

## Amendments to the *Regulations* for 2015/16

This paper lists amendments and additions to the *Regulations* for 2015/16 which were approved by Senate in July 2015.

Senate also approved the proposal to dissolve the *Regulations for Boards of Studies* and *Regulations for Boards of Examiners* and to incorporate them into the new [Code of practice for academic governance](#).

Following the Operational Review there have been a number of changes to professional services structures, staff titles and responsibilities which have been included in the *Regulations* for 2015/16 but are not reported below.

### A1 Regulations for taught programmes

For the 2014/15 academic year, the regulations for the Professional Training Year were included as an annex in the *Regulations for taught programmes*. They were directly incorporated from the old section D of the regulations, without any amendments other than an updating of terminology.

For 2015/16 those elements of the PTY regulations that are regulatory have been incorporated into the main body of the *Regulations for taught programmes* with the remainder that relate to process being put into a new [Code of practice for professional training](#) (much of the content of the current PTY regulations is in fact process rather than regulation). There have been no fundamental changes to principles and practices for 2015/6, although the *Code* will record aspects of activity that currently happen but are not recorded in any University level documentation.

Regulation reference	Amendment/addition	Rationale for amendment/ addition
Table 2	Added Reference to the MBus	New programme
11	Added (in bold) For modules at FHE levels 4,5,6 <b>and at level P</b> the pass mark is 40%	Incorporation of PTY regulations into main body of regulations with some additional text added for clarity
New regulations 13, 14, 15	<b>Professional Training Year</b> All programmes have the option to offer a professional training year (hereafter called Professional Training), unless there are any PSRB requirements which might prohibit this, which is normally taken between FHEQ levels 5 and 6. The Professional Training year can be a paid or unpaid placement and cover a work, research and/or study abroad placement.  The minimum aggregate period of Professional Training shall be 30 weeks, excluding local annual holiday entitlement but including any return period(s) to the University. Whilst on a Professional Training placement, students will be visited by an academic member of staff.	Ditto

	The Professional Training year shall be subject to summative assessment. The range of marks for Professional Training should conform to the normal scale of marks as set out in the <i>Code of practice for assessment and feedback</i> .	
New regulations 16, 17, 18	<p><b>Naming of undergraduate programmes</b> All programme titles should be consistent and clearly convey information about the nature and subject of study.</p> <p>Programmes may combine different subject areas expressed as either an “and” or a “with” combination or a major/minor combination. Some programme may specify a specialist pathway. Programmes designated under the major/minor framework contain specific modules that link the two subject elements.</p> <p>A joint honours programme should have equal weighting attributed to each subject and is expressed as BA/BSc (Hons) in “subject 1” and “subject 2”. A “with” combination and a major/minor programme can vary in how the content is weighted, although the major element of the programme should account for a least 225 credits of the overall credits for the programme (not including P credits) and the “with” or minor element at least 90 credits. The naming convention will operate as BA/BSc (Hons) in “subject 1” with “subject 2”. A programme with a pathway is named by inserting the pathway name in brackets following the generic programme title. In these instances the pathway or specialist content should normally account for at least 90 credits and the title is expressed as BA/BSc (Hons) in “generic title” “(specialist pathway)”.</p>	There was no regulation for undergraduate programmes defining credit requirements for types of programmes – it was found in the <i>Code of practice for the design and approval of programmes</i> whereas there was for taught postgraduate programmes. This is anomalous
Old regulation 32, now 39	<p>New wording ...Students whose studies have been terminated by the University for lack of academic progress and who have taken an intermediate exit award may not return to study on the same programme or one that shares 50% or more of the content of the original programme.</p>	Clarification that of what is defined as “closely similar” in the previous wording
New regulation 38	The title of an exit award should normally be the same as the main award unless there are discipline-specific or PSRB requirements which would make this inappropriate. Titles of exit awards are confirmed at programme validation and listed in the programme specification.	Added for clarity

