed to replace the requirement of a thesis: a successful examination results in the immediate termination of his or her registration.

72.3 Application for consideration for the Degree of PhD by portfolio of published works is made to the Academic Registrar in a format prescribed by him or her, with the appropriate application fee. The application consists of:

- (a) an exposition of up to 25,000 words of the applicant's work, which includes a summary of why the submitted work forms a coherent body of research; and
- (b) a portfolio of published work, including:
 - i. a minimum of four sole-authored peer-reviewed publications or a number of co-authored peer-reviewed publications demonstrating a comparable contribution, where each publication is accompanied by a statement from the principal author (or all other co-authors if the applicant is the principal author) outlining the contribution of the applicant; and
 - ii. such other material to support an application, including material not peer-reviewed, at the applicant's discretion.
- (c) a declaration by the applicant specifying:
 - i. whether or not any part of the published or unpublished work to be presented has been or is being submitted for any other degree or other academic or professional distinction, and
 - ii. the extent of the applicant's contribution to any work published or performed jointly with others.

72.4 If an applicant desires consideration to be given to work which is classified under national security regulations he or she may make reference to it in such form as national security regulations may permit.

72.5 The Academic Registrar will consult with appropriate Director(s) of Research on whether the application can be accepted. On acceptance, the relevant Director of Research appoints suitable examiners (including at least one internal examiner and two external examiners) on behalf of Senate.

External examiners are persons who are appointed in line with criteria approved by Senate, which shall take into account national expectations of the role, and the management of potential conflicts of interest and externality. Terms of appointment are made in line with criteria approved by Senate.

72.6 The Director of Research designates one of the internal examiners to act as the Chair. After appointment, it is the duty of each examiner to present to the Chair any potential conflicts of interest in serving as an examiner. This includes declaring any personal, professional or familial relationship with the applicant. The Chair decides whether or not to exclude the examiner concerned from the examination.

72.7 Upon confirmation from the examiners that they are willing to act, the Chair of examiners arranges for the examination to take place. The examination consists of the examination of the submitted application and normally includes an oral examination of the applicant by the examiners. The oral examination may be waived on the agreement of all examiners, and only if the examiners authorise the conferment of the intended award upon the student.

The examiners may require the applicant to provide additional information. Where this is the case, the Chair of examiners ensures that all examiners agree before proceeding. Such requests shall be communicated clearly in writing by the Chair of examiners to the applicant.

72.8 The examiners have the authority, on behalf of Senate, to authorise the conferment of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. In exceptional circumstances, should the examiners fail to agree an outcome, they may submit a report to the relevant Director of Research (or, where the Director of Research is an examiner, to the Head of School). The report provides a summary of the reasons for being unable to agree on an outcome and, if one exists, a recommendation agreed by the majority of examiners. On receipt of the report, the Director of Research consults with at least two other academic staff of the School who are not examiners and either accepts the recommendation of the majority of the examiners on behalf of Senate, or otherwise recommend a new team of examiners to Senate.

72.9 Applicants have the right to appeal against the decision of the examiners, through the academic appeals procedures outlined for students registered on programmes of supervised research.

72.10 The University shall at its discretion retain all copies of the work presented for the degree of PhD and lend or grant access to such copies.

73 Professional Postgraduate Certificate [PgCert]

73.1 These regulations apply to the following taught programmes of study leading to either the award of learning credits and/or the award of a Postgraduate Certificate of Cranfield University:

Academic Practice
Learning, Teaching and Assessment in Higher Education

73.2 A person may be considered as an applicant for the Professional Postgraduate Certificate if he or she is:

- (a) a current member of the academic or professional staff of the University, or
- (b) a Recognised Teacher of the University.

73.3 For each approved taught programme of study leading to a Professional Postgraduate Certificate, Senate appoints a member of staff of the University to act as Director of the Postgraduate Certificate. The appointed person shall have the following responsibilities:

- (a) to receive applications for the award of the corresponding professional Postgraduate Certificate;
- (b) to arrange for the assessment of the application by examiners selected from a board of examiners appointed by Senate;
- (c) to communicate any decision of the examiners to the applicant.

73.4 Application for consideration for the Professional Postgraduate Certificate shall be made to the Director under conditions specified in advance by the Director. An application shall include:

- (a) a portfolio of work;
- (b) a declaration specifying that the portfolio is the applicant's own work, except where expressly acknowledged that the work has been undertaken jointly with others, and specifying if any elements have been published previously.

