



ASSESSMENT, APPEALS, MISCONDUCT AND EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES PROCEDURES

CONTENT

1	Assessment regulations	2
2	Joint Assessment Regulations for QMU programmes	16
3	Academic misconduct	33
4	Academic appeals	47
5	Student complaints	51
6	Extenuating circumstances	55
7	Student code of conduct	59
8	Appendix	62
9	Academic appeals form	63
10	Student complaint form - Stage 1	67
11	Student complaint form – Review	69
12	Extenuating circumstances form	71



Policy Title	BMU Assessment Regulations
Version	No 1
Effective Date:	September 1 st , 2023
Approved by:	Academic Council
Scope:	BMU programmes (Foundation and Degree)
Purpose:	To establish rules on assessment procedures, progression and award

Part A: Policy and Principles

1. Context

- 1.1. These assessment regulations apply to all British Management University (BMU) undergraduate taught programmes.
- 1.2. BMU recognise that assessment is a fundamental aspect of the student learning experience that enables learning, both as part of the task and through review of performance. It is a vehicle for obtaining feedback and ultimately, it determines whether a student has achieved learning outcomes.
- 1.3. BMU undertakes to ensure academic standards and quality through the consistent operation of assessment processes which are valid, reliable, useful and fair. Consistent and equitable practice is essential to the integrity of assessment processes and to the comparability of its students' expectation and experience.

1. Purpose of Assessment

- 1.1 Assessment satisfies a number of related requirements, namely that it:
 - (1) is integrated with the process of student learning;
 - (2) demonstrates that a student has achieved the learning outcomes for their programme of study;
 - (3) justifies the award of academic credit based on actual student achievement;
 - (4) provides confidence in the maintenance of academic standards both internally and to external stakeholders;
 - (5) supports the evaluation and enhancement of programme design and delivery;
 - (6) provides meaningful feedback and feedforward to students on their performance on a programme of study which promotes learning and encourages reflection;
 - (7) supports the enhancement of programme design and programme delivery.
- 1.2 Additionally, assessment may be used as a diagnostic tool to determine the current knowledge and skills of a student and to assist in the formulation of a programme of future study.

2. Principles of Assessment

- 2.1 Assessment regulations and policy establish a framework for the conduct of assessment across all taught programmes.
- 2.2 Assessment regulations and policy establish sound procedures for the advanced communication of assessment requirements (including assessment criteria), the submission, conduct of examinations, marking and moderation of assessments, the progression of students, the remediation of failure and the conduct of meetings of the Assessment Board. The regulations and policy ensure that academic standards are



- maintained and that there is a retention schedule for copies of assessments and feedback on assessments.
- 2.3 Assessment regulations and policy are reviewed on a periodic basis to ensure that they remain fit for purpose.
 - 2.4 As part of the procedures for the validation and review of awards, programme teams are required to develop an assessment strategy which demonstrates a close alignment with the full range of intended learning outcomes (including knowledge and understanding, intellectual skills, practical skills and transferable skills) and mode(s) of study of that programme.
 - 2.5 Programme assessment strategies are designed to assess all intended learning outcomes but should reduce the extent of assessment to the minimum required to demonstrate the above and should avoid duplication.
 - 2.6 BMU is committed to the principles of equality of opportunity. Assessment regulations and procedures are designed to actively promote equality of opportunity, and to be compliant with the University [Equality and Diversity Policy](#).
 - 2.7 BMU recognises the need for transparency in the assessment of students.
 - 2.8 All modules which are designed to lead to the award of academic credit are expressed in terms of learning outcomes that are capable of assessment and include details of the assessment and of the assessment criteria to be employed.
 - 2.9 All modules which lead to the award of academic credit come under the purview of the Assessment Board and are assigned, as appropriate, to an External Examiner.

3. Fairness, reliability and validity of assessment

- 3.1 Assessment can take many different forms, as dictated by the variety of programmes and learning outcomes but, in all cases, it should be:
 - (1) Fair, in that there should be equality of treatment across all programmes and that there should be a consistent approach to equality and diversity;
 - (2) Valid, that is the assessment can be shown to be relevant to the intended learning outcomes;
 - (3) Reliable, in that there should be consistency of processes and standards across the institution and that there should be comparability of both the volume and complexity of assessment in relation to credit and level of study;
 - (4) Useful, in that it contributes to the knowledge and competencies and employability of the learner;
 - (5) Transparent, in that the requirements of the assessment in terms of intended learning outcomes and assessment criteria are made clear to the student.
- 3.2 To maximise accuracy and fairness of assessment, programme teams are expected to follow the procedures for marking and marks' moderation set out below. All Academic Staff are expected to familiarise themselves with the following terms and procedures:
 - (1) **Component.** A module is assessed by one or two assessment activities (e.g., examination, coursework, or practical). These activities are referred to as assessment component and contribute to the overall assessment for the module.
 - (2) **Condonement of a module.** Condonement of a module may occur where a student has not achieved a minimum pass mark in an undergraduate module at Foundation or in Degree Year 2 and there are no programme specific assessment regulations that require the student to be reassessed.



- (3) **Formative assessment.** Assessment with a developmental purpose, designed to help learners learn more effectively through practice and by giving them feedback on their performance and how it can be improved and/or maintained. Reflective practice by students sometimes contributes to formative assessment. Typically marks awarded for formative assessments do not count towards the final marks of the module; they are designed to provide students with feedback and might not contribute to the final mark and grade.
- (4) **Summative assessment.** Used to indicate the extent to which a learner has met the learning outcomes of a module or course. Typically marks awarded for summative assessments count towards the final mark of the module.
- (5) **Marking.** The process of assessing students' work, taking into account University guidelines for assessment feedback and the relevant criteria/mark schemes as devised by programme and/or module teams.
- (6) **Pre-Assessment Moderation.** The process by which summative assessment is reviewed prior to it being provided to students to ensure it has been rigorously and appropriately designed, taking account of the agreed module learning outcomes, marking criteria and the importance of clarity for students.
- (7) **Post-Assessment Moderation.** The process by which the University ensures that summative assessments have been marked in an academically rigorous manner and that assessment criteria have been applied appropriately. It is not a mechanism to resolve differences between markers or to make changes to individual student's marks.

4. Responsibility for Assessment

- 4.1 Academic Council of BMU have responsibility for the following, in relation to their respective awards:
 - (1) the development of assessment regulations and policy;
 - (2) monitoring the use of these regulations and policy;
 - (3) periodically reviewing and revising these regulations and policy.
- 4.2 The Rector of BMU have responsibility for the following, in relation to their respective awards:
 - (1) ensuring that programmes conform to these regulations and policy;
 - (2) ensuring that assessment processes are secure;
 - (3) reflecting on student performance in assessment;
 - (4) supporting staff to implement these regulations and policy.
- 4.3 The Assessment Board is responsible for making decisions on award and progression and ensuring that all students are treated fairly and consistently under these regulations. Decisions of the Assessment Board will be reported to the Academic Council of BMU. No student will receive an award or the award of academic credit from BMU without the approval of BMU's Academic Council.
- 4.4 The External Examiner is responsible to attend and make recommendations to the Assessment Board relating to the awards of degrees (including borderline cases), diplomas and certificates or the confirmation of results for stand-alone modules. Where there is a reconvened Assessment Board to reconsider, for example, the result of an appeal, attendance is not required. The External Examiner should, however, be consulted about, and make their views known on, any proposed amendment to the classification.
- 4.5 Programme Leaders are responsible for the quality of assessment across programmes. They are responsible for monitoring the outcomes of assessment and reporting these



outcomes to the Dean on Teaching and Learning at BMU, through the annual programme monitoring report.

4.6 Academic staff carry out their teaching responsibilities under the authority of the Rector. The Module Co-ordinators have responsibilities:

- (1) to assess students' work fairly, objectively and consistently;
- (2) to equally distribute students' papers for marking among Team members, when working in a Module Team;
- (3) to ensure students are provided with appropriate, helpful and explanatory feedback on all work submitted for assessment;
- (4) to make reasonable accommodation (e.g., length of time to complete) in assessment tasks and examinations for students with special requirements;
- (5) to ensure deadlines for the submission of examination papers and results to the Registrar are met;
- (6) to immediately report to the Registrar's Office any instances of student cheating, collusion and/or plagiarism.

4.7 Students have responsibilities:

- (1) to familiarise themselves with the University policy on assessment and examinations;
- (2) to ensure they read and understand the assessment requirements and note the submission dates, and seek assistance from the lecturer (if necessary);
- (3) to notify relevant staff as soon as possible prior to, or at the beginning of, the teaching session if they wish to have special requirements accommodated;
- (4) to submit for assessment their own individual and unassisted work, except as otherwise permitted, and understand that cheating, plagiarism, fabrication or falsification of data will be severely dealt with, see Academic Misconduct Policy;
- (5) to behave ethically and appropriately, avoiding any action or behaviour which would unfairly disadvantage or advantage another student;
- (6) to ensure that they understand the requirements, including timetables, for examinations and other assessments tasks;
- (7) to provide evidence, in advance of the Assessment Board, of any extenuating circumstances.

4.8 The Registrar's Office is responsible for the maintenance and retention of records of all provisional marks. The Registrar's Office will also maintain a central archive of approved final marks in relation to the BMU award.

5. Assessment System

5.1 Assessment must:

- (1) be effective in encouraging a high standard and depth of learning;
- (2) be authentic and reliable;
- (3) be consistent in level and challenge across comparable modules;
- (4) support equality, diversity and inclusion;
- (5) focus on attainment in an area of learning rather than on the accumulation of marks;
- (6) encourage reflection on feedback.

5.2 Assessment and learning should be integrated and therefore, assessment must be designed to align with and assess the specified learning outcomes for the module and the programme. Assessment criteria should therefore be directly related to learning outcomes, and along with



broader information relevant to instruction and regulation, must be transparent and explicit for all assessments.

- 5.3 The module descriptor specifies the relative assessment pattern, including weightings across components. The assessment pattern must be based on the intended learning outcomes of that module.
- 5.4 At the commencement of each module the Module Co-ordinator must advise the enrolled students of the form of the assessment and the timing of the components which make up the assessment. This will be consistent with the overall framework established for the programme's assessment, as specified in the module descriptors.
- 5.5 The assessment load should be as light as is compatible with providing adequate opportunity for students to:
 - a. engage in formative exercises to develop as learners;
 - b. demonstrate achievement of the relevant learning outcomes;
 - c. recover from occasional poor performance.
- 5.6 At the start of each programme, Programme Leaders will refer students to the assessment regulations for the programme governing progression and award, and of any changes thereto.

Part B: Marking, Progression, and Award

6. Module Marks and Grades

- 6.1 This section of the policy is designed to ensure consistency of meaning and application of grades across the University and to ensure quality assurance in regard to assessment standards and grades awarded.
- 6.2 The University is committed to preserving the confidentiality of personal information and therefore in all discussions of student performance and public notices of achievement it seeks to avoid the identification of individual students. In all records and public notices of marks and awards students will be identified only by ID number.
- 6.3 A student who submits a late assessment (within 24 hours after the deadline) will be penalised by 20%, or to a minimum pass mark of 40% if the original mark was 59% or less. Assessments submitted more than 24 hours later than the deadline will not be accepted, and will receive a score of 0.
- 6.4 A piece of written work which exceeds the specified word limit by 10% or more will receive a maximum mark of 40%. The number of words counted should include all the text, references and quotations used in the text, but should exclude abstracts, supplements to the text, diagrams, appendices, reference lists and bibliographies.
- 6.5 The University draws upon the following Grading Standards for both undergraduate and postgraduate subjects:

Grade	Mark	Corresponding level in an Honours degree classification
A*	80%-100%	First class
A	70%-79.9%	First class
B	60-69.9%	Upper second
C	50-59.9%	Lower second



D	40-49.9%	Third class
E	30-39.9%	Fail
F	0-29.9%	Fail

7. Award

- 7.1 To gain an undergraduate award, a student must normally be a registered student at the University for at least one academic year.
- 7.2 To qualify for the following awards the student must fulfil the subject specific requirements for the name of the award and also:

Award	Required Credits
BMU Cert HE	160 credit points of which a minimum of 100 are at Degree Year 1 or higher
BMU Higher Cert	320 credit points of which a minimum of 100 are at Degree Year 2 or higher
BMU Undergraduate Degree	480 credit points of which a minimum of 220 are at Degree Year 2 and 3, including at least 100 at Degree Year 3

- 7.3 Students may take credits from level directly above or directly below subject to the guidance set out above and as defined in relevant documentation.
- 7.4 The classification of the award of the Degree with Honours will be based on the marks obtained at Degree Year 2 (20%) and Degree Year 3 (80%). Weighted aggregate scores will be rounded to one decimal place. The classification will be based upon the average mark obtained by combining the weighted results of all modules studied at Degree Years 2 and 3. Any modules undertaken below Degree Year 2 and any modules taken whilst on an exchange arrangement will not be counted towards the BMU Undergraduate Degree.

70 and above First Class
≥60% and <70% Second Class: Upper division
≥50% and <60% Second Class: Lower division
≥40% and <50% Third Class

- 7.5 The award of a BMU Dip HE can include an award with distinction, in cases where the average mark for the 160 credits (or equivalent) at Degree Year 2 or above is 65% or higher. Any modules undertaken below Degree Year 2 and any modules taken whilst on an exchange arrangement will not be counted towards the distinction calculation.
- 7.6 Where a student is admitted to the University in the final year the classification will be based entirely on grades achieved during that year of studies.
- 7.7 Where a student is admitted to a level and given additional credit at that level gained externally, the grades from that credit may contribute to the classification where the credit is at the appropriate level and where marks are available. Otherwise, the classification will be based on grades gained entirely within the University. Any modules taken whilst on an exchange arrangement will not be counted towards the classification.



8. Decision on award classifications and distinctions in borderline cases (undergraduate degrees)

- 8.1 All weighted average marks falling 0.5 per cent or less below the classification or distinction boundary are automatically reclassified at the higher level.
- 8.2 All weighted average marks falling between 0.6 per cent and two percent below the classification or distinction boundary are deemed borderline cases.
- 8.3 For BMU Undergraduate Degree the final classification is determined by the marks across all Degree Year 3 credits. Borderline cases where any 60 or more credits (core or elective modules) are achieved in the classification above the boundary will be awarded the higher classification of degree.
- 8.4 For BMU Dip HE the final award is determined by the marks across Degree Year 2 credits. Borderline cases where any 60 or more credits (core or elective modules) are achieved in the distinction category (65% or above) will be awarded the degree with distinction.
- 8.5 Additional viva voce examinations should not be used in the consideration of borderline cases.

9. Decision on an award in absence of complete assessment information

- 9.1 The Assessment Board has discretion to make an award in the absence of complete assessment information where it is established to the satisfaction of the Board that:
 - (1) such absence is due to a valid documented cause, which would include, but not be limited to, a student's illness;
 - (2) there is enough evidence of the student's achievement at the level at which they are being examined, which would normally equate to two thirds of the assessable work at that level, or evidence is subsequently obtained.
- 9.2 Where the Assessment Board uses its discretion to make an award in the absence of complete assessment information, the justification for this action should be included in the minutes of the meeting.
- 9.3 Awards may be recommended with or without Honours or distinction as appropriate. In order to reach such a decision, the Assessment Board may assess the candidate by any appropriate and reasonable means. Any such assessment will for the purpose of these regulations be deemed a first assessment.
- 9.4 The Assessment Board has a duty to gain as much information about the candidate's ability and performance as possible before making decisions.
- 9.5 Decisions made in the absence of complete information must aim to ensure consistency of standard and equality of opportunity for the student under consideration as compared with his/her peers. The student must not be put in a position of unfair advantage over other candidates for the award.

10. Withdrawing from a module and transfer between modules

- 10.1 A student withdrawing from a module up to the point at which 25% of the taught duration of the module has been delivered may provide the Module Co-ordinator with a written explanation of reasons for withdrawal. If the Module Co-ordinator accepts these as valid reasons, the student will suffer no academic penalty, i.e., the withdrawal will not count as a fail. The student will receive a transcript showing them as withdrawn and will receive no credit.



