

A summary of amendments to University Regulations for 2022/23

(approved by Senate on the 4th July 2022, 24th August 2022 and 14 September 2022)

1. This summary lists the amendments and additions to the Regulations for 2022/23, approved by Senate on 04/07/2022. Additionally, on 24/08/2022 Senate approved an amendment to B1 Regulations for extenuating circumstances, regulation 5 (see point 8 below). Technical amendments were made as required, for example to reflect any changes to role titles/structures/committees or re-wording for clarity.
2. The amendments made for the 2022/23 academic year are informed primarily by process review work undertaken as part of the Seamless Student Journey Programme. There is also consideration given to the wider policy context which gives rise to the need to make some amendments to align with the [Office for Students' Conditions of registration](#).
3. Within [A1 Regulations for taught programmes](#), the minimum aggregate period of Professional Training Year (PTY) for students with valid extenuating circumstances has been reversed to pre-Covid regulatory requirements (min of 900 hours). The reduction introduced by the emergency regulations pertaining to minimum working hours will no longer apply from the 2022/23 PTY cohort.
4. The recently revised [Office for Students' quality and standards conditions for ongoing registration](#) require providers that their "academic regulations are designed to ensure the effective assessment of technical proficiency in the English language in a manner which appropriately reflects the level and content of the applicable higher education course" (Condition B4, assessment and awards). To comply with this requirement, the University academic regulations are now better linked with the Grade Descriptors, Appendix 1 of the [Code of practice for assessment and feedback](#).
5. We are confirming within the A1 regulations that the universal default position for students required to repeat a module is to study that module with attendance, with the option to opt out where necessary. This is consistent with broader messaging around the importance of engaging with taught sessions to support learning.
6. Informed by process review work undertaken as part of the Seamless Student Journey programme, amendments to B1 [Regulations for extenuating circumstances](#) include changes to the maximum number of self-certified requests for extenuating circumstances that can be submitted in each semester/term, whilst the overall maximum number per academic year (n=3) remains the same as previously. This amendment would ensure a more even distribution of self-certified applications throughout the academic year. This also covers students on programmes with a non-standard start (e.g., February start, etc).
7. All deadline extension dates (due to extenuating circumstances) are calculated on the basis of the original submission date regardless of when the student applied for extenuating circumstances. This amendment would encourage students to submit their applications for extenuating circumstances well ahead of the deadline and this amendment should also help to provide students with a predictable date for their reassessment deadline irrespective of the status of their application (approved or still pending).
8. Amendments to B1 [Regulations for extenuating circumstances](#), regulation 5 were introduced to clarify the University position regarding the withdrawal of applications for extenuating circumstances with respect to the timing of the assessment event taking place and the

marking of submitted work of students with approved/pending applications for extenuating circumstances.¹

9. A new section has also been introduced to B2 [Regulations for academic integrity](#) to clarify what should happen in the event that a student is found to have committed concurrent offences, with an approach designed to enable learning while balancing this with a need to be robust where misconduct is occurring in different ways.
10. Following discussions with the Students' Union and relevant stakeholders, Senate approved minor clarifications to the [A2 Regulations for research degrees](#). These amendments reflect current practice and align better with other regulatory areas of the Quality Framework, including [A1 Regulations for taught programmes](#) and other.

New text is shown in **bold**, deletions in ~~strike through~~

A0 Regulations for the Foundation Year		
Regulation reference	Amendment/addition	Rationale for amendment/addition
Relevant amendments to the <i>Regulations for taught programmes</i> will also be made to these Regulations		