All elements of the application must be submitted in accordance with requirements agreed by Senate, providing that Senate may delegate its authority in this matter to a committee of Senate.

73.5 An application for the Professional Postgraduate Certificate may be submitted at any time, subject to the Director confirming it is in line with the prescribed requirements.

73.6 On receipt of an application, the Director refers it to one or more examiners, selected from a board of examiners appointed by Senate. The Director also specifies to the applicant the timescales under which the examination shall take place.

73.7 The appointed examiner(s) may require an applicant to provide additional material, or to present himself or herself for oral examination, or both. Where further requirements are proposed, the examiners communicate these to the applicant clearly in writing.

73.8 Following examination, the appointed examiner(s) recommend to the board of examiners whether or not an award of Postgraduate Certificate should be made. The board of examiners confirm the recommendation or otherwise refer the application to additional examiners for reconsideration.

73.9 Applicants have the right to appeal against the decision of the board of examiners. An appeal should be made in writing to the Academic Registrar within four weeks of notification of the outcome of the application and will only be considered under one or more of the following grounds:

- (a) there was administrative error in the examination;
- (b) the assessment was not conducted in accordance with these Regulations;
- (c) there was incomplete or inadequate assessment on the part of the examiner(s);
- (d) there was prejudice or bias on the part of one or more examiners.

Appeals on other grounds, including the academic judgement of the examiners, will not be considered.

73.10 On receipt of the appeal, the Academic Registrar may make further enquiries of the applicant in order to determine the legitimacy or standing of the appeal, prior to its formal acceptance. He or she may dismiss the appeal if he or she does not believe that sufficient evidence exists to support the stated grounds of appeal, or is outside the scope of these Regulations. Otherwise, the appeal will be referred to the Chair of the board of examiners for consideration.

73.11 The Chair of the board of examiners, along with one or more other examiner(s), reviews the original decision in light of the applicant's appeal submission. The outcome of this review is either to uphold the original decision or to refer the matter to the board of examiners with a view to repealing the original decision and thus award the Postgraduate Certificate. The Chair of the board of examiners provides a full report of the review to the Academic Registrar.

73.12 The Academic Registrar informs the applicant of the outcome of the appeal, normally within 28 days of receipt of the appeal.

73.13 There is no further right of appeal, but an unsuccessful application will not prejudice any future applications for the professional Postgraduate Certificate.

8 JOINT DEGREE REGULATIONS

81 MSc and EngD in Sustainable Materials and Manufacturing: joint degrees with University of Exeter and University of Warwick

81.1 These regulations apply to the award of the following academic distinctions:

- (a) MSc in Sustainable Materials and Manufacturing
- (b) EngD, for students registered in the Centre for Sustainable Materials and Manufacturing

and are outlined in accordance with Regulations 33.7. The regulations stated below take precedence, where appropriate, over other Senate Regulations and supplementary guidance.

81.2 In these regulations, the term “partner” refers to one or more of Cranfield University, the University of Exeter and the University of Warwick.

Partnership management board

81.3 In accordance with Regulation 33.6, the management of the above degrees is undertaken by a partnership management board, who acts on behalf of Senate in line with these Regulations, and who reports annually to Senate. The partnership management board includes at least one member of Senate, nominated by Senate, and outlines the Regulations and other guidance for the above degrees in formal documentation to registered students.

81.4 Notwithstanding the requirement to abide by Regulation 81, where the Regulations and other guidance issued by the partnership management board relating to the above degrees conflict with other Senate Regulations and other supplementary guidance, the Regulations and guidance issued by the partnership management board takes precedence, providing this is not to the material detriment of the student. Otherwise, all other Senate Regulations and supplementary guidance apply to the provision and to the students registered on it.

Academic governance of the provision

81.5 The partnership management board is authorised, on behalf of Senate, to:

- (a) review the delivery and assessment of all programmes of study associated with the partnership;
- (b) outline the requirements for the award of all programmes of study associated with the partnership, including the work submitted for assessment, the conduct of written assessments, the pass requirements and associated qualitative criteria, and the rules governing meetings of examiners;
- (c) review the academic progress of students on the programmes of study associated with the partnership, including the appropriate management of the conditions of registration;
- (d) monitor and promote the quality of the provision relating to the programmes of study associated with the partnership, and to report to Senate any risks or issues relating to the quality or sustainability of the provision;
- (e) manage the academic integrity of the taught programmes of study associated with the partnership, and proposed new taught programmes of study to Senate;
- (f) engage with Senate over the development of its Regulations and other guidance;

- (g) appoint any persons they see fit to support the delivery and assessment of all programmes of study associated with the partnership;
- (h) to do such other things as the Senate or the Laws of the University shall authorise.