Old regulation 61, now 68	New wording A student may not simultaneously register for two full-time programmes or a full-time and a part-time programme either at the University, or at the University and another institution, with the following exceptions ..	Amended so that it is clear that a student cannot be registered on two full-time programmes or a full-time and a part-time programme either at Surrey or elsewhere
Old regulation 127, new 134	Credits and marks accrued by an exchange student while studying with another higher education institution are reported to the University by that institution <b>and are appended to the student's transcript.</b>	In practice this does not happen so statement in bold has been deleted
Old regulation 166 now 173	If a student fails to attend an examination they get a mark of zero and are ineligible for compensation. Clarified that this also applies to reassessment.	For clarity
New regulation 186	A student who fails to be awarded P credits for a unit of assessment taken as part of the Professional Training year shall have the right to submit for reassessment on one subsequent occasion within one year of the first attempt, under conditions specified in the student handbook.	Incorporation of PTY regulations into main body of regulations with some additional text added for clarity

<a href="#">A2 Regulations for research degrees</a>		
Regulation reference	Amendment/addition	Rationale for amendment/ addition
n/a	The Practitioner Doctorate regulations have been merged with the PhD/MD regulations	This change was a response to a recommendation at a validation of a new practitioner doctorate and it removed the need for programme regulations
n/a	The provision for Practitioner Doctorate students to substitute a failed module in order to make up the credit for a subsidiary award or progression has been removed	This practice is not supported by the validation procedures, it could result in students not meeting the learning outcomes of a programme and still progressing or receiving an award. Fortunately, this has not been used on any programme and is a vestigial regulation and so can easily be removed.
9	Removed flexibility for students to start at any point	This has a detrimental impact on the student experience because they miss key orientation and induction events

9	Removed the arbitrary start date of the 1 <sup>st</sup> month and changed this to the actual start date	This strange practice has meant that students were losing days of their registration before they started their degree. This does not help with meeting four year submission rate targets
10	Simultaneous registration is prohibited except in two specified cases for all students	Previously this only applied to full-time students and has now been extended to part-time students
11	Subsidiary awards: This section has been re-worded to tie subsidiary awards to credit bearing modules only and to make it clear that subsidiary awards can only be made on the basis of specified modules and approved through the validation process	This ensures that any awards made on the basis of credit bearing modules are conferred in accordance with the <i>Regulations for taught programmes</i>
13	It has been clarified that students who want to transfer from another institution, for example if their supervisor transfers to Surrey, are required to undergo the same admissions procedures as new students	There was uncertainty about the protocols that needed to be followed for students transferring in from another institution. By requiring that they go through the admissions procedures it can be ensured that students meet our requirements and expectations
15	Collaborative arrangements: This section has been re-written to align with the changes in the new <a href="#">Code of practice for the approval and management of collaborative provision</a>	Collaborative arrangements will be covered in the new <i>Code of practice</i> and so do not need to be duplicated in the PGR regulations. The regulations now point to the <i>Code of practice</i> as the place to find current information on the policies and protocols regarding collaborative arrangements for research degrees
39, 41, 91	Supervisor and internal examiner eligibility	Supervisor and internal examiner eligibility have been updated to reflect changes in job roles

40	Removal of 0.5FTE requirement for Principal Supervisors	This was a vestigial regulation which was designed to ensure that supervisors had sufficient time to dedicate to their students. However, requiring a member of staff to be on a 0.5 FTE contract did not achieve this and it is being replaced by more sophisticated models
43 and 44	Collaborative supervision: The circumstances for the appointment of a collaborative supervisor have been clarified along with their eligibility criteria	The regulatory framework around collaborative supervision was quite loose and unclear and these changes have been implemented to provide greater clarity about collaborative supervision.
45	Supervisor sanctions	This has been added in response to direction from the URDC. It ensures that where supervisors are found not to be fulfilling their responsibilities under the <i>Code of practice</i> , action can be taken
46	All students are now required to have a monthly supervision. Previously, part-time students had to meet a minimum of once every two months	Part-time students are more at risk of not making required progress. More frequent meetings allow the supervisors to better monitor the progress of part-time students and ensure they are on track to complete on time
49 -50	Additional information about doctorates with a structured taught element has been added	This was not included in previous versions of the regulations and has been added to describe the different programme structures for the various models of research degree in place
55	The procedures and situations for which a student might apply for extenuating circumstances have been clarified	Students, administrators and EC panels were unclear about how the <i>Regulations for extenuating circumstances</i> apply to research students. In response to this, all requests for the recognition of extenuation