A1 Regulations for taught programmes		
Regulation reference	Amendment/addition	Rationale for amendment/addition
13	The minimum aggregate period of Professional Training is 1125 hours, excluding local annual holiday entitlement but including any return period(s) to the University. Where there are valid extenuating circumstances a student may be able to complete their period of Professional Training in 750 900 hours. Students who cannot complete a minimum of 750 900 hours will normally be unable to complete level P and this will be considered on a case-by-case basis	The Emergency Regulation pertaining to minimum working hours, to be eligible to apply for Extenuating Circumstances for a shortfall, will no longer apply from the 2022/23 PTY cohort. Please note this relates only to cases where ECs may be considered, and does not change the minimum duration required for approval as a placement year
46	English language Students whose qualifications and/or test results have met the University's requirements but whose proficiency in English is subsequently judged by their tutors to be hindering their academic progress will be required to attend a programme in English for academic study. This should be read in	Requirements for English language proficiency in assessments should be considered in conjunction with the Grade Descriptors (App1, CoP for A&F) in order to comply with the revised OfS' B4.3 condition of registration

¹ This amendment to B1 [Regulations for extenuating circumstances](#), regulation 5 was approved by Senate on 24 August 2022

	conjunction with the <i>Code of practice for assessment and feedback</i>.	
158	<p>Failure to attend for assessment/ examination</p> <p>Where a student has failed an assessment, or reassessment, for a module through failing to attend a required examination (or being late for more than 30 minutes), or by attending a required examination (including online timed open book examinations and online examinations available within a defined window), but not making (in the judgement of the Board of Examiners) a reasonable attempt to address the examination questions, and there are no confirmed extenuating circumstances, the student has failed that unit of assessment at that attempt and will be given a mark of zero. If the attempt was the first attempt and the student fails the module overall as a consequence, they may not progress without reassessment, as described in Regulation 155 above, and compensation will only be available after a re-assessment.</p>	To reflect current practice
162	<p>Failure of modules with a value of more than 60 credits</p> <p>Where an undergraduate student fails modules with a value of more than 60 credits at that level or stage of their programme, their progression through their programme is halted and the Board of Examiners will require them to retake the units of assessment they have failed in the next academic year, in order to pass any failed modules and progress to the next stage or level of their studies². Normally, in such cases the Board of Examiners requires recommends that the student is reassessed with or without attendance. The student may submit a request to the Academic Registry to be reassessed without attendance, based on individual circumstances.</p>	To clarify the existing practice where the default option for students who failed more than 60 credits is to take the resits during the following academic year <i>with</i> attendance. Students can opt out of this arrangement and request to take the resits <i>without</i> attendance.

[A2 Regulations for research degrees, including by published work](#)

Regulation reference	Amendment/addition	Rationale for amendment/ addition
43	Where there are exceptional changes to the supervisory arrangements for registered students, it is permissible for staff holding appointments other than those specified in	To ensure that such appointments can be signed off in a timely manner in the Director's absence

² Exceptional progression arrangements apply to students on the BVMSci Veterinary Medicine and Science programme and students on BSc (Hons) Nursing, BSc (Hons) Midwifery and BSc (Hons) Paramedic Science programmes.

	paragraph 42 to serve as Co-supervisor. Such appointments include, but are not limited to, Visiting Staff and Collaborative Supervisors, subject to approval by the Director of the Doctoral College (or the Deputy Director in their absence) and ratification by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Research & Innovation.	
62	Following the specified period, the student's case will be reviewed by a panel consisting of an Associate Dean (Doctoral College) and an academic member of staff not involved with the supervision of the student. Prior to the panel meeting both the student and their supervisor will be asked to submit a written statement to the panel and/or attend the panel in person. If the panel members agree that the student has failed to meet the targets to the required standard then a recommendation for programme termination will be made to the Admission Progression and Examination Subcommittee. If there is a disagreement between the parties then the case will be referred to the Admission Progression and Examination Subcommittee for adjudication. In exceptional circumstances the student's case may be reviewed by the panel prior to the completion of the three month period. This will only apply when the student has failed interim targets and/or it is the unanimous academic judgement of the Supervisors that there is no prospect of the targets being successfully completed.	Amendment proposed following a complex case which progressed for consideration by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA). In that case it was considered impossible for the targets to be met and therefore unreasonable to allow the student to continue in the circumstances.