- 81.6 In undertaking these duties, the partnership management board must take account of Senate expectations in these areas, and may develop alternative mechanisms and procedures to those outlined for other academic provision of the University. Senate reserves the right to raise concerns about any alternative mechanisms with the appropriate and equivalent bodies of the other partners.
- 81.7 The partnership management board has the authority to set up sub-committees, standing committees or working groups, and to define for such groups their membership, remit and powers and duration.
- 81.8 The MSc in Sustainable Materials and Manufacturing may be awarded on the basis of 180 learning credits.
- 81.9 For the taught programmes of study, the partnership management board identifies a person from one of the partners to act in the capacity of Course Director: he or she retains the primary responsibilities of that role, as defined in Regulations.

Management of students

- 81.10 Students may be registered on both the MSc and EngD programmes concurrently. Each student is registered at all partner institutions, but is considered to have a primary registration with one partner, hereafter referred to as the “home institution”.
- 81.11 Offers of admission to students with Cranfield University as the home institution are made by the Academic Registrar on the recommendation of the partnership management board, or an authority delegated by that body for that purpose. The entry requirements of Cranfield University, as outlined in Regulation 42.2 may not necessarily need to apply.
- 81.12 An offer of admission may be withdrawn by the Academic Registrar only on the recommendation of the partnership management board, or an authority delegated by that body for that purpose.
- 81.13 Students who register with either the University of Exeter or the University of Warwick as the home institution shall be registered automatically for the relevant academic distinctions at Cranfield University.
- 81.14 Changes in the details of a student’s registration relating to his or her intended award(s) and/or the period or duration of registration (including suspensions or withdrawals of registration) are made by the Academic Registrar on the recommendation of the partnership management board, or an authority delegated by that body for that purpose.

- 81.15 In addition, the Academic Registrar reserves the right to suspend the studies, or put in place the early termination of registration, of a student if he or she has received evidence that supports the view that the student is likely to endanger the health or safety of themselves or other students or members of Cranfield University or the other partners, without reference to, or agreement from, the partnership management board.
- 81.16 The partnership management board defines procedures to determine that a student be permanently excluded on the grounds of failure to maintain satisfactory academic progress or failure to show due diligence in his or her studies. These procedures include a right of appeal for the student. The home institution is responsible for issuing any final decision of the partnership, prior to consideration of an external complaint [Stage 4].

Academic appeals

- 81.17 The partnership management board defines procedures to investigate any academic appeals for any awards associated with the partnership. The home institution is responsible for issuing any final decision of the partnership, prior to consideration of an external complaint [Stage 4].

Student conduct and discipline; academic misconduct and penalties

- 81.18 The partnership management board defines procedures to investigate any allegations of student misconduct, including academic misconduct. The home institution is responsible for issuing any final decision of the partnership, prior to consideration of an external complaint [Stage 4].

Student complaints

- 81.19 The partnership management board defines procedures to investigate any comments, concerns or complaints raised by students. The home institution is responsible for issuing any final decision of the partnership, prior to consideration of an external complaint [Stage 4].

Communication of results

- 81.20 The home institution is responsible for issuing formal awards, marks and other verifications of study on behalf of all partners. Cranfield University may delegate these responsibilities to another of the academic partners, on the agreement of the Academic Registrar.

Conferment of awards and graduation

- 81.21 A student is considered to be a graduate of the University once his or her academic distinction has been conferred by the Chancellor of Cranfield University, or by someone acting on his or her behalf, as well as the corresponding authorities of the partners. The home institution is responsible for ensuring its students are conferred the appropriate academic distinctions. Cranfield University may delegate these responsibilities to another of the academic partners, on the agreement of the Academic Registrar.
- 81.22 A graduate is entitled to wear the academic dress of graduates being Doctors of Engineering, or Masters of Cranfield University as appropriate. He or she is also entitled to wear the academic dress specified by the other partners.

Copyright and intellectual property of student work

81.23 The copyright and other intellectual property rights in relation to theses and other work prepared and submitted by a student as part of his or her programme of study are assigned to the home institution, except where specifically agreed otherwise by the partnership management board in writing. Restrictions on the publication or storage of such works are approved by the partnership management board, or an authority delegated by its for such purposes.