- 10.2 A student withdrawing from a module after 25% of the taught duration will be recorded as a “fail”.
- 10.3 A student wishing to transfer from one elective module to another will normally be permitted to do so within the first 25% of the taught duration of the module subject to the consent of both Module Co-ordinators. Only exceptionally will students be permitted to transfer between elective modules after this period.
- 11. Decisions on Student Progression**
- 11.1 Student progression from one level of the programme to the next is at the discretion of the Assessment Board taking into account the student’s performance in all modules and the amount of academic credit accrued during the year.
- 11.2 The Assessment Board is responsible for determining:
- (1) whether the student remains in registration;
 - (2) the conditions governing the student’s progression;
 - (3) the award for which the student is eligible.
- 11.3 The Assessment Board may condone one failed 20 credit module at Foundation¹ and one failed 20 credit module in Degree Year 1 at the first attempt for students of an undergraduate programme, provided that a minimum overall mark of at least 37% has been achieved in the failed module and no individual component of assessment within the module falls below the minimum compensation level of 30%. The result will show as a condoned fail on the academic transcript and the student will be given credit for the module. Students who have failed more than 20 credits must undertake reassessments of all failed modules in the first instance. Once reassessment results are known, condonement may still be applied to one 20 credit module, provided that a minimum overall mark of at least 37% has been achieved in the failed module and no individual component of assessment within the module falls below the minimum compensation level and the student has no further failed modules on their profile.
- 11.4 Programme specific regulations may exempt some modules from eligibility for condonement.
- 11.5 A condoned fail will not affect any subsequent module selections.
- 11.6 Decisions on a student’s continued registration will be made at the end of each academic year, after reassessment results are known. The Assessment Board will take account of the following guidelines in making their decisions.
- 11.7 For undergraduate full-time students:
- (1) Pass modules to a total of 160 credits – continue in registration as a full-time student.
 - (2) Pass modules to a total of 120 credits but less than 160 credits – continue in registration as a full-time student with the right to retake the failed credits. No student may be registered on more than 200 credits in the academic year, including outstanding modules that require to be retrieved.
 - (3) Pass modules to a total of 100 credits but less than 160 credits – continue in registration with a personal learning plan, agreed in consultation with the Programme Leader.
 - (4) Pass modules to a total of 80 credits but less than 160 credits – repeat the Degree Year.
 - (5) Exceptionally, where there are extenuating circumstances, and a student has only 20 credits outstanding, provisional progression may be allowed subject to successful

¹ Except for the modules: International English I, International English II, Quantitative Methods I.



completion of an early retrieval. This regulation is intended to support students carrying forward modules and not to facilitate completion of studies in a shorter time than the usual minimum period of registration or to allow students to undertake additional optional modules in an academic session.

(6) A student who fails more than 60 credits at the second attempt, and who does not present evidence of extenuating circumstances, will be required to withdraw from the programme.

- 11.8 The only decisions available to the Assessment Board on progress and award shall be:
- (1) Continue – passed all assessments;
 - (2) Required to be reassessed in the failed module(s) before continuing;
 - (3) Continue – but required to be reassessed in the failed/deferred module(s) in next academic year;
 - (4) Offered opportunity to repeat the entire level in next academic year before continuing;
 - (5) No reassessment allowed – required to withdraw from course;
 - (6) Decision deferred – outstanding assessments as a first attempt;
 - (7) Decision deferred – outstanding reassessments;
 - (8) Recommendation to Progression Board for specific awards.
- 11.9 Undergraduate programmes of study are designed on four levels with conceptual and material progression being designed into the structure from level to level. Thus, it is expected that students will progress from level to level, and the structure of the programme and the timetables are developed accordingly. Although the above regulations may allow a full-time student to stay in full-time registration albeit without a completed level of study, it may not be possible to construct a programme around the timetable available which is academically coherent and which makes best advantage of the student's time. In most cases students will be expected and advised but not required to complete a level of study before progressing to the next level.

Part C: Assessment Regulations

12. Assessment of a Module

- 12.1 To pass an undergraduate module, a student must obtain at least 40% overall, and at least 30% in each component of assessment unless otherwise specified in the programme document or module descriptor. This regulation applies to the first attempt at the module only. Regulations for reassessment of modules are detailed below.
- 12.2 Where a student has achieved an overall mark of 40% or above but has fallen below the minimum permitted mark in an individual component, this will be shown as a qualifying fail on the academic transcript with a grade of Q.
- 12.3 Where a student is reassessed in an undergraduate module at a second attempt, the maximum mark that can be achieved for the module is 40%.
- 12.4 The nature and extent of the failure will not affect the student's right to be reassessed.

13. Conduct of Assessments

- 13.1 All assessments must be conducted in line with University regulations, policy and procedure.



- 13.2 The Academic Misconduct Policy sets out the expectations of students and staff in respect of academic integrity and the procedure to be followed where it is suspected that a piece of work submitted by a student for assessment may demonstrate academic misconduct.

14. Submission and Collection of Assessment Materials

- 14.1 Clear guidance should be given in module information provided by the Module Co-ordinator on the process by which assignments are to be submitted. The Module Co-ordinator should keep a dated record of all assignments received.
- 14.2 Each Module Co-ordinator sets the mode of assessment submission (electronic, hard copy, or both). Course works, reports, final projects, dissertations and alike must be submitted through anti-plagiarism software – Turnitin.
- 14.3 Students are entitled to receive marks and feedback on all assessments in order that the assessment exercise may perform an educative function. Clear guidance should be given in module descriptor on the process by which feedback on submitted work is returned to students. With the exception of final projects, feedback should always be returned within 15 working days of submission.
- 14.4 Students are entitled to an explanation of how the mark awarded for their work relates to the relevant assessment criteria.

15. Transcripts

- 15.1 The student's assessment record or academic transcript shall specify for each module taken:
- (1) the title;
 - (2) the credit points and the level;
 - (3) the academic year in which most recently taken;
 - (4) the grade and mark most recently obtained;
 - (5) the name of the University together with, if appropriate, the name of any other institution sharing responsibility for the student's programme of study or research;
 - (6) the location of study;
 - (7) the language of instruction/assessment;
 - (8) decision on progress/award.
- 15.2 Academic transcripts are issued following the Assessment Board. They are issued on secure paper to exiting students.

16. Pre-Assessment Moderation

- 16.1 The purpose of pre-assessment moderation is to ensure that:
- (1) summative assessment is appropriately designed, in an academically rigorous manner with reference to the agreed module learning outcomes and marking criteria;
 - (2) the assessment question(s) and instructions are clear and unambiguous;
 - (3) students can be provided with assurance in relation to the design of their assessments.
- 16.2 Pre-assessment moderation takes place *before* the summative assessment is released to students.
- 16.3 Pre-assessment moderator is expected to have experience of teaching and learning and have relevant subject knowledge. Moderator needs not be involved in the delivery of the



relevant module, but where detailed subject knowledge is essential to determine the suitability of an assessment, then the use of staff teaching on a module is appropriate.

- 16.4 Pre-assessment moderation should take place on the basis of: this policy; the stated assessment, the grading standards; and the module descriptor, including the learning outcomes, and should consider whether:
- (1) The assessment(s) design is appropriate and tests the stated module learning outcomes at the appropriate level; and
 - (2) The assessment's question(s) and instructions are clear and unambiguous.

17. Moderation

- 17.1 The post-assessment moderation process ensures that marking is consistently robust and undertaken appropriately in line with assessment criteria on a module. The aims of post-assessment moderation are to:
- (1) ensure a module has been marked in line with the stated assessment criteria;
 - (2) ensure internal consistency and fairness of assessment within a module;
 - (3) provide assurance for students of fairness and equality of grading.
- 17.2 All elements of assessments for Honours projects (or equivalent) must be blind double-marked for the whole cohort.
- 17.3 All summative assessments for undergraduate and postgraduate programmes that are not blind-double marked must be moderated on a sampling basis as a means of verifying the accuracy of marking. The size of the sample to be moderated must be at least the square root of the total number of students (rounded to the nearest whole number) taking the assessment plus all borderline fails (those that are within 2% below the pass mark). The sample should include a range of performance and the minimum size should be six pieces of assessed work.
- 17.4 Moderators must be provided with the following information:
- (1) The module descriptor;
 - (2) The assessment question(s) as provided to the students and any accompanying guidance;
 - (3) The marking criteria used;
 - (4) The marks of all students on the module to enable them to see the spread of marks across the module; and
 - (5) For each piece of written work, a copy of the feedback supplied by the original marker to the student.
- 17.5 In undertaking post-assessment moderation, the moderator is not permitted to suggest amendments to any individual student mark, they may only make recommendations on the sample as a whole or parts thereof.

18. Notification of Results

- 18.1 Official results in relation to the BMU award will be released by the Registrar's Office at the direction of the Rector after being officially endorsed by the Assessment Board.
- 18.2 Assessment grades and marks will be available to students by accessing the online student record system.



19. Reassessment

- 19.1 Reassessment means the opportunity to be reassessed in an assessment component which has been failed. The timing of the reassessment is at the discretion of the Assessment Board but must allow the student sufficient time to prepare. Normally reassessment (as a second attempt) happens within the same academic year or shortly thereafter.
- 19.2 A student will be permitted a maximum of three attempts at any module.
- 19.3 The Assessment Board may at its discretion allow an undergraduate student to be re-assessed in up to 80 credits in any one academic year.
- 19.4 A student who requires to be re-assessed in more than 80 credits will be required to withdraw from the programme, unless they have extenuating circumstances.
- 19.5 A candidate for reassessment is not entitled to be reassessed in components that are no longer part of the programme. Assessment Board may, at its discretion, make such special arrangements as it deems suitable in cases where it is inappropriate for students to be reassessed in the same components, or by the same methods as at the first attempt.
- 19.6 All second attempt assessments shall normally take place before the commencement of the next session of the programme. They should be late enough to allow the students time to prepare themselves, and to avoid overload of assessment shall normally take place in the summer/autumn. Students cannot request an extraordinary exam sitting.
- 19.7 A student who is reassessed for a module failure in an undergraduate module, where there are no clear extenuating circumstances, shall be awarded no more than 40% on passing the reassessment. A student who is reassessed for a module failure in a postgraduate module, where there are no clear extenuating circumstances, shall be awarded no more than 50% on passing the reassessment.
- 19.8 All reassessment results shall be based only upon performance in reassessments; no marks may be carried forward from a student's first attempt at the assessments. To pass an undergraduate module at reassessment, a student must achieve at least 30% in each reassessed component and a weighted average of at least 40%.
- 19.9 A student who has been absent from an assessment, or who has performed badly due to illness or other cause, shall be allowed to take the assessment, and it shall be treated as a first assessment, subject to the reason for absence or poor performance being acceptable to the Assessment Board.

20. Extenuating Circumstances (EC Claim)

- 20.1 The University recognises that there will be circumstances beyond a student's control which may impact adversely on their performance. Under such circumstances, a student has a right to fill in the Extenuating Circumstances form. Please, refer to Extenuating Circumstances Procedure for a detailed information.

Revision History

Version	Approved by	Approval Date	Description of Change
1	Academic Council	April 12 th , 2023	This policy should be reviewed in June 2024

Rector Conrad Ożóg



Grade Descriptors

Undergraduate Descriptors

Approved by the University Academic Council on 22 February 2023

Applicable to all new and existing modules being delivered from September 2023 onwards

Grade A* 80% and above

Outstanding performance, exceptionally able – pass

- Articulates an outstanding understanding and interpretation of the relevant information, key theories and concepts presented by the assessment
- Demonstrates outstanding knowledge of appropriate reading through extensive references to appropriate scholarly sources
- Shows outstanding problem solving, creativity, originality, critical thinking, analysis and evaluation Presents outstanding discussion in a logical, connected and progressing structure, and valid conclusions
- Displays an outstanding ability to appraise evidence and synthesise concepts, knowledge and theory
- Shows an outstanding reflexive awareness of value judgements and assumptions embedded in the subject or discipline

Grade A 70-79.9%

Excellent performance – pass

- Articulates an excellent understanding and interpretation of the relevant information, key theories and concepts presented by the assessment
- Demonstrates an excellent knowledge of appropriate reading through frequent references to appropriate scholarly sources
- Shows excellent problem solving, creativity, originality, critical thinking, analysis and evaluation
- Presents excellent discussion in a logical, connected and progressing structure, and valid conclusions
- Displays an excellent ability to appraise evidence and synthesise concepts, knowledge and theory
- Shows excellent reflexive awareness of value judgements and assumptions embedded in the subject or discipline

Grade B 60-69.9%

Very good performance – pass

- Articulates a very good understanding and interpretation of the relevant information, key theories and concepts presented by the assessment
- Demonstrates a very good knowledge of appropriate reading through references to appropriate scholarly sources
- Shows very good problem solving, creativity, originality, critical thinking, analysis and evaluation
- Presents very good discussion in a logical, connected and progressing structure, and valid conclusions



- Displays a very good ability to appraise evidence and synthesise concepts, knowledge and theory Shows very good reflexive awareness of value judgements and assumptions embedded in the subject or discipline

Grade C 50-59.9%

Good performance – pass

- Articulates a good understanding and interpretation of the relevant information, key theories and concepts presented by the assessment
- Demonstrates good knowledge of appropriate reading through some references to appropriate scholarly sources
- Shows good problem solving, creativity, originality, critical thinking, analysis and evaluation
- Presents a good discussion in a logical, connected and progressing structure, and valid conclusions Displays a good ability to appraise evidence and synthesise concepts, knowledge and theory
- Shows a good reflexive awareness of value judgements and assumptions embedded in the subject or discipline

Grade D 40-49.9%

Satisfactory Performance – pass

- Articulates a satisfactory understanding and interpretation of the relevant information, key theories and concepts presented by the assessment
- Demonstrates satisfactory knowledge of appropriate reading through some references to appropriate scholarly sources
- Shows satisfactory problem solving, creativity, originality, critical thinking, analysis and evaluation
- Presents a satisfactory discussion in a logical, connected and progressing structure, and valid conclusions
- Displays a satisfactory ability to appraise evidence and synthesise concepts, knowledge and theory
- Shows satisfactory reflexive awareness of value judgements and assumptions embedded in the subject or discipline

Grade E 30-39.9%

Unsatisfactory performance – fail

- Articulates partial understanding and interpretation of the relevant information, key theories and concepts presented by the assessment
- Demonstrates partial knowledge of appropriate reading through limited references to appropriate scholarly sources
- Shows insufficient problem solving, creativity, originality, critical thinking, analysis and evaluation
- Presents limited discussion of logical, connected and progressing structure with incomplete conclusions
- Displays a limited ability to appraise evidence and synthesise concepts, knowledge and theory
- Shows insufficient reflexive awareness of value judgements and assumptions embedded in the subject or discipline



Grade F 0-29.9%

Unsatisfactory performance- fail

- Articulates little or no understanding and interpretation of the relevant information, key theories and concepts presented by the assessment
- Demonstrates little or no knowledge of appropriate reading or references to appropriate scholarly sources
- Shows ineffective or no problem solving, creativity, originality, critical thinking, analysis and evaluation
- Presents ineffective or no discussion of logical, connected and progressing structure with incomplete conclusions
- Displays little or no ability to appraise evidence and synthesise concepts, knowledge and theory
- Shows little or no reflexive awareness of value judgements and assumptions embedded in the subject or discipline



Policy Title	Joint Assessment Regulations for QMU programmes
Version	No 1
Effective Date:	September 1 st , 2023
Approved by:	Academic Council (BMU) and the QMU validation panel on behalf of Senate (QMU)
Scope:	BMU programmes validated by QMU
Purpose:	To establish shared rules on assessment procedures, progression and award

Part A: Policy and Principles

1. Context

- 1.1. These joint assessment regulations apply to all British Management University (BMU) undergraduate taught programmes that are delivered in partnership with Queen Margaret University (QMU).
- 1.2. Both partners recognise that assessment is a fundamental aspect of the student learning experience that enables learning, both as part of the task and through review of performance. It is a vehicle for obtaining feedback and ultimately, it determines whether a student has achieved learning outcomes.
- 1.3. Both partners undertake to ensure academic standards and quality through the consistent operation of assessment processes which are valid, reliable, useful and fair. Consistent and equitable practice is essential to the integrity of assessment processes and to the comparability of its students' expectation and experience. Moreover, the joint regulations ensure that the academic standards and requirements for students studying QMU-validated programmes at BMU are equivalent to the standards and requirements for students studying comparable programmes at QMU.

1. Purpose of Assessment

- 1.1 Assessment satisfies a number of related requirements, namely that it:
 - (1) is integrated with the process of student learning;
 - (2) demonstrates that a student has achieved the learning outcomes for their programme of study;
 - (3) justifies the award of academic credit based on actual student achievement;
 - (4) provides confidence in the maintenance of academic standards both internally and to external stakeholders;
 - (5) supports the evaluation and enhancement of programme design and delivery;
 - (6) provides meaningful feedback and feedforward to students on their performance on a programme of study which promotes learning and encourages reflection;
 - (7) supports the enhancement of programme design and programme delivery.
- 1.2 Additionally, assessment may be used as a diagnostic tool to determine the current knowledge and skills of a student and to assist in the formulation of a programme of future study.



2. Principles of Assessment

- 2.1 Assessment regulations and policy establish a framework for the conduct of assessment across all taught programmes.
- 2.2 Assessment regulations and policy establish sound procedures for the advanced communication of assessment requirements (including assessment criteria), the submission, conduct of examinations, marking and moderation of assessments, the progression of students, the remediation of failure and the conduct of meetings of Board of Examiners. The regulations and policy ensure that academic standards are maintained and that there is a retention schedule for copies of assessments and feedback on assessments.
- 2.3 Assessment regulations and policy are reviewed on a periodic basis to ensure that they remain fit for purpose.
- 2.4 As part of the procedures for the validation and review of awards, programme teams are required to develop an assessment strategy which demonstrates a close alignment with the full range of intended learning outcomes (including knowledge and understanding, intellectual skills, practical skills and transferable skills) and mode(s) of study of that programme.
- 2.5 Programme assessment strategies are designed to assess all intended learning outcomes but should reduce the extent of assessment to the minimum required to demonstrate the above and should avoid duplication.
- 2.6 BMU is committed to the principles of equality of opportunity. Assessment regulations and procedures are designed to actively promote equality of opportunity, and to be compliant with the University [Equality and Diversity Policy](#).
- 2.7 BMU recognises the need for transparency in the assessment of students.
- 2.8 All modules which are designed to lead to the award of academic credit are expressed in terms of learning outcomes that are capable of assessment and include details of the assessment and of the assessment criteria to be employed.
- 2.9 All modules which lead to the award of academic credit come under the purview of a Board of Examiners and are assigned, as appropriate, to an External Examiner.