<u>B1 Regulations for extenuating circumstances</u>		
Regulation reference	Amendment/addition	Rationale for amendment/addition
5	<p>Once a request for the recognition of extenuating circumstances has been approved, the student cannot subsequently withdraw the request.</p> <p>Normally, any requests for the recognition of extenuating circumstances should be withdrawn prior to the start of an assessment event or assessment deadline. The University's approach to marking work of students with approved or pending applications for extenuating circumstances is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-certified applications: all self-certified applications, whether 	<p>To reflect current practice and not penalise students for ECs that have been resolved.</p> <p>This amendment will help to clarify the withdrawal of applications for extenuating circumstances process with respect to the timing of the assessment event taking place and the marking of submitted work of students with approved/pending applications for extenuating</p>

	<p>approved or pending an outcome at the time of the event/deadline, may not be withdrawn after the submission deadline or after the start of the assessment event. Any submitted work will not be marked.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidenced applications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Approved evidenced applications may not be withdrawn after the submission deadline or after the start of the assessment event. Any submitted work will not be marked; (ii) Pending an outcome at the time of the event/deadline: where the student completes the event/submission, they may request their application is withdrawn but must do so as promptly as possible and normally no later than the same day as the assessment event/deadline. The evidence relating to the original application must still be provided and the student must also provide reasons for why they could not have withdrawn their application prior to the assessment event/deadline. <p>Where a student with a pending evidenced application completes the event/submission, their work will be marked as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pending evidenced applications which are approved after the event/deadline: any submitted work will not be marked unless the application for extenuating circumstances is withdrawn in a timely manner as described above; • Pending evidenced applications which are rejected after the event/deadline: if a student attended the assessment event/submitted their work and the pending application is subsequently rejected by the University, the submitted work will be marked. <p>Where a student with a pending evidenced application did not attend the assessment event/submit their work and the pending application is subsequently rejected, relevant</p>	<p>circumstances</p>
--	--	----------------------

	regulations for non-submission should apply (A0 Regulations for Foundation Year: regulation 73; A1 Regulations for taught programmes: regulation 158).	
8ii and 8iii Grounds for the recognition of extenuating circumstances	<p>ii) for oneself or a close relative (such as parent, child or spouse/partner) or a person who is dependent upon the student for their care:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • serious short-term illness or accident of a nature that, in employment, would lead an employer to agree to absence on sick leave • a long-term chronic health problem, or other disability as defined by the Equality Act (2010), suddenly worsening • a flare-up of a chronic health problem, or disability as defined by the Equality Act (2010), <p>In instances (ii) independent evidence of the nature of the relationship and/or the dependency will be required (see Regulation 9 below);</p> <p>(iii) a late diagnosis of a condition for which reasonable adjustments are required additional learning requirements such that the student has not received the support they needed</p>	For clarification
9	<p>(iii) for a late diagnosis of a condition for which reasonable adjustments are required a disability resulting in the need for reasonable adjustments, confirmation from Disability and Neurodiversity of the diagnosis and the date it was made and details of any delays to the implementation of the required reasonable adjustments</p>	For clarification, as above
20 Self-certification	Students who are experiencing valid extenuating circumstances may submit a maximum of one three self-certified applications for extenuating circumstances in each academic semester and the Late Summer Assessment period academic year .	This amendment will ensure a more even distribution of self-certified applications throughout the academic year. This will also cover students on programmes with non-standard start (e.g., February start, etc). Where a programme structure includes three academic terms instead of two semesters, students may submit a maximum of one self-certified application per