		circumstances will now be considered in accordance with <i>Regulations</i>
58	The requirement for the independent panel member in the case of unsatisfactory academic progress panels to be from the Faculty in which the student is registered has been removed	This creates a wider pool of individuals to serve
63	The deadline for students to undergo the confirmation has been extended for programmes which have a structured taught element	This provides greater flexibility for programmes where students may not start the research in earnest until 13 months into a programme or where students' time is divided between research work and completion of taught components. This ensures that students have sufficient time to prepare for the examination and that the confirmation remains fit-for-purpose for these programmes.
87	External examiners have to be experienced to serve on an examination panel	Previously, an unexperienced external could be accompanied by an experienced external who might not be an expert in the field. This made examination panels unwieldy and added little value
89	External examiners from outside of the EEA will not be appointed	This is due to visa issues and the costs involved in recruiting examiners from outside of the EEA
91	Removed the requirement for an internal examiner to be appointed from within the Faculty in which the student is registered	This provides greater flexibility and allows any academic within the University to serve on an examination panel regardless of Faculty affiliation
101	The University position on supervisor attendance at the viva has been clarified: supervisors will no longer attend the viva voce examination unless the student makes a written case to the Postgraduate Research Director outlining why it is necessary for the supervisor to be there. Supervisor attendance at the viva will become the exception rather than the norm	This change was made in response to external examiner recommendations, a survey of practices in the sector and the involvement of students

102	Removed the provision for the HoD or EDoF to sit in on a viva voce examination	There has never been a need to do this and if there was a concern about an examination then a Chair would be appointed as a member of the panel to ensure its proper and fair conducted
104, 114	The flexibility for examination panels to give more time for the completion of corrections in the case of a recommendation of a lower award has been removed	This provision carried the risk of inequitable treatment of students at the viva
104	There was a clause in the regulations that an outright fail at the first viva, although a legitimate outcome, would be “normally only be applicable following resubmission”. This clause has been removed	The removal of this clause affords examiners complete freedom to choose to fail the thesis at the first attempt if it is fair and proper to do so
112	The deadline for the resubmission of a thesis has been changed from the date of the viva to the date the student is sent the Statement of Requirements	In the interest of fairness, this gives the student the full 12 months in which to complete the resubmission

#### **B1 Regulations for extenuating circumstances**

<b>Regulation reference</b>	<b>Amendment/addition</b>	<b>Rationale for amendment/ addition</b>
Old regulation 3	Incorporated into new regulation 10 (was 12) and added (in bold) When a student knows before a submission or other deadline that an illness, the worsening of a chronic illness, or an otherwise unforeseen event is beginning, or about to begin, and can provide independent <b>medical</b> evidence to substantiate this ...	To remove duplication  For clarity
Old regulation 4	Deleted	To remove duplication
Old regulation 13, now 12	Following sentence deleted Programme handbooks also state the periods by which a specified person or persons may extend a deadline where supporting evidence has been provided and accepted.	This is not practicable to do
New regulation 46	When a Board of Examiners nullifies a unit of assessment due to the recognition of extenuating circumstances affecting that assessment, the student’s marks are voided and the student takes the assessment again as if for the first time, or second time if the attempt was a resit, in the next University appointed assessment or reassessment period. On no account can a student’s marks be increased as a result of the recognition of extenuating circumstances	To improve clarity and following advice from the OIA

New regulation 52	Repeated requests from the same student for the consideration of extenuating circumstances may result in referral of the student to a Fitness to Study Panel	To allow fitness to study procedures to be used in such circumstances
-------------------	--	---