3. Fairness, reliability and validity of assessment

- 3.1 Assessment can take many different forms, as dictated by the variety of programmes and learning outcomes but, in all cases, it should be:
 - (1) Fair, in that there should be equality of treatment across all programmes and that there should be a consistent approach to equality and diversity;
 - (2) Valid, that is the assessment can be shown to be relevant to the intended learning outcomes;
 - (3) Reliable, in that there should be consistency of processes and standards across the institution and that there should be comparability of both the volume and complexity of assessment in relation to credit and level of study;
 - (4) Useful, in that it contributes to the knowledge and competencies and employability of the learner;
 - (5) Transparent, in that the requirements of the assessment in terms of intended learning outcomes and assessment criteria are made clear to the student.



3.2 To maximise accuracy and fairness of assessment, programme teams are expected to follow the procedures for marking and marks' moderation set out below. All Academic Staff are expected to familiarise themselves with the following terms and procedures:

- (1) **Component.** A module is assessed by one or two assessment activities (e.g., examination, coursework, or practical). These activities are referred to as assessment component and contribute to the overall assessment for the module.
- (2) **Condonement of a module.** Condonement of a module may occur where a student has not achieved a minimum pass mark in an undergraduate module at SCQF level 7 or 8 and there are no programme specific assessment regulations that require the student to be reassessed.
- (3) **Formative assessment.** Assessment with a developmental purpose, designed to help learners learn more effectively through practice and by giving them feedback on their performance and how it can be improved and/or maintained. Reflective practice by students sometimes contributes to formative assessment. Typically marks awarded for formative assessments do not count towards the final marks of the module; they are designed to provide students with feedback and might not contribute to the final mark and grade.
- (4) **Summative assessment.** Used to indicate the extent to which a learner has met the learning outcomes of a module or course. Typically marks awarded for summative assessments count towards the final mark of the module.
- (5) **Marking.** The process of assessing students' work, taking into account University guidelines for assessment feedback and the relevant criteria/mark schemes as devised by programme and/or module teams.
- (6) **Pre-Assessment Moderation.** The process by which summative assessment is reviewed prior to it being provided to students to ensure it has been rigorously and appropriately designed, taking account of the agreed module learning outcomes, marking criteria and the importance of clarity for students.
- (7) **Post-Assessment Moderation.** The process by which the University ensures that summative assessments have been marked in an academically rigorous manner and that assessment criteria have been applied appropriately. It is not a mechanism to resolve differences between markers or to make changes to individual student's marks.

4. Responsibility for Assessment

4.1 The Senate of QMU and Academic Council of BMU have responsibility for the following, in relation to their respective awards:

- (1) the development of assessment regulations and policy;
- (2) monitoring the use of these regulations and policy;
- (3) periodically reviewing and revising these regulations and policy.

4.2 The Dean of School at QMU and the Rector of BMU have responsibility for the following, in relation to their respective awards:

- (1) ensuring that programmes conform to these regulations and policy;
- (2) ensuring that assessment processes are secure;
- (3) reflecting on student performance in assessment;
- (4) supporting staff to implement these regulations and policy.



- 4.3 The joint Board of Examiners is responsible for making decisions on award and progression and ensuring that all students are treated fairly and consistently under these regulations. Decisions of the joint Board of Examiners will be reported to the Senate of QMU and the Academic Council of BMU. No student will receive an award or the award of academic credit from QMU without the approval of QMU's Senate. No student will receive an award or the award of academic credit from BMU without the approval of BMU's Academic Council.
- 4.4 The External Examiner is responsible to attend and make recommendations to the joint Board of Examiners relating to the awards of degrees (including borderline cases), diplomas and certificates or the confirmation of results for stand-alone modules. Where there is a reconvened Board of Examiners to reconsider, for example, the result of an appeal, attendance is not required. The External Examiner should, however, be consulted about, and make their views known on, any proposed amendment to the classification.
- 4.5 Programme Leaders are responsible for the quality of assessment across programmes. They are responsible for monitoring the outcomes of assessment and reporting these outcomes to the Associate Dean on Teaching and Learning at BMU and to QMU, through the annual programme monitoring report.
- 4.6 Academic staff carry out their teaching responsibilities under the authority of the Rector. The Module Co-ordinators have responsibilities:
- (1) to assess students' work fairly, objectively and consistently;
 - (2) to equally distribute students' papers for marking among Team members, when working in a Module Team;
 - (3) to ensure students are provided with appropriate, helpful and explanatory feedback on all work submitted for assessment;
 - (4) to make reasonable accommodation (e.g., length of time to complete) in assessment tasks and examinations for students with special requirements;
 - (5) to ensure deadlines for the submission of examination papers and results to the Registrar are met;
 - (6) to immediately report to the Registrar's Office any instances of student cheating, collusion and/or plagiarism.
- 4.7 Students have responsibilities:
- (1) to familiarise themselves with the University policy on assessment and examinations;
 - (2) to ensure they read and understand the assessment requirements and note the submission dates, and seek assistance from the lecturer (if necessary);
 - (3) to notify relevant staff as soon as possible prior to, or at the beginning of, the teaching session if they wish to have special requirements accommodated;
 - (4) to submit for assessment their own individual and unassisted work, except as otherwise permitted, and understand that cheating, plagiarism, fabrication or falsification of data will be severely dealt with, see Academic Misconduct Policy;
 - (5) to behave ethically and appropriately, avoiding any action or behaviour which would unfairly disadvantage or advantage another student;
 - (6) to ensure that they understand the requirements, including timetables, for examinations and other assessments tasks;
 - (7) to provide evidence, in advance of the Board of Examiners, of any extenuating circumstances.
- 4.8 Academic staff of QMU are responsible for:
- (1) Approving assessment instruments in line with QMU policy;



- (2) Moderating a sample of assessments as agreed by the School Academic Board
- 4.9 The Registrar's Office is responsible for the maintenance and retention of records of all provisional marks. The Registrar's Office will also maintain a central archive of approved final marks in relation to the BMU award.
- 4.10 The Academic Administration Team at QMU is responsible for the maintenance and retention of student records and marks in relation to the QMU award. The Academic Administration Team will also produce paperwork for Boards of Examiners and issue final transcripts and certificates for the QMU award.

5. Assessment System

- 5.1 Assessment must:
- (1) be effective in encouraging a high standard and depth of learning;
 - (2) be authentic and reliable;
 - (3) be consistent in level and challenge across comparable modules;
 - (4) support equality, diversity and inclusion;
 - (5) focus on attainment in an area of learning rather than on the accumulation of marks;
- and
- (6) encourage reflection on feedback.
- 5.2 Assessment and learning should be integrated and therefore, assessment must be designed to align with and assess the specified learning outcomes for the module and the programme. Assessment criteria should therefore be directly related to learning outcomes, and along with broader information relevant to instruction and regulation, must be transparent and explicit for all assessments.
- 5.3 The module descriptor specifies the relative assessment pattern, including weightings across components. The assessment pattern must be based on the intended learning outcomes of that module.
- 5.4 At the commencement of each module the Module Co-ordinator must advise the enrolled students of the form of the assessment and the timing of the components which make up the assessment. This will be consistent with the overall framework established for the programme's assessment, as specified in the module descriptors.
- 5.5 The assessment load should be as light as is compatible with providing adequate opportunity for students to:
- a. engage in formative exercises to develop as learners;
 - b. demonstrate achievement of the relevant learning outcomes;
 - c. recover from occasional poor performance.
- 5.6 At the start of each programme, Programme Leaders will refer students to the assessment regulations for the programme governing progression and award, and of any changes thereto.



Part B: Marking, Progression, and Award

6. Module Marks and Grades

- 6.1 This section of the policy is designed to ensure consistency of meaning and application of grades across the University and to ensure quality assurance in regard to assessment standards and grades awarded.
- 6.2 The University is committed to preserving the confidentiality of personal information and therefore in all discussions of student performance and public notices of achievement it seeks to avoid the identification of individual students. In all records and public notices of marks and awards students will be identified only by ID number.
- 6.3 A student who submits a late assessment (within 24 hours after the deadline) will be penalised by 20%, or to a minimum pass mark of 40% if the original mark was 59% or less. Assessments submitted more than 24 hours later than the deadline will not be accepted, and will receive a score of 0.
- 6.4 A piece of written work which exceeds the specified word limit by 10% or more will receive a maximum mark of 40%. The number of words counted should include all the text, references and quotations used in the text, but should exclude abstracts, supplements to the text, diagrams, appendices, reference lists and bibliographies.
- 6.5 The University draws upon the following Grading Standards for both undergraduate and postgraduate subjects:

Grade	Mark	Corresponding level in an Honours degree classification
A*	80%-100%	First class
A	70%-79.9%	First class
B	60-69.9%	Upper second
C	50-59.9%	Lower second
D	40-49.9%	Third class
E	30-39.9%	Fail
F	0-29.9%	Fail

7. Award

- 7.1 To gain an undergraduate award, a student must normally be a registered student at the University for at least one academic year.
- 7.2 To qualify for the following awards the student must fulfil the subject specific requirements for the name of the award and also:

Award	Required Credits
Cert HE	120 credit points of which a minimum of 100 are at SCQF Level 7 ² or higher
Dip HE	240 credit points of which a minimum of 100 are at SCQF Level 8 or higher
Degree	360 credit points of which a minimum of 100 are at

² See Level Mapping below.



	SCQF Level 9 or higher
QMU Honours Degree BMU Undergraduate Degree	480 credit points of which a minimum of 220 are at SCQF Level 9 and 10, including at least 100 at level 10
QMU Masters Degree BMU Masters Degree	180 credit points of which a minimum of 160 are at SCQF Level 11 and no credits below SCQF Level 10

- 7.3 Students may take credits from level directly above or directly below subject to the guidance set out above and as defined in relevant documentation.
- 7.4 Ten SCQF Credits are equivalent to five European Credits (ECTS) therefore 120 SCQF credits equal 60 ECTS.
- 7.5 The classification of the award of the Degree with Honours will be based on the marks obtained at SCQF Level 9 (20%) and SCQF Level 10 (80%). Weighted aggregate scores will be rounded to one decimal place. The classification will be based upon the average mark obtained by combining the weighted results of all modules studied at levels 9 and 10. Any modules undertaken below level 9 and any modules taken whilst on an exchange arrangement will not be counted towards the Honours calculation.
- 7.6 Where a student has accumulated more than 120 credits at SCQF level 10, a maximum of 120 credits will be counted at level 10 for the purpose of the Honours calculation. All core modules at level 10 will count towards the Honours classification. The optional modules in which the student achieved the highest marks will be included in the calculation of the Honours classification. Additional optional modules at level 10 with lower marks will be counted towards SCQF level 9.
- 70 and above First Class
≥60% and <70% Second Class: Upper division
≥50% and <60% Second Class: Lower division
≥40% and <50% Third Class
- 7.7 The award of an Ordinary Degree can include an award with distinction, in cases where the average mark for the 120 credits (or equivalent) at SCQF level 9 or above is 65% or higher. Any modules undertaken below level 9 and any modules taken whilst on an exchange arrangement will not be counted towards the distinction calculation.
- 7.8 Where a student is admitted to the University in the final year the classification will be based entirely on grades achieved during that year of studies.
- 7.9 Where a student is admitted to a level and given additional credit at that level gained externally, the grades from that credit may contribute to the classification where the credit is at the appropriate level and where marks are available. Otherwise, the classification will be based on grades gained entirely within the University. Any modules taken whilst on an exchange arrangement will not be counted towards the classification.
- 8. Decision on award classifications and distinctions in borderline cases (undergraduate degrees)**
- 8.1 All weighted average marks falling 0.5 per cent or less below the classification or distinction boundary are automatically reclassified at the higher level.
- 8.2 All weighted average marks falling between 0.6 per cent and two percent below the classification or distinction boundary are deemed borderline cases.



- 8.3 For Honours degrees the final classification is determined by the marks across all SCQF Level 10 credits. Borderline cases where any 60 or more credits (core or elective modules) are achieved in the classification above the boundary will be awarded the higher classification of degree.
- 8.4 For Ordinary degrees the final award is determined by the marks across SCQF Level 9 credits. Borderline cases where any 60 or more credits (core or elective modules) are achieved in the distinction category (65% or above) will be awarded the degree with distinction.
- 8.5 Additional viva voce examinations should not be used in the consideration of borderline cases.

9. Decision on an award in absence of complete assessment information

- 9.1 The Board of Examiners has discretion to make an award in the absence of complete assessment information where it is established to the satisfaction of the Board that:
- (1) such absence is due to a valid documented cause, which would include, but not be limited to, a student's illness;
 - (2) there is enough evidence of the student's achievement at the level at which they are being examined, which would normally equate to two thirds of the assessable work at that level, or evidence is subsequently obtained.
- 9.2 Where the Board of Examiners uses its discretion to make an award in the absence of complete assessment information, the justification for this action should be included in the minutes of the meeting.
- 9.3 Awards may be recommended with or without Honours or distinction as appropriate. In order to reach such a decision, the Board of Examiners may assess the candidate by any appropriate and reasonable means. Any such assessment will for the purpose of these regulations be deemed a first assessment.
- 9.4 The Board of Examiners has a duty to gain as much information about the candidate's ability and performance as possible before making decisions.
- 9.5 Decisions made in the absence of complete information must aim to ensure consistency of standard and equality of opportunity for the student under consideration as compared with his/her peers. The student must not be put in a position of unfair advantage over other candidates for the award.

10. Withdrawing from a module and transfer between modules

- 10.1 A student withdrawing from a module up to the point at which 25% of the taught duration of the module has been delivered may provide the Module Co-ordinator with a written explanation of reasons for withdrawal. If the Module Co-ordinator accepts these as valid reasons, the student will suffer no academic penalty, i.e., the withdrawal will not count as a fail. The student will receive a transcript showing them as withdrawn and will receive no credit.
- 10.2 A student withdrawing from a module after 25% of the taught duration will be recorded as a "fail".
- 10.3 A student wishing to transfer from one elective module to another will normally be permitted to do so within the first 25% of the taught duration of the module subject to the consent of both Module Co-ordinators. Only exceptionally will students be permitted to transfer between elective modules after this period.



11. Decisions on Student Progression

- 11.1 Student progression from one level of the programme to the next is at the discretion of the Board of Examiners taking into account the student's performance in all modules and the amount of academic credit accrued during the year.
- 11.2 The Board of Examiners is responsible for determining:
- (1) whether the student remains in registration;
 - (2) the conditions governing the student's progression;
 - (3) the award for which the student is eligible.
- 11.3 The Board of Examiners may condone one failed 20 credit module per level at the first attempt for students at SCQF level 7 and 8 of an undergraduate programme, provided that a minimum overall mark of at least 37% has been achieved in the failed module and no individual component of assessment within the module falls below the minimum compensation level of 30%. The result will show as a condoned fail on the academic transcript and the student will be given credit for the module. Students who have failed more than 20 credits must undertake reassessments of all failed modules in the first instance. Once reassessment results are known, condonement may still be applied to one 20 credit module, provided that a minimum overall mark of at least 37% has been achieved in the failed module and no individual component of assessment within the module falls below the minimum compensation level and the student has no further failed modules on their profile.
- 11.4 Programme specific regulations may exempt some modules from eligibility for condonement.
- 11.5 A condoned fail will not affect any subsequent module selections.
- 11.6 Decisions on a student's continued registration will be made at the end of each academic year, after reassessment results are known. The Board of Examiners will take account of the following guidelines in making their decisions.
- 11.7 For undergraduate full-time students:
- (1) Pass modules to a total of 160 credits – continue in registration as a full-time student.
 - (2) Pass modules to a total of 100 credits but less than 160 credits – continue in registration with a personal learning plan, agreed in consultation with the Programme Leader. No student may be registered on more than 160 credits in the academic year, including outstanding modules that require to be retrieved. Programme Leaders will aim to construct a programme that does not delay the student unduly.
 - (3) Exceptionally, where there are extenuating circumstances, and a student has only 20 credits outstanding, provisional progression may be allowed subject to successful completion of an early retrieval. This regulation is intended to support students carrying forward modules and not to facilitate completion of studies in a shorter time than the usual minimum period of registration or to allow students to undertake additional optional modules in an academic session.
 - (4) A student who fails more than 60 credits at the second attempt, and who does not present evidence of extenuating circumstances, will be required to withdraw from the programme.
- 11.8 The only decisions available to the Board of Examiners on progress and award shall be:
- (1) Continue – passed all assessments;
 - (2) Required to be reassessed in the failed module(s) before continuing;
 - (3) Continue – but required to be reassessed in the failed/deferred module(s) in next academic year;
 - (4) Offered opportunity to repeat the entire level in next academic year before continuing;



- (5) No reassessment allowed – required to withdraw from course;
- (6) Decision deferred – outstanding assessments as a first attempt;
- (7) Decision deferred – outstanding reassessments;
- (8) Recommendation to Progression Board for specific awards.