		each term.
21	<p>Each self-certified application will cover a maximum period of five University working five working days. The period does not include University closure days but will include working days (i.e. Monday to Friday) which fall within University holiday periods. Students may not submit self-certified applications to extend a previously self-certified extension. If additional time is required, the student may submit an application with evidence.</p>	To ensure a more standardised approach to deadline extensions that are due to self-certified extenuating circumstances
24, second bullet point	<p>Where the request meets the grounds and evidence requirements set out in Regulations 8 and 9 above, the following checks are also completed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [...] • where a student requests an extension to a coursework deadline that is longer than three weeks and the submission deadline falls within three weeks of the request, the relevant academic member of staff will be consulted to determine whether an alternative assessment should be offered 	To avoid repetition as this is covered by regulations 25 (new) and 26.
25	<p>Requests for the recognition of extenuating circumstances are normally processed within five University working days of receipt of all required information. Standard maximum extension periods to the coursework deadline are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-certified applications: five University working days from the date of the original assessment deadline • Evidenced applications: 10 University working days from the date of the original assessment deadline <p>Students who request more than 10 University working days will be required to defer the assessment until the next available assessment period. In exceptional cases, the relevant academic member of staff will be consulted to determine whether to allow an exceptional extension to the coursework deadline by another five University working days or to offer an alternative assessment. If the circumstances are deemed valid by an</p>	<p>To clarify the maximum extension period for self-certified and evidenced applications. Both timescales defined from the normal assessment deadline.</p> <p>The proposed change is designed to ensure that students are not disadvantaged in terms of their academic achievement by a long period of extenuating circumstances. Therefore, it is proposed to reduce the standard 3-week period to two weeks with an exceptional decision to either extend by another week or to offer an alternative assessment.</p> <p>This also benefits students by facilitating achievement of the three week turnaround</p>

	<p>Academic Registry member of staff the outcome is one of the following:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an extension to the coursework deadline* • a deferral of the coursework/event to the next appropriate assessment period • the removal of a late submission penalty • an alternative assessment and/or extension and/or deferral • an extension to the deadline for submission of documents to a postgraduate research student progress review or confirmation review meeting and/or an extension to the date of the review meeting itself <p>* Self-certified applications will result in an maximum extension of seven calendar days.</p>	<p>time for feedback and helps academic staff by supporting more predictable planning of marking workload</p> <p>Normally, if a student needs longer than 2 weeks (10 University working days) they can request a deferral. This means less judgement is needed for the person processing the EC which is for automating the process to a greater extent and therefore reduces delays, inconvenience and distress.</p>
New 26	<p>If the circumstances are deemed valid by an Academic Registry member of staff, the outcome is one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an extension to the coursework deadline³ (subject to Regulation 25 above) • a deferral of the coursework/event to the next appropriate assessment period • the removal of a late submission penalty • an alternative assessment and/or extension and/or deferral • an extension to the deadline for submission of documents to a postgraduate research student progress review or confirmation review meeting and/or an extension to the date of the review meeting itself <p>If the student requires additional time, or experiences further extenuating circumstances, they may submit a further application.</p>	To remove a footnote
35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that the nature of the illness affected impaired the student's capacity to report it 	Technical change. Use of the word "impaired" in bullet point 2 brings it into line with bullet point 4

[B2 Regulations for academic integrity](#)

Regulation	Amendment/addition	Rationale for amendment/
------------	--------------------	--------------------------

³Self-certified applications will result in a maximum extension of seven calendar days.