### B2 Regulations for academic integrity

Regulation reference	Amendment/addition	Rationale for amendment/ addition
New regulation 1	These <i>Regulations</i> apply to students on undergraduate and taught postgraduate programmes delivered at the University and by the University's Associated and Accredited Institutions that lead to University of Surrey awards. Postgraduate research students are subject to the provisions of the <i>Code of practice for handling allegations of research misconduct</i>	To take account of the new <i>Code of practice</i>
4	Deleted	This referred to postgraduate research students which are now covered by the <i>Code of practice for handling allegations of research misconduct</i>
19	Added (in bold) Introducing unauthorised textual materials or bringing an unauthorised mechanical or electronic device into an examination room or ancillary area, such as a cloakroom or toilets, constitutes <b>grounds for</b> academic misconduct.	Currently this contradicts para 20 which refers to "possible" academic misconduct. It is for an Academic Misconduct Panel to prove academic misconduct
New regulation 21	Incorporates information on research management misconduct for taught postgraduate students previously contained in the Appendix.	The Appendix has been deleted but this section is still relevant
Old regulation 21, now 22	Reference to OSCAR in relation to dealing with new students has been deleted	OSCAR is not involved in this part of the procedure
Old regulation 33, now 34	Following sentence deleted Where the Student Progression Information record shows that the student is not a newly arrived Foundation Level or FHEQ level 4 student the potential academic misconduct is referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel for hearing.	This sentence is redundant as the section it is in only relates to such students
Old regulation 67, now 68	Added (in bold) At the end of the Academic Misconduct Panel meeting the Chair announces the outcome to the student. Where the finding is that the work includes material that is the product of academic misconduct, the Chair explains the penalty that the Panel will recommend to the relevant Board of Examiners <b>for ratification,</b>	To clarify that a Board of Examiners cannot overturn the outcome of an Academic Integrity Panel but they are the only body that has the authority to agree marks



	and the student's right to appeal.	
Old regulation 68, now 69	Added (in bold) The penalties that an Academic Misconduct Panel may recommend <b>for ratification</b> by a Board of Examiners normally escalate in severity from a first instance of academic misconduct to a third instance.	Ditto
Annex 1 relating to PGR students	Removed and relevant information relating to taught postgraduate programmes incorporated into the main body of the regulations (see new regulation 21)	The new <i>Code of practice for handling allegations of research misconduct</i> covers PGR students

<b>B3 Student disciplinary regulations</b>		
<b>Regulation reference</b>	<b>Amendment/addition</b>	<b>Rationale for amendment/ addition</b>
2	Added For serious and complex cases the initial investigation can also be carried out by the Head of Security. In cases where there would be a conflict of interest for the named Authorised Person to investigate an instance of misconduct, the investigation will normally be carried out by the Head of Security.	To ensure comprehensive coverage and a joined up approach
2(viii)	Added (in bold) Where the misconduct involves the University's computer systems, <b>or misconduct on a social network (as defined in the Student Social Media Policy)</b> , the Head of IT Services or their nominee	To take account of the new Student Social Media Policy
9(xiv)	Added (in bold) - illustrative acts that constitute misconduct: Breach of a University code, rule or regulation, for example: ..... <b>breach of a Managed Exclusion Order, breach of the University's Student Social Media Policy</b>	For clarity and to take account of the new Student Social Media Policy
20	Added (in bold) Appeals against a decision and/or a penalty imposed by an Authorised Person must be made <b>within five working days</b> using the University's standard form ....	This has been custom and practice but has not been included in these regulations
24	Deleted The student should notify the Appeals Section of the University Secretariat that they intend to challenge the dismissal of their appeal within five working days of being notified of the dismissal. The student should state the grounds for their challenge in writing , as set out in Regulation 23 above.	This stage is unnecessary

Old regulation 38, now 37	Following sentence added Enquiries should establish whether, on the balance of probabilities, misconduct has taken place.	This is included for minor offences but not currently for major
Old regulation 65, now 64	Added (in bold) that there is fresh relevant evidence that was not available to the Panel but that has since come to light and should be considered <b>and there were valid reasons why it was not available at the time</b>	For clarity and consistency with other areas of the regulations
Old regulation 73, now 72	Added (in bold) On the basis of the written evidence provided for it and the evidence brought to its attention through the hearing a Disciplinary Appeal Panel may: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>confirm the recommendations made by a Disciplinary Panel and dismiss the appeal</li> <li><b>vary a penalty imposed by a Disciplinary Panel</b></li> </ul> <p>.....</p>	For clarity following advice from the OIA