11.9 Undergraduate programmes of study are designed on four levels, normally corresponding with Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework levels 7, 8, 9 and 10, with conceptual and material progression being designed into the structure from level to level. Thus, it is expected that students will progress from level to level, and the structure of the programme and the timetables are developed accordingly. Although the above regulations may allow a full-time student to stay in full-time registration albeit without a completed level of study, it may not be possible to construct a programme around the timetable available which is academically coherent and which makes best advantage of the student's time. In most cases students will be expected and advised but not required to complete a level of study before progressing to the next level.

Part C: Assessment Regulations

12. Assessment of a Module

- 12.1 To pass an undergraduate module, a student must obtain at least 40% overall, and at least 30% in each component of assessment unless otherwise specified in the programme document or module descriptor. This regulation applies to the first attempt at the module only. Regulations for reassessment of modules are detailed below.
- 12.2 Where a student has achieved an overall mark of 40% or above but has fallen below the minimum permitted mark in an individual component, this will be shown as a qualifying fail on the academic transcript with a grade of Q.
- 12.3 Where a student is reassessed in an undergraduate module at a second attempt, the maximum mark that can be achieved for the module is 40%.
- 12.4 The nature and extent of the failure will not affect the student's right to be reassessed.

13. Conduct of Assessments

- 13.1 All assessments must be conducted in line with University regulations, policy and procedure.
- 13.2 The Academic Misconduct Policy sets out the expectations of students and staff in respect of academic integrity and the procedure to be followed where it is suspected that a piece of work submitted by a student for assessment may demonstrate academic misconduct.

14. Submission and Collection of Assessment Materials

- 14.1 Clear guidance should be given in module information provided by the Module Co-ordinator on the process by which assignments are to be submitted. The Module Co-ordinator should keep a dated record of all assignments received.
- 14.2 Each Module Co-ordinator sets the mode of assessment submission (electronic, hard copy, or both). Course works, reports, final projects, dissertations and alike must be submitted through anti-plagiarism software – Turnitin.
- 14.3 Students are entitled to receive marks and feedback on all assessments in order that the assessment exercise may perform an educative function. Clear guidance should be given in module descriptor on the process by which feedback on submitted work is returned to



students. With the exception of final projects, feedback should always be returned within 15 working days of submission.

- 14.4 Students are entitled to an explanation of how the mark awarded for their work relates to the relevant assessment criteria.

15. Transcripts

- 15.1 The student's assessment record or academic transcript shall specify for each module taken:

- (1) the title;
- (2) the credit points and the level;
- (3) the academic year in which most recently taken;
- (4) the grade and mark most recently obtained;
- (5) the name of the University together with, if appropriate, the name of any other institution sharing responsibility for the student's programme of study or research;
- (6) the location of study;
- (7) the language of instruction/assessment;
- (8) decision on progress/award.

- 15.2 Academic transcripts are issued following the Board of Examiners. They are issued on secure paper to exiting students.

16. Pre-Assessment Moderation

- 16.1 The purpose of pre-assessment moderation is to ensure that:

- (1) summative assessment is appropriately designed, in an academically rigorous manner with reference to the agreed module learning outcomes and marking criteria;
- (2) the assessment question(s) and instructions are clear and unambiguous;
- (3) students can be provided with assurance in relation to the design of their assessments.

- 16.2 Pre-assessment moderation takes place *before* the summative assessment is released to students.

- 16.3 Pre-assessment moderator is expected to have experience of teaching and learning and have relevant subject knowledge. Moderator needs not be involved in the delivery of the relevant module, but where detailed subject knowledge is essential to determine the suitability of an assessment, then the use of staff teaching on a module is appropriate.

- 16.4 Pre-assessment moderation should take place on the basis of: this policy; the stated assessment, the grading standards; and the module descriptor, including the learning outcomes, and should consider whether:

- (1) The assessment(s) design is appropriate and tests the stated module learning outcomes at the appropriate level; and
- (2) The assessment's question(s) and instructions are clear and unambiguous.

17. Moderation

- 17.1 The post-assessment moderation process ensures that (first and second) marking is consistently robust and undertaken appropriately in line with assessment criteria on a module. The aims of post-assessment moderation are to:

- (1) ensure a module has been marked in line with the stated assessment criteria;
- (2) ensure internal consistency and fairness of assessment within a module;



- (3) provide assurance for students of fairness and equality of grading.
- 17.2 All elements of assessments for Honours projects (or equivalent) must be blind double-marked for the whole cohort.
- 17.3 All summative assessments for undergraduate and postgraduate programmes that are not blind-double marked must be moderated on a sampling basis as a means of verifying the accuracy of marking. The size of the sample to be moderated must be at least the square root of the total number of students (rounded to the nearest whole number) taking the assessment plus all borderline fails (those that are within 2% below the pass mark). The sample should include a range of performance and the minimum size should be six pieces of assessed work.
- 17.4 QMU reserves the right to moderate the same sample of work. Normally all modules will be moderated by QMU until such time as the QMU School Academic Board deems that this support is no longer required.
- 17.5 Moderators must be provided with the following information:
- (1) The module descriptor;
 - (2) The assessment question(s) as provided to the students and any accompanying guidance;
 - (3) The marking criteria used;
 - (4) The marks of all students on the module to enable them to see the spread of marks across the module; and
 - (5) For each piece of written work, a copy of the feedback supplied by the original marker to the student.
- 17.6 In undertaking post-assessment moderation, the moderator is not permitted to suggest amendments to any individual student mark, they may only make recommendations on the sample as a whole or parts thereof.

18. Notification of Results

- 18.1 Official results in relation to the BMU award will be released by the Registrar's Office at the direction of the Rector after being officially endorsed by the Board of Examiners.
- 18.2 Assessment grades and marks will be available to students by accessing the online student record system.
- 18.3 Official results in relation to the QMU award will be released by the QMU Academic Administration Team following confirmation by the Board of Examiners. Results will be released via the online student portal.

19. Reassessment

- 19.1 Reassessment means the opportunity to be reassessed in an assessment component which has been failed. The timing of the reassessment is at the discretion of the Board of Examiners but must allow the student sufficient time to prepare. Normally reassessment (as a second attempt) happens within the same academic year or shortly thereafter.
- 19.2 A student will be permitted a maximum of three attempts at any module.
- 19.3 The Board of Examiners may at its discretion allow an undergraduate student to be re-assessed in up to 80 credits in any one academic year.
- 19.4 A student who requires to be re-assessed in more than 80 credits will be required to withdraw from the programme, unless they have extenuating circumstances.
- 19.5 A candidate for reassessment is not entitled to be reassessed in components that are no longer part of the programme. Board of Examiners may, at its discretion, make such special



- arrangements as it deems suitable in cases where it is inappropriate for students to be reassessed in the same components, or by the same methods as at the first attempt.
- 19.6 All second attempt assessments shall normally take place before the commencement of the next session of the programme. They should be late enough to allow the students time to prepare themselves, and to avoid overload of assessment shall normally take place in the summer/autumn. Students cannot request an extraordinary exam sitting.
- 19.7 A student who is reassessed for a module failure in an undergraduate module, where there are no clear extenuating circumstances, shall be awarded no more than 40% on passing the reassessment. A student who is reassessed for a module failure in a postgraduate module, where there are no clear extenuating circumstances, shall be awarded no more than 50% on passing the reassessment.
- 19.8 All reassessment results shall be based only upon performance in reassessments; no marks may be carried forward from a student's first attempt at the assessments. To pass an undergraduate module at reassessment, a student must achieve at least 30% in each reassessed component and a weighted average of at least 40%.
- 19.9 A student who has been absent from an assessment, or who has performed badly due to illness or other cause, shall be allowed to take the assessment, and it shall be treated as a first assessment, subject to the reason for absence or poor performance being acceptable to the Board of Examiners.
- 20. Extenuating Circumstances (EC Claim)**
- 20.1 The University recognises that there will be circumstances beyond a student's control which may impact adversely on their performance. Under such circumstances, a student has a right to fill in the Extenuating Circumstances form. Please, refer to Extenuating Circumstances Procedure for a detailed information.

Revision History

Version	Approved by	Approval Date	Description of Change
1	Academic Council	April 12 th , 2023	This policy should be reviewed in June 2024

Rector Conrad Ożóg



Level Mapping

BMU Level	SCQF Level
Foundation	Level 6
Degree Year 1	Level 7 + Level 8
Degree Year 2	Level 8 + Level 9
Degree Year 3	Level 9 + Level 10

Grade Descriptors

Undergraduate Descriptors

Approved by the University Academic Council on 22 February 2023

Applicable to all new and existing modules being delivered from September 2023 onwards

Grade A* 80% and above

Outstanding performance, exceptionally able – pass

- Articulates an outstanding understanding and interpretation of the relevant information, key theories and concepts presented by the assessment
- Demonstrates outstanding knowledge of appropriate reading through extensive references to appropriate scholarly sources
- Shows outstanding problem solving, creativity, originality, critical thinking, analysis and evaluation Presents outstanding discussion in a logical, connected and progressing structure, and valid conclusions
- Displays an outstanding ability to appraise evidence and synthesise concepts, knowledge and theory
- Shows an outstanding reflexive awareness of value judgements and assumptions embedded in the subject or discipline

Grade A 70-79.9%

Excellent performance – pass

- Articulates an excellent understanding and interpretation of the relevant information, key theories and concepts presented by the assessment
- Demonstrates an excellent knowledge of appropriate reading through frequent references to appropriate scholarly sources
- Shows excellent problem solving, creativity, originality, critical thinking, analysis and evaluation
- Presents excellent discussion in a logical, connected and progressing structure, and valid conclusions
- Displays an excellent ability to appraise evidence and synthesise concepts, knowledge and theory
- Shows excellent reflexive awareness of value judgements and assumptions embedded in the subject or discipline



Grade B 60-69.9%

Very good performance – pass

- Articulates a very good understanding and interpretation of the relevant information, key theories and concepts presented by the assessment
- Demonstrates a very good knowledge of appropriate reading through references to appropriate scholarly sources
- Shows very good problem solving, creativity, originality, critical thinking, analysis and evaluation
- Presents very good discussion in a logical, connected and progressing structure, and valid conclusions
- Displays a very good ability to appraise evidence and synthesise concepts, knowledge and theory Shows very good reflexive awareness of value judgements and assumptions embedded in the subject or discipline

Grade C 50-59.9%

Good performance – pass

- Articulates a good understanding and interpretation of the relevant information, key theories and concepts presented by the assessment
- Demonstrates good knowledge of appropriate reading through some references to appropriate scholarly sources
- Shows good problem solving, creativity, originality, critical thinking, analysis and evaluation
- Presents a good discussion in a logical, connected and progressing structure, and valid conclusions Displays a good ability to appraise evidence and synthesise concepts, knowledge and theory
- Shows a good reflexive awareness of value judgements and assumptions embedded in the subject or discipline

Grade D 40-49.9%

Satisfactory Performance – pass

- Articulates a satisfactory understanding and interpretation of the relevant information, key theories and concepts presented by the assessment
- Demonstrates satisfactory knowledge of appropriate reading through some references to appropriate scholarly sources
- Shows satisfactory problem solving, creativity, originality, critical thinking, analysis and evaluation
- Presents a satisfactory discussion in a logical, connected and progressing structure, and valid conclusions
- Displays a satisfactory ability to appraise evidence and synthesise concepts, knowledge and theory
- Shows satisfactory reflexive awareness of value judgements and assumptions embedded in the subject or discipline

Grade E 30-39.9%

Unsatisfactory performance – fail

- Articulates partial understanding and interpretation of the relevant information, key theories and concepts presented by the assessment



- Demonstrates partial knowledge of appropriate reading through limited references to appropriate scholarly sources
- Shows insufficient problem solving, creativity, originality, critical thinking, analysis and evaluation
- Presents limited discussion of logical, connected and progressing structure with incomplete conclusions
- Displays a limited ability to appraise evidence and synthesise concepts, knowledge and theory
- Shows insufficient reflexive awareness of value judgements and assumptions embedded in the subject or discipline

Grade F 0-29.9%

Unsatisfactory performance- fail

- Articulates little or no understanding and interpretation of the relevant information, key theories and concepts presented by the assessment
- Demonstrates little or no knowledge of appropriate reading or references to appropriate scholarly sources
- Shows ineffective or no problem solving, creativity, originality, critical thinking, analysis and evaluation
- Presents ineffective or no discussion of logical, connected and progressing structure with incomplete conclusions
- Displays little or no ability to appraise evidence and synthesise concepts, knowledge and theory
- Shows little or no reflexive awareness of value judgements and assumptions embedded in the subject or discipline



Policy Title	Academic Misconduct Policy
Version	№ 3
Effective Date:	
Approved by:	Academic Council
Scope:	University wide
Purpose:	To provide students with a policy on academic integrity

1. Academic Integrity

- 1.1 British Management University considers academic integrity to be essential for students' intellectual development. Incidents of academic dishonesty can hinder the free exchange of ideas and seriously damage the reputation of the institution.
- 1.2 The University requires all students, faculty and staff to accept responsibility to pursue academic research and learning in an honest and ethical manner. All behaviour that leads to academic dishonesty is strictly forbidden.

2. Zero Tolerance Policy

- 2.1 The University has a "zero tolerance" policy for all forms of academic dishonesty. Zero tolerance applies to all types of formative and summative assessments, which includes, but is not limited to homework tasks, quizzes, courseworks, presentations, midterm exams, and final exams.
- 2.2 Zero tolerance also applies to admission tests.
- 2.3 Zero tolerance applies to faculty members as well as to students. It is expected that faculty members lead by example.

3. Scope

- 3.1 This policy applies to all students enrolled on undergraduate and taught postgraduate programmes at British Management University. It covers academic misconduct in any form of assessment including written examinations, assessed coursework (in whatever form the coursework might take) and oral/practical assessments.

4. Principles

- 4.1 Academic integrity is the basis for ethical decision-making and behaviour in an academic context. This is reflected in norms of acceptable academic practice and is informed by the values of honesty, trust, responsibility, fairness, respect and courage.
- 4.2 The University endeavours to ensure that all policies, procedures and guidance relevant to academic integrity are clear, accessible and actively promoted.
- 4.3 The University will work with students to strive towards early achievement of academic integrity. We recognise that students who are new to higher education will need some time to achieve this goal. For these early stages this policy reflects the intention to address poor academic practice through pedagogical, formative approaches.
- 4.4 The University will support students so that they can take responsibility in the process of familiarisation with the rules governing assessment including conduct in examinations and the correct academic conventions for referencing and acknowledging the work of others.
- 4.5 Ultimately, it is the student's responsibility to avoid infringements of regulations and policies and to ensure that they have behaved with academic integrity. Ignorance of this policy cannot be used to excuse infringements.
- 4.6 The University will act on all identified infringements of this policy whether inadvertently or through negligence or deliberate intent.
- 4.7 The University expects that all work submitted for assessment by students is the student's own work, without falsification of any kind.



- 4.8 Allegations of academic misconduct will be treated in the strictest confidence. No student will be recorded, or referred to, as having committed an academic misconduct offence until the full process has been completed and the allegation proven.

5. Good Academic Practice

- 5.1 Key aspects of good academic practice include:
- acknowledging the ideas of others through appropriate referencing and citation;
 - meeting expectations about ethical behaviour;
 - fulfilling confidentiality requirements in particular subjects;
 - understanding the permitted boundaries between individual and group contributions.
- 5.2 Students are expected to offer their own analysis and presentation of information gleaned from research, even when group exercises are carried out. Insofar as students rely on sources, they should reference these in accordance with the appropriate convention in their discipline.

6. Definition of Poor Academic Practice

- 6.1 Poor academic practice can be defined as poor scholarship resulting from an individual's lack of knowledge, understanding and practice of the skills required to be academically literate.
- 6.2 For the purposes of this policy the understanding of poor academic practice is based on the following considerations:
- A student in their early stages of HE (Foundation and Degree Year 2) may not have gained the knowledge and skills to demonstrate standards of good academic practice.
 - Instances of unintended plagiarism, or collusion, as defined below, that occur at the early stages of a student's studies can normally be considered as poor academic practice.
 - A student who shows intent to meet good academic practice, but fails in its execution, can be considered to show poor academic practice.
 - A student who shows limited intent to meet good academic practice in spite of having had adequate prior teaching, or as a repeat instance, can be deemed to show academic misconduct.
- 6.3 Addressing cases of poor academic practice requires supportive, constructive and pedagogical approaches by programme teams and members of the learning support services, working with the active participation of the student.

7. Definition of Academic Misconduct

- 7.1 The University defines academic misconduct as "Any action by a student which gives or has the potential to give an unfair advantage in an examination or assessment, or might assist someone else to gain an unfair advantage, or any activity likely to undermine the integrity essential to scholarship and research."
- 7.2 Academic misconduct typically falls under one of the following headings:
- Plagiarism;
 - Collusion;
 - Contract Cheating;
 - Cheating;
 - Unauthorised Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI);
 - Failure to have ethical approval.

8. Plagiarism

- 8.1 Plagiarism is defined as the presentation of another person's work or ideas as the student's own, without proper acknowledgement. This could be in direct copy or close paraphrase.