reference		addition
Page 3 diagram	To delete the top 'No' boxes off to the right and just keep the lower box	Minor change to simplify the diagram
10	Senate, on behalf of the University has delegated the responsibility for managing academic integrity and academic misconduct procedures to the Pro-Vice-Chancellors, Executive Deans of the Faculties advised by, among others, the University's Academic Integrity Officers (AIOs), Associate Deans, Education and the Academic Registry staff.	For clarity
14	<p>Poor academic practice involves collaboration or poor citation practice where there is evidence that the student did not appreciate the rules of academic writing for their discipline, for example where the extent of copied material can be considered so slight that it does not justify a penalty. Examples include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor use of referencing that has not materially given the student an unfair advantage • A very low volume of unattributed quotations that has not materially given the student an unfair advantage • A very low volume of incorrect citations that has not materially given the student an unfair advantage • A very low volume copying with correct citations that has not materially given the student an unfair advantage • Misconduct which can be shown to be entirely the result of technical issues and has not materially given the student an unfair advantage 	For clarity and as guidance to AIOs and others involved in decision making
New 23	<p>Concurrent cases of academic misconduct</p> <p>The approach outlined below will apply in cases of alleged academic misconduct occurring concurrently, within the same assessment period (i.e., in the same semester when the outcome of the separate cases has not yet been communicated to the student). The times of individual submissions/events will be used when determining which penalty to</p>	To include a new section to explain how the University is dealing with concurrent cases of academic misconduct. This has not previously been addressed within the regulations and led to ambiguity over the application of the regulations where students were believed to have committed more than one offence at

	<p>apply to each offence.</p> <p><u>Two concurrent cases</u></p> <p>1) No previous misconduct on record:</p> <p>The AIOs or the Assessments & Awards Office may apply first and second offence penalties. Two first offence penalties would normally be applied when the misconduct is similar. The matter should be referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel if the either of the offences are particularly complex or of the highest severity.</p> <p>2) One previous misconduct offence on record:</p> <p>The AIOs or the Assessments & Awards Office may apply two second offence penalties when the misconduct is similar, and the student has not had the opportunity to reflect on an earlier finding of misconduct. The matter should be referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel if the new offences are different or particularly complex or of the highest severity.</p> <p>3) Two or more previous misconduct offences on record:</p> <p>The AIOs or Assessments & Awards Office should refer the matter to an Academic Misconduct Panel after the student has had the opportunity to respond to the allegations.</p> <p><u>Three or more concurrent cases</u></p> <p>1) No previous misconduct on record:</p> <p>The AIOs or the Assessments & Awards Office may apply first and second offence penalties. Two or more first offence penalties would normally be applied when the misconduct is similar.</p> <p>The matter should be referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel if there are three or more types of misconduct or if the offences are particularly complex or of the highest severity. This referral would be after the student has had the</p>	<p>the same time.</p>
--	--	-----------------------

	<p>opportunity to respond to the allegations.</p> <p>2) One previous misconduct offence on record:</p> <p>The AIOs or the Assessments & Awards Office may apply two or more second offence penalties when the new misconduct is similar, and the student has not had the opportunity to reflect on an earlier finding of misconduct.</p> <p>The matter should be referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel if the offences are different or particularly complex or of the highest severity. This referral would be after the student has had the opportunity to respond to the allegations.</p> <p>3) Two or more previous misconduct offences on record:</p> <p>The AIOs or Assessments & Awards Office should refer the matter to an Academic Misconduct Panel. This referral would be after the student has had the opportunity to respond to the allegations.</p>	
23-24	<p>Where proven, a student’s registration will normally be terminated in cases of the highest severity of academic misconduct. Academic misconduct is deemed to be of the highest severity in the following circumstances (the list is not exhaustive):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) personation or impersonation at assessment (ii) contract plagiarism (iii) failure to store unauthorised materials and/or devices in the designated spaces within an assessment venue or ancillary area (iv) breach of agreed ethical protocol 	To clarify the circumstances and outcomes of the academic misconduct offences of highest severity.
32 33	Where possible evidence of academic misconduct is identified, the details are forwarded to the named contact in the Academic Hive who will arrange for a formal discussion between the student and one or two AIOs ⁴ (one of whom will lead the	The University has been piloting the use of a single AIO for Formal Discussions and would now like to maintain this flexibility on a permanent basis as the pilot has suggested no adverse

⁴ The AIOs should not have a close relationship with the student (or students) and should not have been involved in previously proven misconduct allegations against the student.