9 UNDERGRADUATE AWARDS

91 Undergraduate awards

- 91.1 The University may offer undergraduate awards upon successful completion of a taught undergraduate programme of study.
- 91.2 These regulations apply to undergraduate students studying for the award of learning credits and/or one or more academic distinctions of the University. The relevant academic distinctions include:
- (a) The degree of Bachelor of Arts [BA]
 - (b) The degree of Bachelor of Business Administration [BBA]
 - (c) The degree of Bachelor of Science [BSc]
 - (d) The degree of Bachelor of Engineering [BEng]
 - (e) The Diploma of Higher Education [DipHE]
 - (f) The Certificate of Higher Education [CertHE]

Other academic distinctions of the University relating to undergraduate awards are not currently offered by the University.

- 91.3 The undergraduate programmes of study, their schemes of assessment and the academic distinctions associated with them, are approved by Senate, and conform to the principles outlined in the regulations and in other guidance issued by Senate. The Academic Registrar maintains a full list of current undergraduate programmes of study and the requirements for the award of any associated academic distinctions.
- 91.4 Once approved, any changes to the undergraduate programmes of study are approved by Senate, which defines appropriate delegation of approval.
- 91.5 Senate defines mechanisms for the regular monitoring, review and validation of the quality and standards of all undergraduate programmes of study, and, where appropriate, the partnership arrangements involved in the delivery of such programmes.

.....

The following documents supplement this Regulation:

- *Senate Handbook: Undergraduate Awards*
- *Senate Handbook: Managing Undergraduate Courses*

92 General requirements of undergraduate awards

- 92.1 All undergraduate awards leading to an academic distinction of the University, shall be described in terms of learning credits, where 1 learning credit is associated with 10 notional learning hours of study. A notional learning hour is defined as the time which it is expected that a diligent student will spend, on average, to study and then complete the work needed to achieve the intended learning outcomes.
- 92.2 Senate approves courses of study leading to undergraduate academic distinctions of the University within the following expectations:
- (a) Bachelors award with honours shall include a minimum of 360 learning credits (120 credits at Level 4, 120 credits at Level 5 and 120 credits at Level 6);
 - (b) Bachelors award without honours shall include a minimum of 300 learning credits (120 credits at Level 4, 120 credits at Level 5 and 60 credits at Level 6);
 - (c) The Diploma of Higher Education shall include a minimum of 240 learning credits (120 credits at Level 4 and 120 credits at Level 5);
 - (d) The Certificate of Higher Education shall include a minimum of 120 learning credits (120 credits at Level 4).
- 92.3 Students studying for an undergraduate award of the University must meet the criteria defined by Senate in order to progress through each level of Undergraduate study.

93 Assessment of undergraduate students

- 93.1 Students will be assessed against the awarding criteria prescribed by Senate in these Regulations and other guidance issued on Senate's behalf.
- 93.2 A candidate studying for an undergraduate award of the University who has failed to satisfy the examiners in a written examination or a piece of work submitted for assessment may enter again for that assessment for a further attempt, only on the recommendation of the board of examiners, and in accordance with the pass criteria for the course of study approved. A second attempt will normally result in a maximum mark of 40%. No more than two attempts may be made in total, unless permitted to do so as the outcome of a formal appeal.
- 93.3 Where a candidate is permitted to undertake a piece of assessment for a second time as a result of an appeal or of exceptional circumstances, he or she may be deemed to be undertaking the assessment as if for the first time, at the discretion of the examiners.
- 93.4 A candidate who has satisfied the examiners in a written examination or a piece of work submitted for assessment may not enter again for that assessment, unless required to do so as the outcome of a formal appeal.

.....

The following documents supplement this Regulation:

- *Senate Handbook: Undergraduate Awards*
- *Senate Handbook: Managing Undergraduate Courses*

94 Undergraduate award criteria

94.1 In order to achieve an undergraduate award of the University, students must have attained the minimum number of learning credits associated with that award, as described by Senate.

94.2 Undergraduate awards are classified according to each student's level of achievement, using a calculation method as described by Senate.

94.3 The classifications offered by the University for Bachelors with honours awards are:

Classification	Classification band	Borderline range
First class honours	70% and above	68-69%
Upper second (2:1)	60-69%	58-59%
Lower second (2:2)	50-59%	48-49%
Third class honours	40-49%	-

94.4 Candidates whose classification score falls within two percent of the band for a first or second class award may be considered by a board of examiners for the higher classification based on a borderline calculation as described by Senate. There is no borderline threshold for a third class award.