#### [B4 Regulations for academic appeals](#)

<b>Regulation reference</b>	<b>Amendment/addition</b>	<b>Rationale for amendment/ addition</b>
34	Added an additional ground for requesting a review of the dismissal of an appeal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>that new evidence is available which the student was unable, for valid reasons, to provide at the time of the appeal. The Process Review Appeal Panel will decide whether there are valid reasons why the evidence was not submitted earlier and, if there are valid reasons, will consider this evidence alongside the review of the dismissal of the appeal</li> </ul>	This was an omission in the process
37	Added (in bold) The PRAP meets every three weeks and is administered by the Secretariat. The membership of the PRAP is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vice-President and Registrar (Chair) <b>(or nominee)</b></li> <li>an Associate Dean</li> <li>a student officer nominated by the President of University of Surrey Students' Union</li> </ul>	To ensure timescales can be met if the V-P is unavailable
40	Following sentence added The decision of the Process Review Appeal Panel must be a majority one.	This was an omission

**B5 Regulations for fitness to study**

<b>Regulation reference</b>	<b>Amendment/addition</b>	<b>Rationale for amendment/ addition</b>
10 and 31	Added the Chair of the Admissions, Progression and Examination Sub-committee as an authorised person and APESC to referral body list	This was an omission

**B7 Procedure for complaints about learning opportunities**

The *Procedure for complaints about learning opportunities* has been re-written to take account of the OIA Good practice framework for handling complaints and appeals (December 2014) and is now call the *Procedure for complaints*. This includes:

- inclusion of service related complaints in addition to those related to learning opportunities
- recognition of the early resolution stage
- inclusion of learning opportunities related complaints for students at Associated and Accredited Institutions
- Complaint Panels to be replaced by a Complaints Review Panel with a permanent chair. For learning opportunities complaints this will be the Head of Academic Appeals and Academic Quality (or nominee) and for service complaints this will be the Director of Traded Services (or nominee)

**B8 Regulations for hearings by panels**

<b>Regulation reference</b>	<b>Amendment/addition</b>	<b>Rationale for amendment/ addition</b>
1	Amended to cover just undergraduate and taught postgraduate students. These <i>Regulations</i> provide a framework for the conduct of panel hearings linked to the following .... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a hearing to make recommendations on possible academic misconduct on the part of an undergraduate or taught postgraduate student or students (see <i>Regulations for academic integrity ....</i></li> </ul>	These regulations will no longer apply to PGR students in relation to allegations of research misconduct apart from at the appeal stage as procedures are now covered by the new <i>Code of practice for handling allegations of research misconduct</i>
Table on page 3	Composition of Complaint Review Panel updated in relation to new <i>Procedures for student complaints</i>  Added Head of Academic Appeals and Academic Quality as a Chair of Fitness to Study Panel  Added “or nominee” for Chair of Process Review Appeal Panel	For greater flexibility  To ensure timescales can be met if the V-P is unavailable

21	<p>Added (in bold)</p> <p>Where a student notifies the office or person that is responsible for administering a panel hearing in advance of the panel hearing that they will not be able to attend the hearing, and that there are valid extenuating circumstances to explain their non-attendance (as described in the University's <i>Regulations for extenuating circumstances</i>), the office or person responsible for administering the panel hearing will endeavour to reschedule the panel hearing. <b>If there are no valid reasons for the student's non-attendance the panel hearing will proceed in the student's absence.</b></p>	For clarity
New regulations 29, 30 and 31	<p><i>Burden of proof</i></p> <p>For panel hearings linked to disciplinary matters it is for the University to show that it is more likely than not that the student committed the offence.</p> <p>For panel hearings linked to fitness to study it is for the University to show that the student is not fit to study.</p> <p>For panel hearings linked to fitness to practice it is for the University to show that the student has breached the University's requirements for professional behaviour.</p>	For consistency and completeness
Old regulation 38, now 41	<p>Following sentence added</p> <p>All panel decisions are required to be majority verdicts.</p>	For clarity