

medway school of pharmacy

**ACADEMIC REGULATIONS
FOR UNDERGRADUATE AWARDS
Other than the Master of Pharmacy
(MPharm)**

September 2017

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This document sets out the academic regulations for undergraduate degrees, other than the Master of Pharmacy (MPharm), in the Medway School of Pharmacy. These are joint awards of the University of Greenwich and the University of Kent and these Regulations apply to all students registered for these programmes, regardless of their university of registration.
- 1.2 The Regulations set out the requirements for the assessment and progression of students, the award of credit and the classification of academic awards. They are subject to the approval of the senior academic bodies of both institutions (the University of Greenwich's Academic Council and the University of Kent's Senate).
- 1.3 Hereinafter in these Regulations 'the universities' shall be taken to refer to the University of Greenwich and the University of Kent, who hold conjoint responsibility for the Medway School of Pharmacy.

2 Minimum and Maximum Registration Periods

The period of registration normally permitted for the Medway School of Pharmacy's undergraduate programmes (whether undertaken full-time or part-time) shall be:

Award	Minimum	Maximum
Certificate of Higher Education	1 year	6 years
Diploma of Higher Education	2 years	6 years
Foundation Degree	2 years	6 years
Non-honours Degree	3 years	8 years
Honours Degree	3 years	8 years

These time limits include any period of intermission and any period of time in which a student is undertaking a sandwich placement or repeating part of the programme of study. It also covers extended degrees encompassing a Level 3 stage.

3. Programme Structure, the Award of Credit and Progression

- 3.1 The undergraduate programmes comprise an approved set of **modules** divided into **stages**. Each module is at a specified **level** and a student is awarded a specified number of **credits at that level** following successful completion of the module.
- 3.2 A student who successfully demonstrates via assessment that they have achieved the specified learning outcomes for a module will be awarded the number and level of credits prescribed for the module. Assessment methods vary between modules and assessment is designed so that achievement of the pass mark or above will demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes. Elements of assessment may be formative or summative in nature.
- 3.3 For the award of credit a student is required to achieve at least the module pass mark in each component part (coursework and examination) of the summative assessments for each module). Module specifications will state whether the pass mark has to be achieved overall and/or in prescribed elements of summative

assessment. For all undergraduate programmes other than the MPharm, modules at Levels 4, 5 and 6 have a pass mark of 40%.

- 3.4** Students must achieve specified requirements in each stage before being permitted to progress to the next stage. Each stage will consist of modules amounting to 120 credits. In order to be eligible for the award of the FdSc or BSc (Hons) or of an exit award of CertHE, DipHE, or BSc a student must obtain at least the minimum number of credits required for that award at the specified levels. These requirements are set out below in section 8.

3.5. Failure and the Retrieval of Credit

Referral

- 3.5.1 Where a student has failed one or more modules and is not permitted to progress to the next stage of a programme, the Progression and Award Board may permit the student to undertake further assessment in failed modules. The opportunity to undertake further assessment following the failure of a module is known as **referral**. Depending on the scale of failure, only two further assessment opportunities will normally be permitted, to a maximum of three attempts in total. Where the credit for a failed module is retrieved via referral, the overall mark awarded for the module will be capped at the pass mark.
- 3.5.2 Where a student is required to be reassessed in a module, this will normally take place at the next available opportunity, and before progressing to the next stage of the programme. Students will not be permitted to progress to the next stage of the programme until all of the credits required for the previous stage of the programme have been achieved.
- 3.5.3 Where a student has failed more than two modules at the first opportunity, and attained an overall stage mark of less than 30% without presenting acceptable evidence of mitigating circumstances, s/he will normally be required to withdraw from the programme for reasons of unacceptable academic performance.
- 3.5.4 A student may not be reassessed in elements that are no longer current. The Progression and Award Board may make such special arrangements as it deems appropriate in cases where it is impracticable for students to be reassessed in the same elements and by the same methods as at the first attempt.