- 8.2 In the context of the policy, another person's work or ideas includes text, images (graphics, illustrations or photographs), designs, computer code, diagrams, data and formulae or any other representation of ideas (written, visual or oral) in print, electronic or other media, and may be from any published or unpublished source including books, journals, newspapers, the internet, programme handouts or another student's work.
- 8.3 Plagiarism can occur in examinations and/or coursework assessment which may take a variety of forms including, but not limited to, essays, reports, presentations, dissertations and projects.
- 8.4 The reproduction of a student's own previously submitted work, without acknowledgement, is regarded as self-plagiarism and will be treated in the same way as any other form of plagiarism.
- 8.5 Cases of potential plagiarism may be dealt with by the Viva Voce Procedure. Please, refer to Annex I for more information.
- 8.6 Guidance on sources of evidence to evaluate cases of suspected plagiarism is set out in Appendix III.

9. Collusion

- 9.1 Collusion is the unauthorised co-operation between at least two people, normally with the intent to deceive. It can take the following forms:
- the conspiring by two or more students to produce a piece of work together with the intention that at least one passes it off as their own work;
 - the willing provision of work or examination questions and/or answers by one student to another student where it should be evident to the student providing the work that by so doing an advantage could be gained by the other student. In this case both students are guilty of collusion;
 - the unauthorised co-operation between a student and another person in the preparation and production of work which is presented as the student's own work.
- 9.2 Cases of potential collusion may be dealt with by the Viva Voce Procedure. Please, refer to Annex I for more information.
- 9.3 Guidance on sources of evidence to evaluate cases of suspected collusion is set out in Appendix III.

10. Contract Cheating

- 10.1 Contract cheating is the commissioning and submission of work as the student's own where the student has paid or solicited another person to produce the work on the student's behalf.
- 10.2 Contract cheating can also include sections of work that are improved by third parties, either for payment or for free.
- 10.3 While the use of proofreading services to help students identify deficiencies in their work does not constitute contract cheating, students must retain ownership of their work, and allowing third parties such as proof-readers to edit the work themselves could be deemed as contract cheating.
- 10.4 Cases of potential contract cheating may be dealt with by the Viva Voce Procedure. Please, refer to Annex I for more information.
- 10.5 Guidance on sources of evidence to evaluate cases of suspected contract cheating are set out in Appendix III.

11. Cheating

- 11.1 Cheating includes any behaviour which the student would reasonably know would interfere with the fair operation of the assessment process and could gain unfair advantage, such as:



- any transgression of the University's examination room rules, as set out in the BMU Examination Rules;
- obtaining or seeking to obtain access to examination papers prior to an examination;
- behaviour in a manner likely to prejudice the chances of another student in an assessment;
- offering a bribe or inducement to invigilators, examiners or other persons connected with the assessments;
- being party to an arrangement whereby a person other than the student would fraudulently represent them at an assessment;
- submitting a fraudulent claim for extenuating circumstances.

12. Unauthorised Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI)

12.1 Unauthorised use of AI is when a student presents the output of an artificial intelligence technology (for instance, a large language model (LLM) or paraphrasing application) as their own work. This does not apply to assessments which specifically permit or encourage the use of such tools.

13. Failure to have ethical approval

13.1 Failure to have ethical approval includes instances where students embark on research activities which require ethical approval without that approval being formally granted. It is the student's responsibility to apply for ethical approval and to seek clarification on whether ethical approval is required if unsure.

14. Process for Dealing with Cases of Examination Cheating

14.1 Where an invigilator suspects a student of infringing examination rules or any other requirements relating to the conduct of the examination, they shall take the appropriate action as detailed in the Examination Rules.

14.2 A report of the incident should be provided to the Registrar Exam Officer, who will refer the case to the Academic Misconduct Committee.

15. Process for Dealing with Suspected Cases of Academic Misconduct (Stage 1)

15.1 All potential instances of poor academic practice or academic misconduct will require action.

15.2 The Module Co-ordinator must report all suspected infringements, other than exam cheating instances, to the Programme Leader for consideration before any allegation of academic misconduct is put to the student.

15.3 It is the responsibility of the person identifying the suspected infringement to clearly set out the nature of their suspicions and provide supporting evidence showing how and where the suspected infringement has taken place.

15.4 Where a marker suspects an infringement, they will, if appropriate, note on the student's work the nature of the alleged offence and report their concerns to the Module Co-ordinator.

16. Consideration by the Programme Leader

16.1 Upon receipt of any reports of suspected infringement, the Programme Leader will consider the evidence provided and decide how to proceed.

16.2 It is important for the Academic Staff to be aware that in some instances, particularly in the early stages of a module, it will not always be appropriate to proceed to a formal allegation. In particular, if the assessed work, or student's conduct, can be considered as poor academic practice then it should not normally be considered as a potential case of academic misconduct. The Academic Staff should also satisfy themselves that the student has



been given appropriate advice on attributing sources and the production of bibliographies prior to assessment.

16.3 In considering second or subsequent instances of poor academic practice, the Programme Leader may decide to proceed to a formal allegation, however:

- Concurrent instances of infringements should be treated as one instance;
- Repeat infringements may still be treated as poor academic practice if the student has not had sufficient time to engage with academic support;
- Repeat infringements can be deemed to be academic misconduct if:
 - the student has failed to engage with academic support, or
 - the principle of unfair advantage is breached.

16.4 Having reviewed the evidence, the Programme Leader will decide that either:

- no offence has been committed;
- there is insufficient evidence of an offence;
- no offence has been committed but there is evidence of poor academic practice; or
- there is sufficient evidence of academic misconduct.

16.5 Records should be maintained, in line with University Data Protection Policy requirements, to enable the identification and monitoring of students who have been judged to have demonstrated poor academic practice. These records will be made available to the relevant Assessment Board.

17. Actions if no offence has been deemed to have been committed

17.1 If the Programme Leader decides that no offence has taken place, or that there is insufficient evidence of an offence, they shall request the marker to consider the work on its academic merits and mark it in accordance with the assessment criteria. They may also recommend that the student is made aware of the concerns and offered further support and guidance to avoid any similar concerns about their academic practice in future. This advice, along with details of where to go for further support, should be given to the student with the feedback on their assessment. No further action will be taken with the student.

17.2 If the Programme Leader decides that the case constitutes poor academic practice, they shall:

- a. request the marker to consider the work on its academic merits;
- b. ensure that the feedback to the student identifies their poor academic practice and how this can be addressed; and
- c. issue the student with an informal warning about their academic practice and require them to engage with Academic Success Centre.

18. Actions if academic misconduct deemed to have been committed

18.1 If the Programme Leader decides that there is sufficient evidence that an offence may have been committed, they instruct the Module Co-ordinator to proceed to a formal allegation.

18.2 To proceed to a formal allegation, the Module Co-ordinator should:

- a. complete the Allegation of Academic Misconduct form with the following information:
 - the student's name, ID number, level of study and programme details;
 - module details, including information about the weighting of the component of assessment;
 - the formal allegation to be put to the student;
 - a summary of the alleged offence.
- b. collate the relevant supporting evidence, with the assistance of the Registrar. This may include:
 - a report of the incident, where relevant;



- a copy of the original script marked with the allegedly plagiarised passages or passages where there is suspected collusion;
- a copy of source material marked with passages which have allegedly been plagiarised or where there is suspected collusion;
- a copy of the plagiarism detection software report, where relevant;
- a copy of the instructions given to the student regarding the component of assessment and a copy of the referencing instructions given to the student where relevant;
- any other evidence to support the allegation. Where an allegation of collusion implicates more than one student, a single allegation of Academic Misconduct form should be completed including details of each student.

18.3 The completed Allegation of Academic Misconduct form and supporting documentation should be submitted by the Registrar's Office to the Academic Misconduct Committee for the formal allegation to be put to the student.

18.4 Following notification to the student of an allegation by Academic Misconduct Committee, the Module Co-ordinator is responsible for ensuring the student is provided with support to enable them to understand the allegation and respond appropriately.

19. Process for Dealing with Suspected Cases of Academic Misconduct (Stage 2: Formal Allegation)

19.1 Upon receipt of the Allegation of Academic Misconduct form and supporting documentation from the Module Co-ordinator, Academic Misconduct Committee shall write to the student concerned to:

- a. put the allegation as defined by the Module Co-ordinator;
- b. request a written statement in response to the allegation and submission of any evidence they deem appropriate;
- c. signpost support available to the student to enable them to respond, including from their programme team, student support services and the Students' Union;
- d. request confirmation of whether the student also wishes to attend an investigative meeting of the Academic Misconduct Committee to respond in person;
- e. request a reply within five working days of the date on which the letter is sent;
- f. enclose a copy of this policy;
- g. enclose copies of any evidence or reports.

19.2 The letter from Academic Misconduct Committee to the student shall be copied to the relevant Chair of the Assessment Board and Programme Leader. Where possible, every effort should be made to resolve the matter before the meeting of the Assessment Board. However, where it remains unresolved, the Assessment Board will record a *deferred decision* (DD) on the electronic student record.

19.3 If no written reply to the allegation is received from the student within five working days of the date on which the letter is sent, this is deemed to be acceptance of the allegation.

19.4 If the student replies denying the allegation, or if they ask to also respond in person, Academic Misconduct Committee shall invite the student to attend an investigative meeting. The student should be given at least five working days' notice of the meeting.

19.5 While the allegation remains unresolved, the student shall have the right to continue on the programme or commence the next part or stage of the programme (where permitted within the relevant assessment regulations).

20. Academic Misconduct Committee

20.1 The Academic Misconduct Committee (the Committee) shall comprise:

- Vice Rector Academic or nominee (Chair);
- Dean of Undergraduate Studies;
- Programme Leader;



- At least two members of academic staff (to be drawn from a pool of academics who have been trained for the role); and
 - Registrar acting as Committee's Secretary.
- 20.2 Membership of the Committee may be varied to ensure that the academic staff members are not considering any allegations concerning their own modules, but have the necessary understanding of the discipline to inform discussions. A representative from the Registrar's Office will be in attendance to record the Committee's decision and justification for that decision.
- 20.3 The Committee will be convened at regular intervals to consider all formal allegations of academic misconduct. This will ensure consistency of approach across the range of programmes offered within the University. The Committee has the authority to determine:
- a. that no offence has been committed, or there is insufficient evidence of an offence, in which case the allegation will be removed from the student's record, and the case should be referred back to the programme team to be dealt with by them in accordance with paragraph 17.1;
 - b. that this is a case of poor academic practice, and the case should be referred back to the programme team to be dealt with by them in accordance with paragraph 17.2;
 - c. that an offence has been committed and recommend the penalty to be imposed, as set out in the Academic Misconduct Penalties table.
- 20.4 The decision of the Committee as to whether an offence has been committed is final and will be reported to the student and relevant Assessment Board. The Assessment Board will consider the penalty recommended by the Committee and inform the student of the penalty imposed and the impact of that penalty on their studies and/or award.
- 20.5 In determining whether an offence has been committed, the judgement will be made on the balance of probability.
- 20.6 In determining the recommended penalty, the Committee will take into account:
- the severity of the offence;
 - the intent;
 - whether it is a first or subsequent offence;
 - the academic stage of the student;
 - any mitigation;
 - the proportionality of the penalty to the offence.
- 20.7 A guide to the standard penalty to be imposed for first offences is provided in Appendix II.
- 20.8 The University does not normally accept a student's medical or personal circumstances as an excuse or reason for academic misconduct. However, where the Committee deems that the evidenced circumstances have severely impaired the student's capacity for rational judgement, the Committee may take account of the circumstances in determining the recommended penalty for the offence.
- 20.9 The Committee shall normally recommend the standard penalties suggested for first offences. However, the Committee may vary the penalty in such circumstances where the suggested penalty is deemed to be too lenient or too harsh to ensure that the outcome is not disproportionate to the offence. In all cases, the penalty should normally exceed that which would follow if the student had failed the assessment without academic misconduct.
- 20.10 The penalty recommended for second or third offences will normally be one penalty point higher than the standard penalty for the offence or one point higher than the penalty previously imposed, whichever is higher. Any student with three sequential offences will automatically receive a minimum of penalty 6 and be required to withdraw.

21. Standard Meeting of the Academic Misconduct Committee

- 21.1 Where a student accepts the allegation and does not want to respond in person, a standard meeting of the Academic Misconduct Committee will be convened, normally no



later than ten working days after the date of the letter putting the allegation to the student. The documentation, including any written response submitted by the student, will be distributed to the Committee for consideration, normally five working days before the meeting.

- 21.2 The consideration of accepted allegations of academic misconduct where the student does not wish to also respond in person need not involve a physical meeting of members of the Committee if alternative methods of discussion and mutual deliberation are available.
- 21.3 The Committee's decision and recommended penalty will be based on the documentary evidence provided.

22. Investigative Meeting of the Academic Misconduct Committee

- 22.1 Where a student denies the allegation, or wishes to respond to the allegation in person, an investigative meeting of the Committee will be arranged. This will normally take place no later than ten working days after the date of the letter putting the formal allegation to the student.
- 22.2 The Secretary of the Committee will inform the student, in writing, of the date, time and venue of the investigative meeting.
- 22.3 The student may be accompanied at the meeting by a friend. A friend is defined as a member of staff of the University, or a registered student of the University, or a member of the Students' Union. The role of the friend is to act as an observer, give moral support and to assist the student to make their case. In addition, where reasonable adjustments are required, a student may be accompanied by a supporter, for example a sign language communicator or a notetaker.
- 22.4 If the student does not appear at the meeting, the Committee may proceed with the consideration of the allegation in the student's absence provided the Committee is satisfied that the student has received proper and timely notification of the meeting.
- 22.5 The Chair of the Committee shall explain that the purpose of the meeting is to establish whether an offence of academic misconduct has been committed. They will put the allegation to the student and make available for scrutiny any relevant documentary evidence, including any statements by staff or students, sources of allegedly plagiarised passages and/or passages where collusion is suspected, annotated coursework or scripts, and falsified documents.
- 22.6 The student will make a statement in response to the allegation, following which the members of the Committee have the right to put any questions to the student.
- 22.7 At any time during the meeting, the Chair of the Committee may decide to suspend proceedings in order to seek more evidence. The student will be advised of the action that will be taken and the date of the reconvened meeting.
- 22.8 If the student admits the offence at the meeting, the Chair of the Committee shall invite the student to sign a written statement to this effect.
- 22.9 At the end of the questioning, the student will be asked to leave the meeting for the Committee to deliberate and reach its decision in private.
- 22.10 The Committee shall determine its decision based on the written and oral evidence. If the Committee finds that there is no case to answer, or that it is a case of poor academic practice, the Chair will inform the student accordingly, and all record of the alleged academic misconduct will be removed from the student's record. The Programme Leader and the Chair of the Assessment Board will be informed of the decision and the work will then be marked on its academic merit.
- 22.11 In cases where it is determined that there is no case to answer or that it is a case of poor academic practice, the case will be referred to the programme team to be dealt with by them in accordance with paragraphs 17.1 to 17.2.



22.12 If the Committee finds that an offence of academic misconduct has been committed, the Committee will agree a penalty to be recommended to the Assessment Board in accordance with paragraphs 20.6 to 20.10.

23. Notification of the Decision

23.1 The Registrar’s Office will communicate the decision of the Committee to the student and the relevant Assessment Board in writing within five working days of the Committee meeting.

23.2 The notification to the student will include the decision and the rationale for the decision. The Assessment Board will also be notified of the recommended penalty.

24. Action by Assessment Board

24.1 Following receipt of the Committee’s decision, the Assessment Board will meet (where necessary as an extraordinary meeting) to consider the penalty recommended by the Committee and determine the penalty to be imposed and the consequence of that penalty in the context of the student’s overall profile and the relevant assessment regulations.

24.2 The Assessment Board do not have the authority to amend the decision of the Committee as to whether or not an offence has been committed, but may apply a lower penalty where the recommended one will have a disproportionate impact.

24.3 The Chair of the Assessment Board will notify the student, in writing, of the penalty imposed and the appropriate course of action within ten working days of the date of the letter informing the student of the Committee’s decision. A copy of the letter should be sent to Academic Misconduct Committee.

25. Appeals Procedure

25.1 Students may appeal against the verdict of academic misconduct and/or the penalty imposed under the provisions of the Academic Appeals Policy.

26. Plagiarism Detection Software

26.1 All work that is submitted electronically will be passed through plagiarism detection software.

Revision History

Version	Approved by	Approval Date	Description of Change
3	Academic Council		This policy should be reviewed in June 2024, when new Senior Staff are onboard and some of the responsibilities mentioned herein can be devolved.

Rector Conrad Ozóg



Viva Voce Procedure

1. General Principles

1.1 The Viva Voce Procedure exists within the marking process in order to address potential academic misconduct concerns where evidence of a misconduct is not always obtainable, and to provide markers with a means by which they can satisfy themselves that the student can demonstrate knowledge of the work and topic in question to be assured of the legitimacy of the work.