94.5 There is no classification offered for non-honours degrees.

94.6 The classifications offered by the University for the degrees of Diploma of Higher Education and Certificate of Higher Education are:

Classification	Classification band
Distinction	70% and above
Merit	60-69%
Pass	40-59%

There is no borderline consideration for the degrees of Diploma of Higher Education and Certificate of Higher Education.

.....
The following documents supplement this Regulation:

- *Senate Handbook: Undergraduate Awards*
- *Senate Handbook: Managing Undergraduate Courses*

95 Maximum periods of registration

95.1 Senate defines maximum periods of registration for students studying towards an undergraduate award of the University.

95.2 No student studying towards an undergraduate award shall exceed the below prescribed periods of registration:

Award	Full-time	Part-time
Honours degree	6 years	12 years
Non-honours degree	5 years	10 years
Diploma of higher education	4 years	8 years
Certificate of higher education	2 years	4 years

95.3 No student studying towards an undergraduate award may be registered for a period of study of more than twelve years, without the approval of Senate.

.....

The following documents supplement this Regulation:

- *Senate Handbook: Undergraduate Awards*
- *Senate Handbook: Managing Undergraduate Courses*

96 Conduct of assessment

- 96.1 The assessment prescribed for courses of study leading to distinctions of the University is approved by Senate, which at its discretion delegates such approval to a standing committee of Senate, or to the Pro-Vice Chancellor (Education).
- 96.2 Each piece of assessment (including examination papers, assignments and other instructions for work submitted for assessment) is the responsibility of a named member of academic staff or Recognised Teacher. He or she is accountable to both the Course Director and the board of examiners for the relevance and accuracy of the instructions to students.
- 96.3 The board of examiners takes into account any Senate policies relating to assessment, and may delegate its authority to manage the assessment or the consideration of individual students, providing that ultimate responsibility for any decisions remains with the board of examiners.

Conduct of written examinations

- 96.4 Written examinations arranged by the University are conducted in accordance with instructions issued by the Academic Registrar, and at the times and places prescribed by him or her.
- 96.5 For each written examination, the Pro-Vice Chancellor (Education) appoints one or more persons to act as invigilators. The invigilators supervise the candidates and control the conduct of the examination throughout the whole period of the examination, and ensure the maintenance of good order and compliance with the instructions issued by the Academic Registrar.
- 96.6 Each candidate at a written examination arranged by the University must comply with the instructions of the invigilators, who may expel him or her from the examination if he or she fails to do so.
- 96.7 Where a candidate fails to follow the rubric of a written examination, the board of examiners may at its discretion award a mark of zero for the whole examination, or discount one or more answers in order for the examination to be considered valid.

Submission of work for assessment

- 96.8 Candidates submit work for assessment in accordance with instructions provided to them by their Course Lead in course documentation. The instructions may include mark penalties for the late or incorrect submission of work. Failure to follow these instructions may result in a mark of zero for the associated piece of work.

Number of occasions of assessment

- 96.9 A candidate who has failed to satisfy the examiners in a written examination or a piece of work submitted for assessment may enter again for that assessment for a further attempt, only on the recommendation of the board of examiners, and in accordance with the pass criteria for the course of study approved by Senate. A second attempt will normally result in a maximum mark of 40%. No more than two attempts may be made in total, unless permitted to do so as the outcome of a formal appeal.
- 96.10 Where a candidate is permitted to undertake a piece of assessment for a second time as a result of an appeal or of exceptional circumstances, he or she may be deemed to be undertaking the assessment as if for the first time, at the discretion of the examiners.

96.11 A candidate who has satisfied the examiners in a written examination or a piece of work submitted for assessment may not enter again for that assessment, unless required to do so as the outcome of a formal appeal.

Anonymity of students

96.12 The Academic Registrar and boards of examiners consider how and when to implement mechanisms to allow for the anonymity of students during the marking process. This anonymity need not extend to consideration of students' overall performance by boards of examiners, although it is open to boards of examiners to approve schemes for extending anonymity if they see fit.

Moderation of assessment marks

96.13 Boards of examiners ensure that all elements of summative assessment are subject to moderation to ensure that examiners are applying assessment criteria consistently in line with guidance outlined by Senate.