Compensation and condonement

- 3.5.5 The use of mechanisms that allow for the award of credit based on the near failure of a limited number of modules ('compensation') or, very exceptionally, for failures below that level ('condonement') may not be permitted for some modules. These are identified in the relevant programme specification.
- 3.5.6 A student who fails up to 25% of the credits for a Stage may, at the discretion of the Progression and Award Board, receive compensation for that failure and be awarded credits for the relevant module(s), provided that they have a good overall performance, normally defined as an average stage mark of 50% or above, and provided the mark for any individual module is within five percentage points of the pass mark (i.e. the achievement of a mark in the range 35% - 39%) and that there is evidence to show that the programme learning outcomes are being or have been achieved.

- 3.5.7 A student cannot be condoned or compensated for more than 60 credits across the programme.

Deferral

- 3.5.8 The Progression and Award Board will take into account the advice of its Mitigating Circumstances Panel to determine whether the student will be allowed to re-sit the assessment or examination as if for the first time and without the penalty of a capped mark. This is known as **deferral**. Where the credit for a failed module is retrieved via deferral, therefore, the overall mark awarded for the module shall stand.
- 3.5.9 Where the Mitigating Circumstances Panel advises that a candidate has failed a module due to illness or other mitigating circumstances, and it is in the student's best interests for it to do so, the Progression and Award Board also has the discretion, within certain limits, to condone the failure and award credits for the module. Credits can be awarded up to a limit of 25% of a stage of a programme of study, provided that there is evidence to show that the programme learning outcomes are being or have been achieved.
- 3.5.10 The marks achieved for the module affected will not be adjusted to take account of the illness or other mitigating circumstances, but the student's transcript will indicate the module for which credits have been awarded through condonement.

Failure to Progress

- 3.5.11 Students who have exhausted all reassessment attempts permitted by the Progression and Award Board and still fail to meet the requirements for progression will be required to withdraw from the programme. Students in this position who satisfy the requirements specified in section 8 of these Regulations may be awarded an appropriate exit award.

4. Progression Requirements

The progression requirements shown below refer to the stages of full-time study, or their equivalent on the part-time programme.

For programmes that include the possibility of a sandwich placement:

Stage 1

- 4.1 Credits will be awarded for individual modules in which a mark of at least 40% has been achieved, thus indicating that the student has met the learning outcomes of the modules for at least a threshold pass.
- 4.2 In order to progress to Stage 2 of the programme, a student will be required to gain 120 credits at Level 4 and pass all Stage 1 core modules.

Stage 2

- 4.3 Credits will be awarded for modules in which a mark of at least 40% has been achieved, thus indicating that the student has met the learning outcomes of the modules for at least a threshold pass.

- 4.4 In order to progress to Stage 3 of the Honours degree programme, a student will be required to gain 120 credits at Level 5 and pass all Stage 2 core modules.
- 4.5 The summative assessment results for Stage 2 of the Honours degree programme will contribute **25%** towards the classification of the final award.

Sandwich Placement

- 4.6 Credits will be awarded for modules in which a mark of at least 40% has been achieved, thus indicating that the student has met the learning outcomes of the modules for at least a threshold pass.
- 4.7 In order to progress to Stage 3 of the Honours degree programme, a student will be required to gain 120 credits at Level 5 and pass all Sandwich Placement modules.
- 4.8 The summative assessment results for the Sandwich Placement on the Honours degree programme will contribute **10%** towards the classification of the final award.

Stage 3

- 4.9 Credits will be awarded for modules in which a mark of at least 40% has been achieved, thus indicating that the student has met the learning outcomes of the modules for at least a threshold pass.
- 4.10 In order to complete the Honours degree programme successfully, a student will be required to gain 120 credits at Level 6 and pass all Stage 3 core modules.
- 4.11 Where a student has undertaken a sandwich placement, the summative assessments at Stage 3 will contribute **65%** towards the classification of the final award.
- 4.12 Where a student has NOT undertaken a sandwich placement, the summative assessments at Stage 3 will contribute **75%** towards the classification of the final award.
- 4.13 Where a student fails and does not successfully retrieve the assessments for Stage 3 of the Honours degree programme but obtains the necessary 300 credits (see 8.1.4 below), the award of a BSc will be unclassified.