	meeting). Where there is suspected collusion or evidence that a student has provided work for another student to pass off as their own or possible academic misconduct in group work, the AIO(s) will meet with both/all students concerned individually.	consequences to having a flexible approach. AIOs would be able to ask for a second AIO to attend on any case where this would support their decision making. Amend reference to AIOs thereafter to AIO(s).
38 39	Should a student choose to waive their right for a formal discussion to take place, they must notify the University of their decision in writing (via e-mail). If the student does not attend the formal discussion and there are no valid reasons for non-attendance, the AIO(s) will reach a finding based on the information available to them.	To allow students to waive their right for a formal discussion to take place.
75 76	Where the finding is that the academic misconduct is deemed to be of the highest severity, as detailed in Regulation 23, an Academic Misconduct Panel may will normally instruct a Board of Examiners that the student's registration be terminated, regardless of whether there has been any previous instances of proven academic misconduct. In exceptional circumstances, the Panel may apply a first and/or second offence penalty.	To reflect current practice
Table 1 A new footnote	<i>Table 1: Penalties that an Academic Integrity Officer, the Assessments & Awards Office and an Academic Misconduct Panel instructs a Board of Examiners to apply</i> In exceptional cases, where the volume of academic misconduct is proven to be low, a mark of zero is given for the unit of assessment; the module mark is not capped. If the module is failed – the unit of assessment may be retaken as a second or third attempt (subject to eligibility). Reassessment penalty is applied to the re-assessed unit(s) of assessment.	To add a footnote to clarify penalties for the first offence instances where the volume of academic misconduct is proven to be low

[B2.1 Regulations for Academic Integrity - appeals](#)

Regulation reference	Amendment/addition	Rationale for amendment/addition
14	If the good reasons are not deemed valid, the appeal will not be considered and the student will be offered a Completion of Procedures letter.	To remove an unnecessary inclusion
16	Once assigned an appeal, the OSCAR Case	A minor technical change to

	<p>Manager compiles information from relevant parties including the Faculty, Department or School to create the dossier which contains the evidence base for the appeal. This is normally done within 20 working days of receiving the appeal. The dossier contains the appeal lodged by the student, the supporting evidence for their appeal, the information provided by the person or body that made the decision that is the focus of the appeal, and any other relevant information gathered by OSCAR. In cases where, upon initial review of an academic appeal dossier by the OSCAR Case Manager, an appellant appears to have not submitted any or enough sufficiently compelling evidence, the OSCAR Case Manager advises the student to provide further evidence in order to prevent their appeal being closed. The student may choose to provide additional evidence or to request a review based on initially submitted information.</p>	clarify the existing practice
19	<p>When the Case Manager has compiled the dossier, they consult with the Academic Registrar a member of staff from the pool of trained Chair persons and a sabbatical officer or student member nominated by the Students' Union to review the evidence and decide whether the appeal should be upheld in full, partially upheld or dismissed. A majority decision is made if agreement cannot be reached.</p>	To allow flexibility and for the timelier resolution of appeals.
28	<p>The membership of an Academic Misconduct Appeal Panel comprises two members of staff from the pool of trained Panel members, one of whom must be an AIO from the pool of trained Chair Persons, who will chair the hearing. It also includes a sabbatical officer or a student member nominated by the Students' Union. A member of Academic Registry attends as Secretary to the Appeal Panel.</p>	<p>These decisions are not academic judgements – as demonstrated by the presence of a sabbatical officer on the Panel.</p> <p>This would mirror the approach taken for appeals against AIO decisions (see section 19).</p>

<u>B3 Student disciplinary regulations</u>		
Regulation reference	Amendment/addition	Rationale for amendment/addition
32	<p>If misconduct is identified as having occurred, on the balance of probabilities, the Authorised Person is permitted to apply one or more minor offence penalties, whilst must decide whether any such misconduct could reasonably be considered to warrant either a minor or a major</p>	To reflect the existing practice