.....
The following documents supplement this Regulation:

- *Senate Handbook: Undergraduate Awards*
- *Senate Handbook: Managing Undergraduate Courses*

97 Boards of examiners

97.1 Undergraduate awards shall be conferred through a board of examiners appointed and managed by the University in accordance with these Regulations and guidance issued on behalf of Senate.

97.2 Unless explicitly specified otherwise in the University Laws, a board of examiners includes:

- (a) at least one internal examiner; and
- (b) at least one examiner external to and independent of the University and any validated partner.

Internal examiners are those members of the academic staff or Recognised Teachers of the University appointed to the board of examiners. Appointments are renewed or reviewed on at least an annual basis.

External examiners are persons appointed in line with criteria approved by Senate, which shall take into account national expectations of the role, and the management of potential conflicts of interest and externality. Terms of appointment are made in line with criteria approved by Senate.

97.3 The quorum for a meeting of the board of examiners is the attendance of two thirds of the membership of the board: attendance includes those contributing to the meeting by remote means. External examiners normally attend all meetings of a board of examiners: where this is not possible, he or she is asked to provide comments in advance of the meeting, and is required to approve all decisions made by the board of examiners in his or her absence.

97.4 One of the internal examiners is appointed by the University's Pro-Vice Chancellor (Education) to act as Chair. The Chair is responsible for:

- (a) ensuring that all examiners have been provided with sufficient information and support to undertake their duties;
- (b) chairing the meetings of boards of examiners;
- (c) ensuring that moderation of marks has taken place and is fair and transparent; and
- (d) overseeing all academic aspects of the assessment process.

97.5 The Pro-Vice Chancellor (Education) appoints a member of the professional staff to act as Secretary. He or she is responsible for ensuring appropriate communications between the examiners, and between the board of examiners and the Academic Registrar. He or she is also responsible for ensuring that formal records of all meetings and decisions are kept.

97.6 It is the duty of each internal examiner to present to the Chair of the board of examiners any potential conflict of interests in serving on the board. This includes declaring any personal, professional or familial relationship with any of the candidates. The Chair decides whether or not to exclude the examiner concerned from the relevant decision(s).

.....
The following documents supplement this Regulation:

- *Senate Handbook: Undergraduate Awards*
- *Senate Handbook: Managing Undergraduate Courses*

- 98.1 The power of the Senate to authorise the conferment of distinctions of the University in relation to undergraduate programmes of study, is delegated to the board of examiners appointed by the University's Pro-Vice Chancellor (Education). Such conferment must include the accrual of the required number of learning credits and abide by the pass criteria for the course of study, except where specific circumstances have been invoked, as outlined below:

(a) accredited prior learning

This includes circumstances where a candidate has presented evidence to support the approval of accredited prior learning, from previous study either at Cranfield University or another higher education institution.

The Academic Registrar may instruct the board of examiners to approve the recognition of learning credits accrued outside of the period of registration, in accordance with the approved structure of the taught programme of study and with guidance issued by Senate.

(b) exceptional circumstances

This includes circumstances where, as soon as practicable after the assessment concerned, a candidate has presented a written account of circumstances that may have resulted in his or her performance being lower than that of which he would normally be capable or expected by his academic advisers to achieve.

The board of examiners, at its discretion, may choose to permit further opportunities for assessment.

The Pro-Vice Chancellor (Education), on the recommendation of the relevant board of examiners, may choose to discount the associated marks for the purpose of determining an overall assessment of the candidate, in accordance with the approved structure of the taught programme of study and with guidance issued by Senate.

(c) in-programme changes to the taught programme of study

This includes circumstances where a candidate has been unable to accrue the required number of learning credits for a particular award as a result of changes to the course of study within his or her period of registration.

The Pro-Vice Chancellor (Education) may instruct the board of examiners to authorise the award with no fewer than 90% of the required number of credits associated with the award, providing he or she has received evidence to demonstrate that the intended learning outcomes of the course of study have been met in full.

(d) aegrotat degree

This includes circumstances where a candidate has been prevented from completing all or part of the assessment prescribed for his or her course for reasons restricted to serious illness or death, duly certified by a medical practitioner, or other cause deemed sufficient by Senate.

Senate may approve the award of the degree. "Serious illness" is defined as circumstances where there is conclusive evidence that there is no possibility that the candidate will be able to return to study at any future time.