For programmes WITHOUT the possibility of a sandwich placement:

Stage 1

- 4.14 Credits will be awarded for individual modules in which a mark of at least 40% has been achieved, thus indicating that the student has met the learning outcomes of the modules for at least a threshold pass.
- 4.15 In order to progress to Stage 2 of the programme, a student will be required to gain 120 credits at Level 4 and pass all Stage 1 core modules.

Stage 2

- 4.16 Credits will be awarded for modules in which a mark of at least 40% has been achieved, thus indicating that the student has met the learning outcomes of the modules for at least a threshold pass.

- 4.17** In order to be awarded a Foundation degree, a student will be required to gain 120 credits at Level 4 and 120 credits at Level 5 and pass all Stage 1 and 2 core modules.
- 4.18** In order to progress to Stage 3 of the Honours degree programme, a student will be required to gain 120 credits at Level 5 and pass all Stage 2 core modules.
- 4.19** The summative assessment results for Stage 2 of the Honours degree programme will contribute **25%** towards the classification of the final award.

Stage 3

- 4.20** Credits will be awarded for modules in which a mark of at least 40% has been achieved, thus indicating that the student has met the learning outcomes of the modules for at least a threshold pass.
- 4.21** In order to complete the Honours degree programme successfully, a student will be required to gain 120 credits at Level 6 and pass all Stage 3 core modules.
- 4.22** The summative assessments at Stage 3 will contribute **75%** towards the classification of the final award.
- 4.23** Where a student fails and does not successfully retrieve the assessments for Stage 3 of the Honours degree programme but obtains the necessary 300 credits (see 8.1.4 below), the award of a BSc will be unclassified.

5. The Subject Assessment Panel (SAP)

- 5.1** The purpose of the Subject Assessment Panel (SAP) is to confirm the marks for a student cohort on the range of modules that falls under its purview. These marks go forward into the students' profiles, for consideration at the Progression and Award Board.
- 5.2** It is the responsibility of the relevant Module Convenor to ensure that the data submitted are accurate and complete. The Chair of the Panel must be satisfied, **before the meeting of the Panel** that all module results are available and have been checked. The SAP report must be authorised as accurate by the Chair.
- 5.3** The SAP is responsible for overseeing the performance of students on individual modules and considering, in the light of any comments from Module Convenors and External Examiners, whether any changes might be required to the marks awarded or to the modules in the future.
- 5.4** The functions and terms of reference of the Subject Assessment Panel are as follows:
1. To consider and review the nature of assessments and examinations for a group of modules within the Panel's subject area;
 2. To receive and consider comments from External Examiners and Module Convenors on the student cohort's performance on individual modules;

3. To confirm as appropriate the marks for the modules under its purview.

5.5 The Subject Assessment Panel shall therefore decide the final result of the marks allocated to the students on the modules within which they have been assessed. Comment from the External Examiner(s) on the standard of marking may result in the adjustment of the marks for the whole cohort, but on no account should this be used to modify the marks of individual students without consideration of the marks for the whole cohort.

5.6 The Medway School of Pharmacy must ensure that formal written records of the proceedings of each Subject Assessment Panel are maintained.

5.7 Composition of the Subject Assessment Panel

The Subject Assessment Panel shall consist of the following:

- The Head of the Medway School of Pharmacy (Chair) or nominee;
- Teaching staff for the modules under consideration by the Panel, as internal examiners;
- Participating External Examiner(s) for all Level 5 and Level 6 Panels: at least one External Examiner must have commented on standards but s/he need not have been in attendance.

6. The Progression and Award Board

6.1 The responsibility for the assessment of a student's performance is delegated by the senior academic bodies of the universities (the Academic Council and the Senate) to the Progression and Award Board, either for one or for several programmes.

6.2 The Progression and Award Board shall decide the final result of the process of assessment for each student. The decisions of the Board shall not be subject to any further approval within the universities but, in the case of an externally validated examination, they shall be subject to confirmation by the external body concerned. The decisions of the Board shall be recorded and results made available as soon as possible after the meeting.