1.2 To avoid adding undue delay to the marking process, the viva should be held as soon as possible.

1.3 Where there is evidence of an academic misconduct, the matter can be referred to the Academic Misconduct Committee.

2. Criteria

2.1 The Viva Procedure should only occur if two or more members of the marking team share two or more of the following concerns:

- a) The content of the work falls consistently outside of the topics taught on the module and there is no reasonable explanation for the student to have responded to the question in that way;
- b) The methods used in the submission are substantially different from those taught on the module;
- c) The anticipated mark for the assignment falls outside that predicated for anyone within the cohort and is excessively high for a student working at that stage of study;
- d) The sources used are not on the reading list for the module and are a significantly unusual resource for the student to have obtained and/ or cited;
- e) The language and/ or syntax used in the assessment are incoherent;
- f) The language and / or syntax are at a level of sophistication beyond that anticipated of a student working at this stage of study;
- g) The language and syntax used in certain sections of the assessment response are demonstrably different from that in other sections of their assignments;
- h) Sources referenced do not match the content of the assessment;
- i) Sources referenced do not appear to be real;
- j) There is hard evidence in the submission of third-party involvement (such as track change comments in the submission);
- k) The student has responded to an entirely different title without explanation.

3. Viva Voce Meeting

3.1 The following procedures are suggested as minimum operational standards for the holding of Viva Voce Meeting:

- a) A Viva should be held if requested by two or more members of the marking team;
- b) The criteria for the selection of students for Viva Meetings, as outlined above, must be consistently applied;
- c) The Registrar invites students to the Viva Voce Meeting. Students must be given five working days' notice of a Viva so as to enable them to attend;
- d) In the invitation to the Viva, the student must be notified of the assignment about which concerns have been raised; which of the concerns listed in section 2 above have been raised about their assignment, who will be conducting the Viva and their reason for their attendance and the date and time of their Viva;
- e) Viva Voce Panel (hereinafter, the Panel) should consist of two members of the Academic Staff, a member of the marking team and a member of the Programme team, and a Registrar acting as the Panel's Secretary.
- f) The focus of attention in the viva discussion will be the areas of study covered within the relevant examination or assessment;
- g) The Viva should not usually extend beyond 30 minutes in duration;



- h) The Viva should be conducted in English;
- i) The student should not be asked to undertake a new assignment or test of their knowledge.

4. Outcome

- 4.1 Through the course of the Viva Meeting a student will be asked to demonstrate their knowledge of the work and topic in question. If they demonstrate sufficient understanding of the information to assure the Viva Voce Panel of the legitimacy of their work, then the piece of work will be returned to the standard making process with no further action taken.
- 4.2 If through the Viva a student fails to reassure the Panel of the veracity/authenticity of their work, then the Panel may decide to refer the case to the Academic Misconduct Committee for investigation.
- 4.3 The respective outcome of the Viva Voce Meeting should be communicated to all participants of the Meeting by the Registrar.



Appendix 1. Penalties for Academic Misconduct

The following table sets out the standard penalties for proven offences.

Minor Offence	Penalty 1	The work submitted will be marked in accordance with the assessment criteria but the component mark will be capped by 20 points, but no less than the pass mark. The student will receive a formal written warning.
	Penalty 2	Refer component (mark of 0%, recorded as refer infringement (RI)) with reassessment opportunity where permissible under the relevant assessment regulations. On reassessment, the component mark will be capped at the pass mark. The student will receive a formal written warning.
Serious Offence	Penalty 3	Refer component (mark of 0%, recorded as refer infringement (RI)) with reassessment opportunity where permissible under the relevant assessment regulations. On reassessment, the component and module mark will be capped at the pass mark. The student will receive a formal written warning.
	Penalty 4	Fail component (mark of 0%, recorded as fail infringement (FI)) with opportunity to retake module where permissible under the relevant assessment regulations. On retake, the component and module mark will be capped at the pass mark. The student will receive a formal written warning.
Grave Offence	Penalty 5	Fail module (mark of 0% for all components, recorded as fail infringement (FI)) with no opportunity for reassessment or retake. The student can take an alternative module where permissible under the relevant assessment regulations, but the module mark will be capped at the pass mark. If the fail results in termination of studies, any work already submitted for outstanding modules will be ratified by the Assessment Board (with no opportunity for reassessment or retake) and the student considered for an exit award only. The student will receive a formal written warning.
	Penalty 6	Fail module (mark of 0% for all components, recorded as fail infringement (FI)) and the student required to withdraw. The Assessment Board will be instructed to ratify the marks for any work already submitted for outstanding modules (with no opportunity for reassessment or retake) and to consider the student for an exit award based on the credit achieved.
Gross Misconduct	Penalty 7	Fail module (mark of 0% for all components, recorded as fail infringement (FI)) and the student required to withdraw immediately without being awarded a degree or exit award. Credits which have already been ratified by an Assessment Board will be recorded on a record of achievement only.

All students who receive a penalty between 1 and 5 will be offered support through an Academic Success Centre on plagiarism and academic writing. Uptake of the support will be monitored for evaluation.



Appendix 2. Indicative Offences and Standard Penalties for First Offences

Coursework and Time Constrained Assignments (including, but not limited to, written work, presentations, posters, dissertations, final projects)

	Indicative offence	Standard penalty
Minor Offence	Limited use of quotes or close paraphrasing (not more than a few lines) without the use of quotation marks and/or correct referencing, where the student has cited the plagiarised material in the reference list and/or bibliography.	Penalty 1
	Using work previously submitted for another assignment without acknowledgement (self-plagiarism).	Penalty 2
Serious Offence	Extensive use of quotes or close paraphrasing without the use of quotation marks and/or correct referencing, where the student has cited the plagiarised material in the reference list and/or bibliography.	Penalty 3
	Submission of work produced in collaboration by two or more students as the work of a single student.	Penalty 3
	Using another person's work or ideas and submitting some of it as if it were the student's own.	Penalty 3
	Submitting a fraudulent claim for extenuating circumstances.	Penalty 3
	Using another person's work or ideas and submitting all of it as if it were the student's own.	Penalty 4
	The presentation of data based on work purporting to have been carried out by the student but which has been fabricated (i.e. invented, altered or falsified).	Penalty 4
	Failure to have ethical approval where required and embarking on research activities which require ethical approval without that approval being formally granted.	Penalty 4
	Extensive use of quotes or close paraphrasing without the use of quotation marks and/or correct referencing, where the student has not cited the plagiarised material in the reference list and/or bibliography.	Penalty 4
Grave Offence	Commissioning another person to complete an item of assessment that is submitted as the student's own work (e.g. friends and family members).	Penalty 5
	Disguising work in a deliberate attempt to conceal its origins.	Penalty 5
	Offering a bribe or inducement to persons connected with the assessment in order to gain an unfair advantage.	Penalty 5



Attempting to persuade another student or a member of staff to participate in any other actions in order to gain an unfair advantage.	Penalty 5
---	-----------

Examinations and Time Constrained Assignments (including, but not limited to, written, online, viva and practical)

	Indicative offence	Standard penalty
Minor Offence	Removing any script, question paper, or other official stationery (whether completed or not) from the examination room, unless specifically authorised by an invigilator or examiner.	Penalty 1
	Possession of devices (such as mobile phones, smart watches or personal multimedia devices) of any kind other than those specifically permitted.	Penalty 2
Serious Offence	Communicating with another student or with any third party other than the invigilator or examiner during an examination.	Penalty 3
	Copying or attempting to copy the work of another student, whether by overlooking, asking for information, or by any other means.	Penalty 3
	Behaviour in a manner likely to prejudice the chances of another student.	Penalty 3
	Submitting a fraudulent claim for extenuating circumstances.	Penalty 3
	Possession or use of crib sheets, revision notes or unauthorised texts; unauthorised access of the internet; or use of devices (such as mobile phones, smart watches or personal multimedia devices) of any kind other than those specifically permitted.	Penalty 4
Grave Offence	Being party to any arrangement whereby a person other than the student represents, or intends to represent, the student in an examination.	Penalty 5
	Taking into an examination a pre-written examination script for submission.	Penalty 5
	Obtaining, or seeking to obtain, access to an unseen examination paper prior to the start of an examination.	Penalty 5
	Offering a bribe or inducement to invigilators, examiners or other persons connected with the examination in order to gain an unfair advantage.	Penalty 5
	Attempting to persuade another student or a member of staff to participate in any other actions in order to gain an unfair advantage.	Penalty 5

Note

The tables above are provided as a guide to the recommended standard penalty to be imposed for first offences of academic misconduct with examples given as an indication of the type of offence.



The penalty for a second or subsequent proven offence will normally be one penalty point higher than the standard penalty shown or one point higher than the previously imposed penalty, whichever is higher.

The examples given above do not represent an exhaustive list of potential offences and should not be interpreted as such.

Appendix 3. Guidance on Types of Evidence to Evaluate and Present in Suspected Infringements of Policy

Evidence to evaluate in cases of suspected plagiarism

- Data from Turnitin (or equivalent plagiarism detection software) indicating matches in sections of text – cross referenced against student's referencing for absences of acknowledgment. **Note: a high similarity 'score' is not acceptable as a stand-alone justification for allegations of plagiarism;**
- Unacknowledged text/idea/image that in the marker's judgement is not 'in the public domain' but comes from an identifiable source/set of sources;
- Absence of clear acknowledgement of source of text/idea/image in citations or narratives;
- Heterogeneity of font/pica/style of sections of text; variations in spellings (UK/US);
- Absence of elements of bibliographical details;
- Students' use of language about their ownership of text/idea/image;
- Students' responses to viva/informal questions.

Evidence to evaluate in cases of suspected collusion

- Data from Turnitin (or equivalent plagiarism detection software) indicating matches in texts between two students in same cohort;
- Marker's comments and evaluation of students' assessments;
- Level of cooperation/group work that exceeds set parameters;
- Set requirements of assessment brief on acceptable limits of group work activity;
- Students' responses to viva/informal questions.

Evidence to evaluate in cases of suspected contract cheating

- Module Co-ordinators' and markers' familiarity with students' work – unexplained grade shifts;
- Failure of essay to align to assignments as set, and to content of lecture(s);
- Errors/inconsistencies in use of English (UK/US), changes in style, voice or syntax, heterogeneity in fonts/styles;
- Outcome of investigative interview / viva with student;
- Third party evidence (other students);
- IT forensics.



Procedure Title	Academic Appeals Procedure
Version	№3
Effective Date:	September 1 st , 2023
1. Approved by:	Academic Council
Scope:	University wide
Purpose:	To establish University rules on academic appeals

General Principles

- 1.1 An academic appeal is a representation against a decision of the Assessment Board in respect of an assessment outcome for an individual student. The purpose of these regulations is to provide a framework within which a student may seek to challenge the decision of an Assessment Board in respect of that student's assessment, in order to protect against potential unfairness resulting from omission or error on the part of the University. The regulations are intended to provide an opportunity to remedy material disadvantage to a student.
- 1.2 As academic appeals are always related to individual assessment outcomes, it is unusual for students to submit collective appeals. However, the University recognises that there may be exceptional circumstances where the issues raised affect a number of students and therefore those students may wish to lodge a collective appeal. In these cases, each student is expected to show how they have personally been affected by the situation. In certain instances, a nominated individual may be required to act as spokesperson for those students who are making the collective appeal.
- 1.3 An academic appeal may only be submitted by the student whose assessment decision is being challenged – a third party may not submit an academic appeal on behalf of a student.
- 1.4 The University will not consider academic appeals which are made anonymously, nor will it consider requests made by appellants for appeals to be considered anonymously.
- 1.5 Student expenses for making an appeal will not be reimbursed by the University, regardless of the subsequent outcome.
- 1.6 The University undertakes to treat all appeals with confidentiality. Disclosure of evidence will be restricted to those parties involved in the review process.

2. Definitions

- 2.1 An '*Academic Appeal*' is defined as a request for a review of a decision of an Assessment Board charged with decisions on student progress, assessment and awards. This includes challenges to the outcomes of the extenuating circumstances process.
- 2.2 A '*Complaint*' is any expression of dissatisfaction with the standard of service provided by the University or its agents, or with the actions or lack of actions by the University, its agents, or members of staff.
- 2.3 A '*BMU Assessment Board*' is the formal body of the BMU constituted for the purpose of, *inter alia*, making decisions concerning student assessment, progression and award.
- 2.4 '*Extenuating Circumstances*' are defined for the purposes of assessment as circumstances of a serious nature, usually sudden or unforeseen, that occurred during or immediately before a specific item or period of assessment, and which had an adverse impact on the student's performance. Please, refer to Extenuating Circumstances Procedure for the details.
- 2.5 '*Academic Judgement*' is a decision made by academic staff on the quality of the work or the criteria applied to the work, a degree classification, fitness to practice, research methodology or module content/outcomes.
- 2.6 '*Professional judgement*' is a decision reached in due process of an Extenuating Circumstances Panel.
- 2.7 '*Material irregularity*' means the University has not acted in accordance with its own regulations or procedures, or has not acted with procedural fairness, and that this failing on the part of the University is so significant that it has had a material impact on the outcome. I.e., had it not been for this failing the outcome would probably have been substantively different.



2.8 The 'Assessment Process' includes all aspects of assessment, including the application of assessment regulations, compliance with assessment requirements, calculation of marks and outcomes, and the conduct of the Assessment Board.

3. Grounds for Appeal

3.1 A decision of an Assessment Board may only be changed where one or both of the following criteria (the grounds) have been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the body considering the appeal:

- a) that there has been a material irregularity in the assessment process or in the procedure of the Assessment Board;
- b) that there has been a material irregularity in the conduct of the Extenuating Circumstances process.

3.2 Students wishing to appeal using ground b) (noted above) are advised to read Extenuating Circumstances Claim Procedure, prior to submitting an appeal.

3.3 Academic appeals which seek to challenge the academic judgement of the Assessment Board will not be considered, and therefore matters of academic judgement will not be grounds for an academic appeal.

4. STAGE 1: Initial Consideration

4.1 All academic appeals must be made within **10 working days of the publication of the decision which is being appealed** using the academic appeal form and submitted to the Registrar's Officer. All evidence must be provided at the time the appeal is submitted.

4.2 An academic appeal submitted after this deadline may, exceptionally, be admitted at the discretion of the Registrar's Officer where the student can provide good reason, to the satisfaction of the Registrar's Officer, for its late submission.

4.3 An appeal must be submitted in writing on the Academic [Appeal Form](#) completing all relevant sections including full name; student number; signature of the student and date. Students should indicate the date of the official notification of the decision and the ground(s) which they are appealing. A clear and succinct explanation as to why they are dissatisfied with the decision should be provided. The appeal should encompass all matters within the scope of this procedure that the student would like to be considered. New aspects of an appeal cannot be introduced later in the procedure.

4.4 An appeal that is raised by several students on the same issue can be considered as one collective appeal. In such circumstances, the names of all students must be included on the Academic Appeal Form. The group are advised to appoint a representative (no more than two students) to facilitate communication for the purposes of the formal Procedure.

4.5 The appeal request will be acknowledged normally within **10 working days** of its receipt.

4.6 The Registrar's Officer shall review the appeal request and make one of the following determinations:

- a) That the appeal provides evidence of permissible grounds, as stated above, in which case the appeal shall move to Stage 2.
- b) That the appeal does not provide evidence of permissible grounds, as stated above, in which case the Registrar's Officer will advise the student in writing of this finding, **within 10 working days** of receipt of the appeal, and that the appeal will not be further considered.

4.7 The Registrar's Officer will write to the student to notify him/her of this determination normally **within 15 working days** of receipt of the appeal.

4.8 Where the Registrar's Officer determines that the appeal does provide evidence of permissible grounds, the appeal shall move to Stage 2.

5. STAGE 2: Consideration by the Assessment Board

5.1 Where it is determined by the Registrar's Officer that the appeal shall progress to Stage 2, the Registrar's Officer will investigate all of the relevant issues detailed in the appeal. The Registrar's Officer will normally complete this investigation **within 20 working days** of receipt of the appeal, or within 20 working days of the conclusion of the review of the Deputy Registrar.

5.2 Upon the completion of these investigations, the Registrar's Officer will:



- 5.2.1 in the case of an appeal based on grounds of material irregularity in the assessment process, report his/her findings in writing to the Chair of the Assessment Board whose decision is being appealed. The Chair of the Assessment Board shall consider these findings on behalf of the Assessment Board, and where appropriate should liaise with and seek views and opinions from relevant academic and other staff. The Chair shall, on behalf of the Assessment Board, reach one of the following determinations:
- a) that a material irregularity in the assessment process did occur and that, had it not been for that irregularity, the original decision of the Assessment Board would have been different. In such cases the Chair shall uphold the appeal and modify the Board's original decision as appropriate; or
 - b) that a material irregularity in the assessment process did occur, but even had the irregularity not occurred the original decision of the Board would not have been different. In such cases the Chair shall reject the appeal and the Board's original decision will stand; or
 - c) that a material irregularity in the assessment process did not occur. In such cases the Chair shall reject the appeal and the Board's original decision will stand.
- 5.2.2 in the case of an appeal based on grounds of material irregularity in the conduct of the Extenuating Circumstances process, report his/her findings in writing to the Registrar's Office, with a copy to the Chair of the Assessment Board whose decision is being appealed. The Chair shall consider these findings on behalf of the Registrar's Office, and where appropriate should liaise with and seek views and opinions from relevant academic and other staff. The Chair shall, on behalf of the Registrar's Office, reach one of the following determinations:
- a) that a material irregularity in the conduct of the Extenuating Circumstances process did occur and that, had it not been for that irregularity, the original decision of the Registrar's Office would have been different; or
 - b) that a material irregularity in the conduct of the Extenuating Circumstances process did occur, but even had the irregularity not occurred the original decision of the Board would not have been different; or
 - c) that a material irregularity in the conduct of the Extenuating Circumstances process did not occur.