In considering the authorisation of an award under these circumstances, Senate reviews evidence including:

- i. the personal circumstances of the candidate;
- ii. where work has been submitted for assessment, the extent to which the candidate has satisfied the examiners; and
- iii. any recommendation on whether the candidate, had he or she not been so prevented, would have satisfied the examiners in the assessment of his or her work.

Senate only authorises an aegrotat award where the candidate has completed a significant period of their course of study, which is normally evidenced by work submitted for assessment. Only in very exceptional circumstances is an award made where no work has been submitted for assessment, and only where compelling evidence of the required academic standard has been provided.

Where such an award is considered by Senate due to the death of the candidate, the award is only made on the explicit request of the next of kin of the candidate.

Where such an award is considered by Senate due to any other reason, including illness, the award is only made on the explicit request of the candidate or by his or her next of kin if evidence is presented to suggest that the candidate cannot reasonably submit such a request. If an award is made, the candidate will not be permitted to be considered for the same award on any future occasion.

98.2 The board of examiners, at its discretion, may request any candidate either to attend a meeting of the board of examiners for an oral examination or otherwise request further information to be presented, in order to clarify any questions over the quality, origin or completeness of written examination or work submitted for assessment.

98.3 The board of examiners comes to an agreement on each candidate presented to it for consideration, and retain records of any deliberations. All decisions of the board of examiners to confer awards are accompanied by the signatures of the Chair of the board of examiners and any external examiners. Boards of examiners choose either to:

- (a) confer a relevant academic distinction on the candidate, in accordance with the structure of the taught programme of study approved by Senate; or
- (b) fail the candidate; or
- (c) defer a decision on the outcome of assessment, requiring the candidate to undertake further work to demonstrate that he or she has met the intended learning outcomes of the course; or
- (d) defer a decision on the basis that insufficient evidence has been provided in order to determine a clear outcome.

Any deferment of a decision shall be in accordance with guidelines approved by Senate.

98.4 Where the board of examiners recommends a formal and final outcome (i.e. the conferment of an award or a fail), formal communication of the decisions is made by the Academic Registrar, and includes an overall award outcome and a formal record of student achievement.

- 98.5 If a candidate is indebted to the University or the institution offering the provision for his or her course of study, the decision of the board of examinations, and any formal confirmation of the result, is withheld by the Academic Registrar until such debts have been cleared. In addition, such candidates are not entitled to graduate, or to have any distinction of the University conferred upon them until all debts relating to the course are discharged.
- 98.6 Candidates may exercise a right of appeal in light of procedures outlined by Senate.

.....

The following documents supplement this Regulation:

- *Senate Handbook: Undergraduate Awards*
- *Senate Handbook: Managing Undergraduate Courses*

- 99.1 Senate recognises that, from time to time, students may feel dissatisfied with the outcome of their studies, or with the conduct of the examiners in coming to their decisions about the academic standards attained by the student. It therefore defines informal and formal processes for students to appeal against the decisions of examiners, and to request a re-consideration of their academic performance.
- 99.2 Students studying for an undergraduate award of the University shall make any appeal against the decision to award or not award an academic distinction directly to the University.
- 99.3 Senate defines procedures which apply to students studying for an undergraduate award of the University, which as a minimum include two procedures:

I Claims of exceptional circumstances

A procedure to consider claims by a student that the quality of his or her submitted work and/or examination performance was adversely affected by illness or other factors which he or she was unable or unwilling to declare prior to the assessment date or deadline.

II Claims of assessment irregularity

A procedure to consider claims by a student that the assessment of his or her work was not conducted fairly and/or within the University's published Regulations and other guidance. This procedure must include as a minimum a three stage procedure:

(a) Stage 1 investigation (*informal investigation and resolution*)

- i. The grounds for appeal to Stage 1 are limited to:
 - A. that there were administrative errors in one or more parts of the assessment process, to the extent where the assessment outcome would have been different.
 - B. that the assessment of the taught programme of study was not carried out in accordance with the relevant regulations or published programme material.
 - C. that the assessment of the individual candidate was incomplete, resulting in an absence of marks.
 - D. that there was prejudice or bias against the candidate by one or more examiners.
- ii. For students studying towards an undergraduate award of the University, appeals can only be made against the decision to award or not award an academic distinction of the University. The stage 1 appeal is investigated by the board of examiners. Students studying towards an undergraduate award may in addition submit an informal (Stage 1) appeal against the assessment of an individual piece of work: such appeals cannot proceed to Stage 2 until a formal decision to award or not award an academic distinction of the University has been made.
- iii. Appeals are submitted formally to the Academic Registrar, who may dismiss summarily a Stage 1 investigation if he or she does not believe that sufficient evidence exists to support the stated grounds of appeal.