	<p>penalty. An Authorised Person is permitted to apply a minor offence penalty one or more minor offence penalties, whilst major offence penalties can only be applied by a Disciplinary Panel or a Disciplinary Appeal Panel. - change to one or more to read as "An Authorised Person is permitted to apply one or more minor offence penalties, whilst...</p>	
47	<p>Where, after making enquiries, the Case Manager is able to show that there are sufficient grounds and evidence for the student's appeal against a penalty imposed by an Authorised Person to be upheld, the Case Manager writes to the Chief Student Officer to make that recommendation will consult another Case Manager to agree an outcome. Where an outcome cannot be agreed, a third Case Manager will be consulted. Where the Case Managers is satisfied that this recommendation is sound agree that the appeal should be upheld they direct the Case Manager to write to the student and the Authorised Person, explaining the grounds for upholding the appeal. The Chief Student Officer They will also consider whether there has been any adverse impact upon the student and whether the University should provide a remedy.</p>	<p>To adopt a more proportionate approach to considering appeals against minor misconduct penalties. This approach would be equivalent to the consideration of academic appeals (which have more serious consequences).</p>
48	<p>Where, after making enquiries, the Case Manager finds that the student's appeal does not meet the criteria outlined in Regulation 43 above, and is not supported by evidence, they write to the Chief Student Officer, will consult another Case Manager, setting out why the student's appeal should be dismissed. Where an outcome cannot be agreed, a third Case Manager will be consulted. Where the Case Managers is satisfied that this recommendation is sound agree that the appeal should be dismissed, they direct the Case Manager to write to the student dismissing their appeal and explaining the grounds for the dismissal. The student will be offered a Completion of Procedures letter.</p>	<p>To adopt a more proportionate approach to considering appeals against minor misconduct penalties. This approach would be equivalent to the consideration of academic appeals (which have more serious consequences).</p>
58	<p>The membership of a Disciplinary Panel comprises three members from the pool of trained panel members as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a senior member of academic staff (Chair) the pool of trained Chair persons • a member of University staff • a sabbatical officer or a student member 	<p>To allow for the timelier consideration of cases by highly trained and experienced colleagues.</p>

	nominated by the Students' Union A member of OSCAR is in attendance as Secretary to the Panel	
79	<p>The membership of a Disciplinary Appeal Panel comprises three members from the pool of trained panel members as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Pro Vice-Chancellor, Education or their nominee (Chair) a member of the pool of trained Chair persons • a member of University staff • a sabbatical officer or a student member nominated by the Students' Union <p>A member of OSCAR is in attendance as Secretary to the Appeal Panel.</p>	To allow for the timelier consideration of cases by highly trained, and experienced colleagues.

B4 Regulations for academic appeals

Regulation reference	Amendment/addition	Rationale for amendment/addition
25	<p>If an appeal is received after the 10 working days deadline the student will be asked to provide rationale reasonable in all of the circumstances (“good reasons”) as to why the appeal is late. The evidence will be considered by two OSCAR Case Managers who will determine whether the good reasons are valid. If the two Case Managers cannot come to an agreement a third Case Manager will be consulted and a majority decision will be made. A decision on the validity of the good reasons will normally be made within five working days of receiving the information. If the good reasons are not deemed valid the appeal will not be considered and the student will be offered.</p>	To rectify an unnecessary inclusion
27	<p>Once assigned an appeal, the OSCAR Case Manager compiles information from relevant parties including the Faculty, Department or School to create the dossier which contains the evidence base for the appeal. This is normally done within 20 working days of receiving the appeal. The dossier contains the appeal lodged by the student, the supporting evidence for their appeal, the information provided by the person or body that made the decision that is the focus of the appeal, and any other relevant information gathered by OSCAR. In</p>	A minor technical change to clarify the existing practice

	cases where, upon initial review of an academic appeal dossier by the OSCAR Case Manager, an appellant appears to have not submitted any or enough sufficiently compelling evidence, the OSCAR Case Manager advises the student to provide further evidence in order to prevent their appeal being closed. The student may choose to provide additional evidence or to request a review based on initially submitted information.	
40	<p>The membership of a Process Review Appeal Panel comprises three members from the pool of trained panel members as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an Associate Dean (Chair) a member of staff from the pool of trained Chair persons • a member of academic University staff • a sabbatical officer or a student member nominated by the Students' Union <p>The OSCAR Case Manager is in attendance as Secretary to the Panel.</p>	<p>To allow for the timelier consideration of cases by highly trained and experienced colleagues.</p> <p>These are not academic judgements, as shown by the fact that two non-academics make the decision at Stage 1 and a sabbatical officer sits on the Stage 2 panel.</p> <p>To better reflect existing practice as the majority of these cases are not chaired by an Associate Dean.</p>
49	<p>On a twice yearly basis Academic Registry will examine a random sample of Stage one appeal cases to ensure consistent application of these Regulations. The outcomes will be reported to the University Education Committee or Doctoral College Board as appropriate.</p>	<p>This unnecessary level of bureaucracy is overly burdensome and is not replicated in any other student process.</p> <p>This process is reviewed by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator, which has not found a case to be either justified or partly justified for the last 7 years. This excellent track record demonstrates the integrity of the existing process.</p>

[B5 Regulations for support to study](#)

Regulation reference	Amendment/addition	Rationale for amendment/addition
38	<p>The membership of a Support to Study Panel comprises three members from the pool of trained panel members as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a senior member of academic staff nominated by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Education (Chair) a member of staff from the pool of trained-Chair persons 	<p>To allow for the timelier consideration of cases by highly trained, and experienced colleagues.</p> <p>To better reflect existing practice, as the majority of these cases are not chaired</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a member of University staff • a sabbatical officer or a student member nominated by the Students' Union <p>A member of OSCAR is in attendance as Secretary to the Panel.</p>	by senior members of academic staff.
59	<p>The membership of a Support to Study Appeal Panel comprises three members from the pool of trained panel members as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a senior member of academic staff nominated by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Education (Chair) a member of staff from the pool of trained-Chair persons • a member of academic University staff • a sabbatical officer or a student member nominated by the Students' Union <p>A member of OSCAR is in attendance as Secretary to the Appeal Panel.</p>	<p>To allow for the timelier consideration of cases by highly trained, and experienced colleagues.</p> <p>To better reflect existing practice, as the majority of these cases are not chaired by senior members of academic staff.</p>

[B6 Regulations for fitness to practise](#)

Regulation reference	Amendment/addition	Rationale for amendment/ addition
43	<p>The membership of a Fitness to Practise Panel comprises three members from the pool of trained panel members plus an external member as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a senior member of academic staff nominated by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Education (Chair) a member of staff from the pool of trained-Chair persons • a member of academic University staff • a sabbatical officer or a student member nominated by the Students' Union • a Registrant of the relevant Registration Body who is external to the University <p>A member of OSCAR is in attendance as Secretary to the Panel.</p>	<p>To allow for the timelier consideration of cases by highly trained, and experienced colleagues</p> <p>To better reflect existing practice, as the majority of these cases are not chaired by senior members of academic staff.</p> <p>This amendment is supported by the Head of the School of Health Sciences.</p>
61	<p>The membership of a Fitness to Practise Appeal Panel comprises three members from the pool of trained panel members plus an external member as follows,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a senior member of academic staff nominated by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Education (Chair) a member of staff from the pool of trained-Chair persons • a member of academic University staff • a sabbatical officer or a student member 	<p>To allow for the timelier consideration of cases by highly trained and experienced colleagues.</p> <p>To better reflect existing practice as the majority of these cases are not chaired by senior members of academic staff.</p>

	<p>nominated by the Students' Union</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• a Registrant of the relevant Registration Body who is external to the University <p>A member of OSCAR is in attendance as Secretary to the Appeal Panel.</p>	<p>This amendment is supported by the Head of the School of Health Sciences.</p>
--	--	--