6.3 The Medway School of Pharmacy must ensure that formal written records of the proceedings of each Progression and Award Board are maintained.

6.4 The Progression and Award Board is responsible for ensuring that standards are maintained and that all the requirements for assessments that contribute to the conferment of an academic award, as laid down in the programme specification and in the regulations of any other appropriate awarding or accrediting body, are complied with.

6.5 Delegation of Responsibility by the Progression and Award Board

The Progression and Award Board may delegate to other sub-committees or individuals such functions as may be appropriate; for example, final decisions on the acceptance or rejection of claims of mitigating circumstances may be delegated to a Panel. Any progression implications will nevertheless remain the remit of the Progression and Award Board.

- 6.6** Lists of marks for the modules for a student cohort will already have been confirmed by the Subject Assessment Panel. It is the responsibility of the Programme Leader, working in conjunction with those responsible for student records, to ensure that the data submitted to the Progression and Award Board are accurate and complete. The Chair of the PAB must be satisfied, **before the meeting of the Board**, that all module results and records of mitigating circumstances related to the students to be considered, are available, so that each student's profile is reviewed in full at the meeting.
- 6.7** Recommendations for the award of credit, the referral, deferral and progression of students and the conferment of academic awards shall be made to the universities by the Progression and Award Board for the programme. The functions and terms of reference of the Progression and Award Board are as follows:
1. To oversee progression and award procedures in designated programmes to maintain standards;
 2. To ensure compliance with the requirements for progression and awards ;
 3. To examine individual student assessment profiles;
 4. To review and make decisions on the progression of students and on reassessment in the light of overall performance, where necessary taking personal mitigating circumstances into account;
 5. To make decisions on awards;
 6. To authorise the decisions made, including certifying the results through the signature of the Chair, the Officer and the External Examiner and through the minuting of key decisions in relation to progression, reassessment in the light of overall performance and consideration of any mitigating circumstances.

Exceptionally it may be necessary to use Chair's action to finalise a decision, and in such circumstances the Chair should normally consult the External Examiner. The decisions made by Chair's action must be recorded and presented for information at the next meeting of the Progression and Award Board.

6.8 Composition of the Progression and Award Board

The Progression and Award Board shall consist of the following:

- Head of Medway School of Pharmacy (Chair) or nominee
- The appropriate Programme Leader(s);

- Representative members of teaching staff as internal examiners
- At least one External Examiner
- A Minuting Officer
- A University Officer who is knowledgeable of and able to give advice regarding the application of these Regulations, who acts as the guardian of the Regulations on behalf of the universities.

The proceedings of a Progression and Award Board shall not be invalidated by the absence of any internal staff member designated by the Chair as a member of the Board.

6.9 Student Membership

In normal circumstances, no student should be a member of a Progression and Award Board or attend an examiners' meeting. If, however, a person who is otherwise qualified to be an examiner for a programme (for example, as a member of staff or as an approved External Examiner) is coincidentally registered as a student on another programme of study, in either of the universities or elsewhere, that should not in itself disqualify that person from carrying out normal examining commitments.

6.10 Declaration of Personal or Actual Interest

The Progression and Award Board shall be advised if any member has a personal or professional connection with any of the students being considered. The Chair has discretion to request anyone declaring an interest to retire from the meeting at the point at which discussion of the student's profile takes place.

7. External Examining and the Assurance of Standards

The essential role for External Examiners appointed by the universities shall be to provide independent, informative comment and recommendations upon whether or not:

- The universities are maintaining the academic standards set for their awards in the Medway School of Pharmacy;
- The assessment process measures student achievement rigorously and fairly against the intended outcomes of the programme and is conducted in line with the policies and regulations agreed between the two universities for the Medway School of Pharmacy;
- The academic standards and the achievements of students of the Medway School of Pharmacy are comparable with those in other UK higher education institutions of which the External Examiners have experience;
- In providing an oversight of standards, Examiners will be encouraged to identify formally:

- Good practice and innovation relating to learning, teaching and assessment
 - Enhancements to the quality of the learning opportunities provided to students.
- v. In providing oversight of the standards of the universities' awards, External Examiners will be expected to:
- Attend annually the Progression and Award Boards (PAB) as required by the Medway School of Pharmacy. The School will ensure that all PABs are attended by at least one External Examiner to oversee its deliberations, as described in 6.6 above.
 - Attend, as required by the Medway School of Pharmacy or the relevant PSRB, other specified assessment activities, which may include, *inter alia*, vivas, objective structured practical examinations (OSPES), in which students are assessed and where external comment is normally expected to form part of external quality oversight of the module or programme;
 - Report to the Vice-Chancellors of the universities, as Chairs of their senior academic bodies, on any matters of serious concern arising from the assessments, which put at risk the standard of the universities' awards in the Medway School of Pharmacy.
 - Provide the universities with a formal report at the end of each academic session in a manner and on a timescale determined by agreement between the two institutions.

8. The Conferment of Awards

8.1 The Progression and Award Board may make recommendations for the conferment of the following awards:

- Certificate of Higher Education (at least 120 credits)
- Diploma of Higher Education (at least 240 credits)
- Foundation Degree (at least 240 credits)
- BSc (at least 300 credits)
- BSc (Hons) (at least 360 credits)

8.1.1 **A Certificate of Higher Education** will be awarded if a student successfully completes Stage 1 of full-time study on a Foundation Degree or an Honours degree programme or the equivalent of part-time study (at least 120 credits at Level 4), but does not continue into Stage 2, or if the candidate fails the second year assessment and does not retrieve the failure.

- 8.1.2 **A Diploma of Higher Education** will be awarded if a student successfully completes Stages 1 and 2 of full-time study on the Honours degree programme or the equivalent of part-time study (at least 240 credits, of which at least 90 must be at Level 5 or above), but does not progress into Stage 3, or if the candidate fails to obtain a degree after the Stage 3 assessment and does not retrieve the failure.
- 8.1.3 **A Foundation Degree** will be awarded if a student successfully completes Stages 1 and 2 of full-time study or the equivalent of part-time study on the Foundation Degree programme (240 credits, of which at least 90 must be at Level 5)
- 8.1.4 **BSc (Non-honours)**: a candidate who completes Stages 1-3 of full-time study or the equivalent of part-time study on the Honours degree programme, but does not complete the final year successfully, may be eligible for the award of a BSc degree without Honours (at least 300 credits, of which at least 150 credits must be at level 5 or above, including at least 60 at Level 6 or above), or may be permitted to undertake additional courses in order to qualify for a BSc (Hons) degree.
- 8.1.5 **BSc (Honours)**: a candidate who successfully completes stages 1-3 of full-time study or the equivalent of part-time study on the Honours degree programme, (360 credits, of which at least 210 credits are at level 5 or above, including at least 90 credits at level 6) will be awarded an Honours degree.
- 8.1.6 Once a recommendation for award has been approved on behalf of the two universities, the graduand will be invited to attend the Joint Awards Ceremony.

9. Summative Assessment Regulations for the Award of the Foundation Degree and the Honours Degree

- 9.1 The summative assessment marks for Stages 1 and 2 of the Foundation degree programme will be aggregated to produce the final overall average mark. The Foundation degree is unclassified, but students can be awarded a merit or a distinction for marks above a certain level.
- 9.1.1 Candidates who pass Stage 2, or its equivalent in part-time mode, will be eligible for the award of the Foundation degree. Distinction and Merit shall be awarded as follows:
- | | |
|-----------------------|---------------|
| Pass with Distinction | 70% and above |
| Pass with Merit | 60% - 69% |
- 9.2 The summative assessment marks for Stages 2 and 3 of the Honours degree programme will be aggregated to make a weighted contribution to the final overall average mark for classification purposes, in accordance with the weightings set out in section 4 above.
- 9.2.1 Students entering the programme at stages other than stage 1 of the Honours degree will have the credits with which they were admitted onto the programme form a part of the total credits required for the programme; however, no marks accrued as a part of achieving those credits will be able to be considered as contributing to the aggregation for their award. In those circumstances, the weighting of marks contributing to their award will be based solely on the credits accrued on the Honours degree programme.

9.2.2 Candidates who pass Stage 3, or its equivalent in part-time mode, will be eligible for the award of the Honours degree. The classifications shall be as follows:

First Class Honours	70% and above
Upper Second Class Honours	60% - 69%
Lower Second Class Honours	50% - 59%
Third Class Honours	40% - 49%

9.3 Borderline Judgements

9.3.1 The Progression and Award Board may use its discretion in considering cases on the borderline of classification categories. A borderline case is normally defined as a student who has an Overall Grade Point Average within 2.0 percentage points below the classification percentiles stated in 9.2.2 above (e.g. 38.0, 48.0, 58.0 and 68.0 respectively for Third, 2:2, 2:1 and 1st class degree classifications). Exceptionally, the Progression and Award Board may give consideration to student profiles that fall outside this 2% boundary where the student has had mitigating circumstances confirmed by the Mitigating Circumstances Panel.

9.3.2 The Progression and Award Board may consider the following when awarding a degree classification which is higher than that indicated by the overall Grade Point Average:

- i. The student profile as a whole, taking into account the programme/ award specification; the spread of marks obtained across all assessment tasks, and the marks obtained on those courses in which the student has performed better or worse than the classification dictated by the overall Grade Point Average. Where there is sufficient evidence of higher aptitude, a higher classification may be awarded.
- ii. Recognition of the development of the student whose performance in the final Stage indicates a higher classification than the overall Grade Point Average.
- iii. The views of the External Examiner on the quality of the student's work.

10. Late Submission of Coursework

10.1 If coursework is received later than the deadline specified, the work will be marked in the normal manner so that, regardless of any subsequent decision made in relation to the late submission, the work has been appropriately assessed.

10.2 Where work has been submitted late and either no plea of mitigating circumstances has been received or a plea has been made but not found to be acceptable, a mark of **zero** will be recorded for the work.

10.3 In accordance with 3.5.10, where a plea of mitigating circumstances has been made and found to be acceptable, the mark achieved will be recorded. In making its decision about the student's progression or award, the Progression and Award Board will decide whether the mitigating circumstances can be regarded as having had an adverse effect on the student's profile.

11. Intermission

Where a student admitted to a programme of study wishes to interrupt their programme for a prescribed period of time, the appropriate intermission procedure must be followed. It is important that students read the guidance about intermission available on the website before making an application to intermit. The form to apply for intermission should be completed and submitted to the Head of School prior to withdrawal from the universities' registration system.

12. Mitigating Circumstances

- 12.1** it is the responsibility of students to attend examinations and to submit work for assessment as required; however, if there is evidence of the student becoming unwell prior to or during the assessment or if there are personal circumstances which they deem to have affected their performance, the student is required to provide documentary medical evidence or evidence of these circumstances within the deadlines specified in order to support a request for mitigating circumstances to be considered by the Mitigating Circumstances Panel.
- 12.2** If a student does not provide the Panel with information about any personal circumstances that may have affected their performance in assessments or their capacity to complete the assessments, or to do so in the time span required, any subsequent appeal on these grounds may be rejected.
- 12.3** If a student fails to attend examinations or to submit work for assessment without good cause, the Progression and Award Board has the authority to deem the student to have failed the assessments concerned.

13. Appeals

- 13.1** If a student wishes to appeal a decision of the Progression and Award Board, they must complete and submit the requisite appeal form before the specified deadline or the appeal will not be able to be heard.

14. Cheating and Plagiarism

- 14.1** There are various forms of academic dishonesty but this will normally refer to cheating in examinations or presenting work for assessment which does not represent the student's own efforts. All examples of cheating or plagiarism will be penalised, as described in the Academic Misconduct Regulations agreed by the universities.
- 14.2** If it is established that a student has cheated or otherwise attempted to gain an unfair advantage, the School will follow the relevant disciplinary procedures agreed by the universities in considering the case.