- iv. The assigned investigators provide a full and complete report to the Academic Registrar, along with a clear recommendation of whether the appeal is dismissed or fully or partially upheld, along with any proposed amendments to the student record and registration.
- v. The Academic Registrar confirms the decision to the student in writing.

(b) Stage 2 investigation (*formal investigation and resolution*)

- i. The grounds for appeal to Stage 2 are the same as those for Stage 1.
- ii. Appeals are submitted formally to the Academic Registrar, which must also include a commentary on the outcome of the Stage 1 investigation. The Academic Registrar may dismiss summarily a Stage 2 investigation if he or she does not believe that sufficient additional evidence has been provided to support the stated grounds of appeal.
- iii. Otherwise, he or she appoints one or more member of the University not associated with the undergraduate provision to investigate the appeal.
- iv. The assigned investigators review the conduct of the Stage 1 investigation, and the original and revised evidence, and decide whether to dismiss the appeal or refer the matter back to the board of examiners. They may also recommend an alternative outcome for the board of examiners to consider.
- v. The assigned investigators provide a full and complete report to the Academic Registrar, along with a clear recommendation of whether the appeal is dismissed or fully or partially upheld, along with any proposed recommendations to the board of examiners.
- vi. The Academic Registrar confirms the decision to the student, and to the board of examiners, in writing.
- vii. Any further review by the board of examiners as a result of a Stage 2 investigation is conducted in the same manner as a Stage 1 investigation, save that the recommended outcomes of the re-investigation are considered as final, with no recourse to a second Stage 2 investigation. The student still has the right to appeal to Stage 3.

(c) Stage 3 investigation (*review*)

- i. The grounds for review at Stage 3 are limited to:
 - A. that the evidence provided to the Stage 2 investigators was incomplete or inaccurate, to the extent where it is reasonable to conclude that the outcome may have been substantially different;
 - B. that the Stage 2 investigators had summarily dismissed significant pieces of evidence in coming to their decision;
 - C. that the Stage 2 investigators had not made clear recommendations on each element of the appeal;
 - D. that the Stage 2 investigators were prejudiced or biased against the student, including any undisclosed conflicts of interest;

- E. that the recommendations from the Stage 2 investigation were not considered appropriately by the board of examiners.
- ii. The Academic Registrar may summarily dismiss a Stage 3 investigation if he or she does not believe that sufficient evidence exists to support the stated grounds of review.
- iii. Otherwise, he or she appoints two or more senior members of the University to investigate the review. The appointed officers review in full the conduct of the Stage 2 investigation, and the original and revised evidence, and decide whether to dismiss the review or uphold the review and direct the board of examiners to come to a new decision.
- iv. If a Stage 3 review is upheld, the board of examiners cannot issue the same outcome as that initially agreed upon.
- v. The assigned investigators provide a full and complete report to the Academic Registrar, along with a clear recommendation of whether the review is dismissed or fully or partially upheld, along with any proposed recommendations to the board of examiners.
- vi. The Academic Registrar confirms the decision to the student, and to the board of examiners, in writing.

(d) External complaint

- i. If the matter is not resolved finally by a Stage 3 investigation, or the student remains dissatisfied with the outcome, he or she may submit a complaint to the external complaints regulator for the UK higher education sector.

99.4 At all internal stages (Stages 1, 2 and 3), all investigating persons abide by general good practice in the conduct of investigations, which includes:

- (a) timeliness of the investigation, taking into account the issues under investigation and the need for any persons to prepare appropriately for an interview;
- (b) for the student being investigated, open access to key documents that will influence the final decision, and a right to rebut or dispute such evidence;
- (c) the right of any person being interviewed to be accompanied by a person of his or her choosing, provided that any such accommodation is confirmed in advance of the interview, and that the accompanying person shall not represent the person being interviewed;
- (d) at the resolution of either a Stage 2 or Stage 3 investigation, a full written report is provided to the student.

.....
The following documents supplement this Regulation:

- *Senate Handbook: Academic Appeals*

<i>Owner</i>	Academic Registrar
<i>Department</i>	Education Services
<i>Implementation date</i>	September 2023
<i>Approval by and date</i>	Senate, September 2023
<i>Version number and date of last review</i>	Version 3.6, March 2023
<i>Next review by</i>	September 2025