The Registrar's Office shall notify his/her findings and determination to the Chair of the Assessment Board. The Chair of the Assessment Board shall consider these findings on behalf of the Assessment Board. The Chair shall, on behalf of the Assessment Board, reach one of the following determinations:

- a) that, in light of the findings of the Registrar's Office, the original decision of the Assessment Board would have been different. In such cases the Chair shall uphold the appeal and modify the Board's original decision as appropriate; or
 - b) that, in light of the findings of the Registrar's Office, the original decision of the Assessment Board would not have been different. In such cases the Chair shall reject the appeal and the Board's original decision will stand.
- 5.3 Written confirmation of the Stage 2 decision, along with the full reasons for that decision, should be provided by the Registrar's Officer to the student within **30 University working days** of receipt of the appeal. Where the outcome of the appeal may impact on a student's progression, and any delay in considering the appeal may adversely impact the student's academic career, the University will do all that it can to expedite the consideration of the appeal, however this cannot be guaranteed as it is important that a robust process is followed, and full consideration is given to the appeal.
- 5.4 Where the Chair of the Assessment Board modifies the Board's original decision, this shall be reported to the next meeting of that Assessment Board.
- 6. STAGE 3: Appeal to Queen Margaret University (QMU)**
- 6.1 If a Student is not satisfied with the decision taken during Stage 2, he/she may invoke the [QMU appeals procedure](#).



- 6.2 A Student can launch an appeal within **21 working days** after he/she received the decision of Stage 2.
- 6.3 At this stage, a Student should collect all the documents related to his/her appeal, including a submitted appeal form, evidence of material irregularity, and decision of the Stage 2, and send it to appeals@qmu.ac.uk.
- 6.4 The University Secretary will acknowledge receipt of the Academic Appeal within 3 working days of receipt of the appeal, and pass the appeal to the relevant Dean of School who shall attempt to resolve the case. The Dean of School will normally respond to the student (and copy in the Programme Leader and the Convener of the Joint Exam Board) within 21 days of receipt of the appeal, either giving a decision or specifying a date for the decision. The Dean may decide to reject or uphold the appeal. If the appeal is upheld and this gives rise to a change in the student's progression, the amended progression decision must be ratified by the Joint Board of Examiners.
- 6.5 If the Dean rejects the appeal, the decision taken during Stage 2 stands as it is.
- 6.6 The Decision taken by the QMU is final and not subject to appeal.

Revision History

Version	Approved by	Approval Date	Description of Change
3	Academic Council	April 12 th , 2023	This procedure should be reviewed in June 2024, when new Senior Staff are onboard and some of the responsibilities mentioned herein can be devolved.

Rector Conrad Ożóg



Student Complaints Procedure

Student Complaint refers to a case where a Student has complaint(s) against the University in relation to delivery of teaching, support and maintenance services, university facilities, administration, or any other concern that can be raised in the Student-University relationships.

Time limit for raising a complaint

- Generally, it is in the best interests of the student and the university if any concern or complaint is raised as soon as possible after the relevant incident has occurred.
- A complaint will normally be considered if the issue was informally raised in accordance with Stage 0 proceedings within **14 days** of the relevant incident occurred.
- If the student remains dissatisfied with the Stage 0 outcome, or if the student has been informed that the informal resolution is not applicable to the issue raised, the student shall have **5 working days** to submit a formal Stage 1 Complaint Form.
- If the student fails to comply with time limit requirements provided in the procedure, the university will consider whether such student, in exceptional circumstances, has valid reasons for delay.

Principles of Complaint Procedure

- This procedure applies to all registered students of the university in accordance with Admissions policy.
- The University guarantees that any student lodging a complaint will not be adversely affected by the fact of raising matter or with any decision rendered on the matter.
- The student will have a fair opportunity to present his or her complaint and will be provided with clear reasons for the outcome produced at each stage of the procedure.
- It is in the mutual interests of the student and the university to resolve concerns and issues informally, at the initial Stage 0 of the Procedure.
- The University will strive to conduct fair proceedings at all stages of complaints and keep certain information confidential where necessary.
- A group of students can launch a joint complaint.
- A complaint made anonymously will only be accepted if supported by relevant evidence and does not constitute mere 'hearsay'.
- Matters related to Academic decisions of Academic Staff lie outside the scope of the Student Complaints Procedure.
- The University will adjust its procedure where necessary.

Expected conduct during the procedure

- During the procedure, all students are expected to maintain a good conduct according to the University's Student Code of Conduct.
- The University Complaints Committee reserves a right to terminate proceedings, if it finds the complaint raised to be of frivolous or vexatious nature.
- At all stages of proceeding, all parties are required to preserve confidentiality. However, details of complaint may need to be disclosed to the relevant parties to carry out a full investigation.
- Staff and students are required to submit all necessary documents and evidence, and are expected to co-operate with the University in investigation process.
- The Student Complaints Procedure is not a disciplinary procedure, although an upheld complaint may give rise to such a procedure. The University may decline to settle the complaint while any matter intrinsic to it is the subject of disciplinary or other formal procedures within the University.



Student Complaints Procedure

Stage 0. Informal resolution stage

- 0.1 The purpose of Stage 0 is to address promptly the raised issues and concerns in an informal ambiance.
- 0.2 The University expects that the majority of issues and concerns can be resolved informally at Stage 0 through discussion between the staff and the student involved in the matter raised.
- 0.3 The student should send an email from an official University account to the member concerned, which constitutes commencement of informal proceedings.
- 0.4 The student should:
- be specific about the problem;
 - describe the issue succinctly;
 - provide supporting documentary evidence where appropriate;
 - state the outcome sought – be clear and realistic;
 - if unsure who to contact, send an email to studentcomplaints@bmu-edu.uz.
- 0.5 Upon receipt of the student's request, the relevant staff member(s) will swiftly organise a meeting with the student to discuss concern raised.
- 0.6 The Stage 0 will normally lead to one or a combination of the following outcomes:
1. A solution to the student's issue or concern;
 2. An explanation in case if the desired outcome cannot be achieved;
 3. An apology, where it is appropriate to do so;
 4. The University finds that the issue cannot be resolved on an informal basis and, therefore, may guide the student to submit an official complaint under Stage 1.
- Examples of instances when the University will refer the student directly to the Stage 1 proceedings include, but are not confined to:
- If a detailed investigation is required;
 - If the student is seeking a financial outcome;
 - If it is not appropriate to grant the outcome sought on an informal basis;
 - If the complaint is of a sufficiently serious nature.
- 0.7 The Staff member should issue a written report on the outcome upon student's request or when it is appropriate to do so.
- 0.8 If the student is dissatisfied with the outcome of Stage 1 or when the University finds informal proceedings inappropriate, the student will be directed to submit an official complaint form to proceed to Stage 1 of formal hearing.

Stage 1: Formal complaint

- 1.1 To submit a formal Stage 1 complaint, the student needs to fill in the Stage 1 Complaint Form and send it via his or her University email account to studentcomplaints@bmu-edu.uz.
- 1.2 The student may submit the Stage 1 Complaint Form if:
- he or she is unsatisfied with the outcome of the Stage 0; or
 - the university believes that the concern raised to be directly referred to the Stage 1 of formal complaint.
- 1.3 A Stage 1 Complaint will only be considered if it is made within **5 working days** from the Stage 0 outcome, or within **5 working days** from informing the student that the issue or concern raised cannot be heard under informal proceedings.
- 1.4 If the student did not exhaust the Stage 0, he or she may be referred to the Stage 0 where appropriate. Examples of reasons where it may not be appropriate to resolve the issue or concern informally are provided in Section 0.6 of this procedure.
- 1.5 The Stage 1 Complaint Form includes the following information:
- complainant's name, address, contact telephone numbers, University email address, student number and programme of study;
 - the nature of the complaint (attaching any supporting evidence where available);



- an outline of the steps taken to resolve the complaint informally at Stage 0, if applicable;
 - details of the outcome the complainant is seeking.
- 1.6 Receipt of the complaint will be acknowledged by the Executive Assistant to the Rector within three working days.
- 1.7 The Executive Assistant to the Rector will then refer the complaint to the University Complaints Committee consisting of Vice Rector (Academic), Associate Dean and the Registrar's Officer. The Registrar Officer will be responsible for conducting investigation, collecting relevant information and evidence, and issuing the outcome to the Student.
- 1.8 The University will take into consideration matters that need quick resolution. The matters include, but are not limited to, complaints allegation of serious harm, medical evidence that matter complained of has serious effect on the student's health, complaints related to serious service failure, or highly sensitive complaints. However, the University must balance between thorough investigation of a complaint and quick resolution.
- 1.9 Normally, the Registrar's Office will need to conduct interview(s) with the student to carry out the investigation. In this situation the student has a right to be accompanied by a 'friend'. Another member of administration staff will minute the meeting, and copies of the minutes will be handed over to the student.
- 1.10 The Stage 1 outcome and the Stage 1 investigation report will normally be emailed to the student within 20 working days of submission of the Stage 1 Complaint Form, unless a complex and prolonged investigation is required, in which case the student will be informed about timescales.
- 1.11 If the University Complaints Committee upholds the complaint, it should issue a remedy. The Registrar's Office will inform the student about the remedy and date of implementation.
- 1.12 The Registrar's Office will send a copy of the Stage 1 outcome letter and the Stage 1 investigation report to studentcomplaints@bmu-edu.uz. Then the Executive Assistant to the Rector will email the Stage 1 outcome letter and the Stage 1 investigation report to the student.
- 1.13 The Stage 1 outcome letter should include:
- the procedure(s) followed;
 - whether the complaint is upheld, partially upheld or not upheld;
 - the remedy for the complaint, if the complaint is upheld or partially upheld;
 - inform the student that they may request a review of the outcome at Stage 2.
- The Stage 1 investigation report should include:
- A report of the complaint and the findings;
 - Minutes of any interviews/meetings held to investigate the complaint;
 - A copy of all evidence considered relating to the complaint;
 - A copy of correspondence with the student, and any relevant emails between University staff.
- 1.14 The Stage 1 complaint and the response will be formally recorded, and anonymised details will be reported to the Registrar's Office.
- 1.15 If the complainant is not satisfied with the Stage 1 investigation or its outcome, they may wish to pursue the complaint at Stage 2 of the Procedure. If the student wishes to request a Stage 2 review of the complaint, they must submit a Stage 2 Complaint Form within **5 working days** of receiving the Stage 1 outcome letter and the Stage 1 investigation report.

Stage 2: Review

- 2.1 If the student is not satisfied with the outcome or investigation report of the Stage 1, he or she may pursue the review the complaint at the Stage 2 of the Procedure.
- 2.2 If the student wishes to request a Stage 2 review, he or she should fill in the Stage 2 Complaint Form and send it to studentcomplaints@bmu-edu.uz from their University email account within **5 working days** of receipt of the Stage 1 outcome letter and the Stage 1 investigation report.
- 2.3 The complainant should also attach:
- the Stage 1 outcome letter and Stage 1 investigation report;



- a statement of why the complainant remains dissatisfied;
- details of the outcome the complainant is seeking.

2.4 Rector will review the complaint and determine:

- whether the Stage 1 outcome was reasonable in the circumstances;
- whether the relevant procedure(s) were followed;
- whether the student has been provided with clear reasons for the outcome of the complaint at Stage 1;
- consider any new information which the student was unable to provide for valid reasons earlier the process; and
- consult as appropriate with a view to determining a suitable resolution of the complaint.

2.5 Normally, the Stage 2 Review procedure will not consider the issues afresh or involve a further investigation.

2.6 Rector will submit a report to the University Complaints Committee, with a recommendation as to remedy, if appropriate. The University Complaints Committee will issue the University’s formal Stage 2 response to the complainant. A full response will normally be sent within **15 working days** of submission of the Stage 2 complaint, unless delay is unavoidable, in which case the complainant will be kept informed of the likely timescales.

2.7 The Stage 2 complaint and the response will be formally recorded, and anonymised details will be reported to the Registrar’s Office.

2.8 Stage 2 of the Student Complaints Procedure concludes the University’s procedures in relation to complaints, and the complainant will normally be issued with a Completion of Procedures Letter.

3. Recording, reporting and learning from complaints

3.1 Following the outcome of an upheld or partially upheld complaint, the Vice Rector (Academic) will be responsible for formally deciding what corrective action should be implemented, if any. This shall be reported annually to the Registrar’s Office. The report shall not identify the student and appropriate levels of confidentiality will be maintained.

3.2 Examples of corrective action may include, but is not limited to, a change to policy, procedure or practice and relevant staff training.

3.3 Stage 1 and Stage 2 complaints shall be recorded and reported to the Registrar’s Office annually.

3.4 The following details will be recorded and reported:

- The complainant’s programme and part of study
- The complainants age, gender, ethnicity and whether the complainant has a disability.
- The complainants name shall not be reported. If the student considers that this makes him or her identifiable, upon the request of the student this information shall not be reported.
- Summary of the complaint, whether or not the complaint was upheld and the remedy to resolve the complaint where appropriate.

Revision History

Version	Approved by	Approval Date
1	Academic Council	February 22 nd , 2023

Rector Conrad Ozóg



Extenuating Circumstances Procedure

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The purpose of these regulations is to provide a framework within which a student may submit a claim for extenuating circumstances in respect of an assessment where a student is prevented from submitting or presenting for an assessment by the published date, or, exceptionally, in respect of an assessment submitted or presented by the student which was adversely affected by those circumstances.
- 1.2 Extenuating circumstances claims must relate to one or more identified assessment components and must relate directly to the timing of the assessment affected.

2. General Principles

- 2.1 Assessment component marks and the award classification cannot be changed as a result of extenuating circumstances or self-certification, unless a claim has been accepted for the late submission of assessment.
- 2.2 Authority for consideration of extenuating circumstances claims rests with the Registrar's Office who are doing so under the delegated authority of the Progression and Award Board.
- 2.3 The confidential nature of information provided by students in support of an application for extenuating circumstances will be respected by the University in compliance with data protection law. Confidential information will only be shared with the relevant individuals within the University on a 'need to know' basis, all of whom are required to keep applications securely to avoid unauthorised access or other breaches of information security.
- 2.4 All claims and evidence will be kept by the University for the duration of time as stated in the University's Records Retention Policy after which the evidence shall be destroyed.
- 2.5 An academic appeal can only be submitted on the grounds there has been material irregularity in the conduct of the Registrar's Office. Students should refer to Academic Appeals Policy for the procedure to be followed.

3. Definitions

- 3.1 The University defines extenuating circumstances as serious unforeseen, unpreventable circumstances that significantly disrupt a student's ability to undertake assessments.
- 3.2 The expectation is that students should be able to manage minor ailments themselves e.g. coughs or colds. Students should be aware that if they submit a Extenuating Circumstances claim for their absence during the Supplementary Exam Week it may impact their progression to the next stage of study if the progression requirements of the course have not been met. For final year students, it may delay their graduation.

4. Independent documentary evidence

- 4.1 In all cases, claims must be substantiated by original independent documentary evidence. This must be an official document for example, a letter signed on official headed paper, and must include the dates during which the circumstances applied. The evidence must demonstrate the effect the circumstances had on the student's ability to submit or present themselves for assessment.
- 4.2 Medical evidence must be obtained from the person, practice or institution that diagnosed or assessed the illness/injury at the time it occurred. Evidence that a student reported that they were ill, or which does not include a clear diagnosis, will not be accepted. Self-reporting will not be accepted.
- 4.3 Written evidence from Complementary Therapists will only be considered where the University is satisfied that the therapist is a member of a recognised professional body.
- 4.4 Failures of equipment, including IT systems and computer viruses will only be accepted when they occur University-wide, site-wide, nationally or internationally and is verified by Information Systems and Support.



4.5 The University reserves the right to check the authenticity of all documentation submitted as part of an extenuating circumstances claim. False declarations to the Registrar's Office will be investigated in accordance with Academic Misconduct Policy.

5. Extenuating Circumstances Claim Submission

5.1 Extenuating Circumstances claims must be submitted by completing the Extenuating Circumstances submission form provided by the Registrar's office and accompanied by documentary evidence.

6. Consideration of Claims

6.1 The extenuating circumstances claim form and evidence will be considered by at least two members of staff on behalf of the Registrar's Office.

6.2 Where a student is known to a member of staff other than in their professional capacity, that staff member must declare an interest and must not participate in the discussion of that student's claim.

7. Claims submitted for the Late submission of Coursework

7.1 Where the extenuating circumstances claim is accepted for late submission by the Registrar's Office, the student should submit the piece of work at the earliest available opportunity and within 5 working days of the original submission deadline.

7.2 Where a student is unable, for valid reasons, to submit coursework within 5 working days of the submission deadline, the student may submit a claim for non-submission. The claim will be assessed in accordance with these regulations.

7.3 Following consideration of the extenuating circumstances claim for late submission the following outcomes will be applied:

- a) where the extenuating circumstances claim is accepted as valid the actual mark achieved will be awarded;
- b) where the extenuating circumstances claim is accepted and the work is submitted after the deadline on the fifth working day, a mark of zero will be recorded.
- c) where the extenuating circumstances claim is rejected, and the work is submitted within 24 hours of the original deadline, the work will be marked, and 20 (twenty) points will be deducted from the original mark, to a minimum of the pass mark – 40%;
- d) where the extenuating circumstances claim is rejected, and the work is submitted:
 - within 5 working days after the original deadline;
 - within 24 hours of the 5 working day deadline;
 - more than 24 hours after the original deadline;
 - or, a student fails to submit their assessment within 5 working days;a mark of zero will be awarded.

8. Claims submitted for Non-attendance or Non-submission

8.1 Where the extenuating circumstances claim is accepted for non-submission or non-attendance, the student will have to undertake that assessment (as a first attempt) during the Re-sit Exam Week.

8.2 Where the extenuating circumstances claim has been accepted for non-submission or non-attendance and the student either submits their work by the published deadline or attends their assessment, the claim will be invalidated, and the student's mark will stand, unless the claim has been accepted under the fit to sit policy.

8.3 Where the extenuating circumstances claim is accepted for a deferral in the whole module, the student will be given an opportunity to re-take all assessment components in the module during the following academic year. Re-take in these circumstances shall not count



as a further attempt at the module for the purposes of calculating the maximum permitted number of attempts.

8.4 Where the extenuating circumstances claim is not accepted, the non-submission or non-attendance will be treated in the same way as any other non-submission or non-attendance of that assessment component.

9. Claims submitted in exception to the 'Fit to Sit' Policy

9.1 An 'unfit to sit' extenuating circumstances claim is where the student submits or presents for the assessment, and only after the event submits an extenuating circumstance claim.

9.2 Pending consideration of the claim by the Registrar's Office, the assessment will be assessed in the normal way, with no account taken of the extenuating circumstances claim.

9.3 Where the extenuating circumstances claim is accepted as an exception to the 'Fit to Sit' policy, the assessment result will be set aside, and normally the student will re-sit that assessment component during Re-sit Exam Week.

9.4 A claim may be accepted even where the assessment task has been passed by the student.

9.5 Where the extenuating circumstances claim is not accepted, the mark awarded for the assessment will stand.

Revision History

Version	Approved by	Approval Date	Description of Change
1	Registrar's Office	July 1 st , 2021	This procedure should be reviewed in July 2021, when new Senior Staff are onboard and some of the responsibilities mentioned herein can be devolved.

Rector Conrad O'zóg



Policy Title	Student Code of Conduct
Version	№ 4
Effective Date:	September 1 st , 2023
Approved by:	Academic Council
Scope:	University wide
Purpose:	To provide students with a code of conduct

1. Introduction

1.1 This Code applies to all enrolled students of the British Management University (BMU) in Tashkent (hereinafter, 'the University') and is part of the governance policy of the University. The University undertakes to enforce compliance with the Code of Conduct through the Disciplinary Procedure in accordance with its duty of care and responsibility to the members of its community, and to defend its good name and reputation.

2. Expectations

2.1 All students of the University are expected to conduct themselves with due regard to their legal responsibilities as adults and to uphold the good name and reputation of the University in a manner consistent with the fulfillment of the University's objectives and in accordance with its regulations and policies.

3. General Rules

3.1 A student must not engage in any conduct, either in person, via social media, via email, or by any other means, which is contrary to the standard of conduct expected of students set out in these Regulations. This includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- a. A student must not engage in conduct which might bring the University or any of its staff, officers, students, subsidiaries or trusts into disrepute.
- b. A student must not come to the University premises under the influence of alcohol or drugs.
- c. A student must not engage or attempt to engage in acts of terrorism.
- d. A student must not commit fraud.
- e. A student must not engage in conduct which is illegal including the use, supply or possession of illegal drugs.
- f. A student must not engage in actual or threatened physical violence.
- g. A student must not engage in bullying or intimidating behaviour.
- h. A student must not engage in conduct which is harassment or discrimination on any grounds.
- i. A student must not engage in conduct which is disruptive, obstructive, aggressive, offensive or rude.
- j. A student must not provide false or misleading information to the University.
- k. A student must not deliberately, recklessly, or negligently disclose confidential information.
- l. A student must not engage in conduct which disrupts or is likely to disrupt, any employee of the University in the performance of his or her duties or teaching or study or research or assessment or the administration of the University, or to the activities of its members.
- m. A student must not disregard rules or instructions given by the University.
- n. A student must not remove without authorisation, misuse, abuse or damage University property or property belonging to a contractor, including intellectual property.
- o. A student must not engage in conduct or attempt to engage in conduct which breaches the health and safety rules e.g. tampering with fire safety equipment, failing to secure University Accommodation against unauthorised entry, unhygienic practices in the preparation or storage of food or drink, and unauthorised alterations to electrical services.
- p. A student must not do anything or neglect to do something which creates a fire risk or in any way, puts the health and safety of others or property or the University's insurance policy at risk.



- q. A student must not refuse to surrender their student ID card to University staff when reasonably requested to do so and a student must not allow another person to use their student ID card.
- r. A student must attend any compulsory disciplinary meetings they are called to.

4. Disciplinary Procedure

- 4.1 The Registrar's Office will appoint the members of the Disciplinary Committee, and invite one of them to act as Chair. The Committee will have three or five members, at the discretion of the Registrar's Office. The members will normally include both a member of the academic staff of the University and a student of the University. The Registrar's Office shall have regard to the need to ensure that all members of the Committee are impartial and have had no previous involvement with the matter. Care will be taken to ensure an appropriate gender balance in the composition of the panel.
- 4.2 The Registrar's Office will appoint a Secretary to the Committee and will arrange for a note of the proceedings to be taken. The Committee may seek advice from a qualified lawyer.
- 26.2 The student may attend the disciplinary hearing, and may be accompanied by a friend. A friend is defined as a member of staff of the University, or a registered student of the University, or a member of the Students' Union. The role of the friend is to act as an observer, give moral support and to assist the student to make their case. In addition, where reasonable adjustments are required, a student may be accompanied by a supporter, for example a sign language communicator or a notetaker. Legal representation is not permitted.
- 4.3 The Committee will rely only on evidence presented at the hearing. The deliberations and decisions of anyone previously considering the matter shall be irrelevant for the Committee's purposes.
- 4.4 The Committee will find a student guilty of misconduct only if, on the evidence before it, it is satisfied of the student's guilt. If the members of the Committee cannot agree, the verdict of the Committee will be that of the majority of its members. Any decision of the Committee shall be based on the balance of probabilities.
- 4.5 Subject to the provisions of these regulations, the order of proceedings shall be at the discretion of the Committee. Members of the Committee may ask questions of any witness called before it. The Committee may ask for additional enquiries to be undertaken, and may call for additional witnesses to attend.
- 4.6 If two or more students are involved in related misconduct, the Committee may at its discretion deal with their cases together.
- 4.7 The evidence presented at the hearing will normally be oral evidence, given by witnesses appearing in person. The Committee may accept a witness's written statement in evidence where it agrees that the witness need not attend, or where it is impracticable for the witness to attend, or where in the opinion of the Committee it is for some other reason in the interests of justice to do so.
- 4.8 The allegation or allegations will be notified to the student at least one week before the hearing.
- 4.9 The Registrar's Office may call for written witness statements in support of the allegation in advance of the hearing. If such statements are obtained, members of the Committee will be entitled to see them in advance of the hearing and copies will be made available to the student at least one week before the allegation is heard.
- 4.10 The Committee may impose time limits on oral addresses and submissions.
- 4.11 The Committee will refuse to admit evidence that is in its opinion irrelevant to the issues raised.
- 4.12 The Committee shall have power to adjourn a hearing to another date, as it thinks fit.
- 4.13 If the Committee finds that there is no case for the student to answer, it must dismiss the allegation.



4.14 At the termination of the proceedings, the Chair of the Disciplinary Committee will write a short report to the Registrar's Office. In the event of a finding of guilt, the report will set out the misconduct alleged, a brief summary of evidence received, the grounds for the finding of guilt, the penalty imposed, and the factors taken into account in deciding the penalty. A copy of the report will be sent to the student and to the Rector by the Registrar's Office.

4.15 The Chair of the Committee, on the advice of the Registrar's Office, has the power to suspend the activity of the Disciplinary Committee at any time and to stop the proceedings against the student, if he or she believes it appropriate to do so.

5. Penalties

5.1 If a student is found guilty of an allegation of misconduct, the Disciplinary Committee will impose penalties. The penalties are set out below.

5.2 When determining penalties, consideration will be given to the seriousness of the misconduct, the circumstances of the misconduct, and the means and general personal circumstances of the student.

5.3 A student found guilty of misconduct may be:

- a. Absolutely discharged, which means that although the student may be technically guilty of the misconduct alleged, no blame should be attached to his or her actions;
- b. Admonished;
- c. Cautioned, which means that no penalty is imposed, but if the student is found guilty of misconduct on a subsequent occasion in the following twelve months, or some other specified period, he or she will then be dealt with for both offences;
- d. Conditionally discharged, which means that no penalty is imposed, subject to the student fulfilling certain stipulated conditions including future good behaviour over the following twelve months or some other specified period. If the conditions are not met, a penalty may be imposed following a further hearing;
- e. Excluded from the University for a fixed period of time, up to a maximum of twelve months. A student who is excluded from the University has restricted rights to enter University premises and to participate in University activities. The terms of the exclusion will be notified to the student in writing. An order of exclusion may include a requirement that the student shall have no contact with a named person or persons;
- f. Suspended from the University for a fixed period of time, up to a maximum of twelve months. A student who is suspended is prohibited from entering University premises, and from participating in University activities. Suspension may be subject to qualification, such as permission to take an examination. The terms of the suspension will be notified to the student in writing. An order of suspension may include a requirement that the student shall have no contact with a named person or persons;
- g. Expelled from the University, which means that the student ceases to be a member of the University, and loses all rights and privileges of membership.

Revision History

Version	Approved by	Approval Date	Description of Change
4	Academic Council	August 29 th , 2023	This policy should be reviewed in June 2024, when new Senior Staff are onboard and some of the responsibilities mentioned herein can be devolved.

Rector Conrad Ozóg



**BRITISH
MANAGEMENT
UNIVERSITY**

APPENDIX



**British Management University in Tashkent
Academic Appeals Form**

1. Personal Details

Full Name:	
ID Number:	
Programme of Study:	
Year of Study:	
University E-mail Address:	
Alternative E-mail:	
Contact Phone Number:	
Module(s) affected:	

2. Checklist

Please, note, that your appeal will only be accepted, if you answer “Yes” to all of the statements below:

I understand that the completion and submission of this form initiates the formal University Academic Appeals Policy and it should be submitted in accordance with that Policy.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
I have discussed the matter with my personal academic tutor (PAT) and/or Module Leader in order to better understand the reason for the result or decision against which I wish to appeal.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
The discussion with PAT and/or Module Leader have not resolved my concerns.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
I submit this form within ten (10) working days of notification of the result I appeal against.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
I understand that an academic appeal may only be submitted by the student whose assessment decision is being challenged – a third party may not submit an academic appeal on behalf of a student.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
I understand that an appeal which questions academic or professional judgement will not be permitted .	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
I understand that I may not challenge marks or grades awarded unless I can demonstrate they have been affected by one or more of the following factors: a. that there has been a material irregularity in the assessment process or in the procedure of the Assessment Board;	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>



<p>b. that there has been a material irregularity in the conduct of the Extenuating Circumstances process.</p> <p><i>'Material irregularity'</i> means the University has not acted in accordance with its own regulations or procedures, or has not acted with procedural fairness, and that this failing on the part of the University is so significant that it has had a material impact on the outcome. In other words, had it not been for this failing the outcome would probably have been substantively different.</p>		
I understand that academic decisions remain in force unless and until an appeals process determines otherwise.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

3. Details of your appeal

Please state the decision against which you are appealing (e.g. exclusion, requirement to re-sit year etc, EC board):

Please state the date on which you were notified of the decision against which you are appealing and include a copy of the results transcript with this form (please note that you cannot appeal against provisional results):

Please give details of your appeal (including your desired outcome) under the relevant ground or grounds below.

Please note that an appeal which questions academic or professional judgement will not be permitted. This means you may not challenge marks or



grades awarded unless you can demonstrate they have been affected by one or more of the following factors.

- a) that there has been a material irregularity in the assessment process or in the procedure of the Assessment Board;

'Material irregularity' means the University has not acted in accordance with its own regulations or procedures, or has not acted with procedural fairness, and that this failing on the part of the University is so significant that it has had a material impact on the outcome. In other words, had it not been for this failing the outcome would probably have been substantively different.

Details:

- b) that there has been a material irregularity in the conduct of the Extenuating Circumstances process.

If you are appealing on this ground, you must give credible and compelling reasons with supporting documentation explaining why this information was not made available prior to the decision being made

Details:



Please indicate what supporting documentation you are submitting that you wish to be considered in the appeal (e.g. medical certificate, emails and other correspondence, exam scripts, etc.) and include it with this form. Evidence should normally be contemporaneous, and capable of verification.

How do you propose your appeal can be resolved to your satisfaction?

Declaration:

I declare that the information given in this form is true and that I have consulted the Academic Appeals Policy before completing the form.

Signed:

Date:

(An electronic signature is acceptable)

Note: The University will have due regard towards maintaining confidentiality in relation to your appeal but, in order for it to be considered fully, the content will need to be disclosed to members of staff who are involved in putting the Procedure into effect e.g. the Programme Team as well as staff whose input may be required to respond to the issues you have raised e.g. your Module Leader, Personal Academic Tutor, Student Health and Mental Support Centre etc. By signing the declaration above you are consenting to the disclosure and sharing of information relevant to the appeal within the University at all stages of the Procedure.



Student Complaint Submission Form – Stage 1

Surname/Family Name	
First Name	
Address (Tashkent)	
Mobile	
University Email	
Student ID	
Programme of Study	

The nature of your complaint

Please give details of your complaints; continuing on additional sheets if necessary, and attach any supporting evidence you may have.



Please outline any steps you have already taken to resolve your complaint informally at Stage 0, including who you contacted and when, and the response received:

Please explain why you remain dissatisfied:

Please describe the outcome you are seeking:

Signature	
Date	

Please send the completed form and any supporting evidence via email to studentcomplaints@bmu-edu.uz from your University email account.



Student Complaint Submission Form – Stage 2 Review

Surname/Family Name	
First Name	
Address (Tashkent)	
Mobile	
University Email	
Student ID	
Programme of Study	

The nature of your complaint

Please give details of your complaints; continuing on additional sheets if necessary, and attach any supporting evidence you may have.



Please outline any steps you have already taken to resolve your complaint at Stage 1, including who you contacted and when, and the response received:

Please explain why you remain dissatisfied:

Please describe the outcome you are seeking:

Signature	
Date	

Please send the completed form and any supporting evidence via email to studentcomplaints@bmu-edu.uz from your University email account.



Extenuating Circumstances Form (EC Form)

Please submit your EC Form to the Registrar’s Office.

The Student should submit an EC form when he or she is not able to undertake assessment(s) due to serious unforeseen and unpreventable circumstances. You may contact the Registrar’s Office to seek advice and guidance in completion of an EC form.

Step 1 - Personal Details

Name:		ID Number:	
University Email Address:		Date of birth:	
Degree Programme:		Year of studies: 1/2/3/4	

Step 2 - Specify the Period of Time when Your Work Has Been Affected by Your Circumstances

From:	To:
-------	-----

Step 3 - Student Consent to the British Management University

The information that I have provided in my extenuating circumstances claim is complete and accurate, and to the best of my knowledge. I give my consent for this information to be disclosed to the relevant University Officers that are going to examine my case. I understand that this information will be kept in my personal records and may be referred to at any further Examiners’ meetings.

Student Signature:	Date:
--------------------	-------

Step 4 - List All Modules and Assessments that Are Affected by Your Extenuating Circumstances

Module Name:	Work affected: <i>written work, course work, project work, group work, presentation, in-class test, exam, dissertation</i>	Name of Module Leader:	Deadline(s) of assignment(s):	What outcome(s) do you seek for? <i>Extension granted, removal of late penalty, re-arrange of examination or in-class test, repeat year.</i>



Step 5 - Your Extenuating Circumstance(s)

Please, explain what had happened to you and when:

Step 6 - How Have your Extenuating Circumstances Affected Your Studies

Please, specify the impact of Extenuating circumstances on your ability to study and/or take assessments:

Step 7 - Your Supporting Evidence



It is your responsibility to support your claim with evidence as soon as possible to avoid delays. Normally, you should submit supportive documents no later than **5 working days** after EC Form submission.

It is important that the evidence you submit covers the dates indicated in Steps 2 and 4, and relates to the extenuating circumstances indicated in Steps 5 and 6.

Please, tick the type of evidence you submitted:

- Medical Confirmation Form/Doctor's Letter;
- Evidence from Student Counselor or other mental health professional;
- Supporting letter from other professional you consulted about your issue;
- Death certificate;
- Other (please, provide the details)

Supporting evidence submitted? Yes/No

If No, please confirm when evidence will be submitted:

--FOR INTERNAL USE ONLY--

Step 8 - For Use by the Registrar's Office

Please, indicate action to be taken:

- Authorised Absence
- Removal of late penalty
- Extension(s) granted – deadline(s) agreed test date
- Re-arrange new in-class

New deadline/in-class test date: _____

Job title:

Student notified: Yes/No

Print Name:

Relevant Staff Notified: Yes/No

Signature of the Officer:

Date: