Background

The Academic Regulations are the policies through which QM articulates the processes for the management of its academic provision. This document details notable changes for the Academic Regulations 2013-14. Senate is asked to consider these changes, and to approve the Academic Regulations.

Senate is asked to note the following points:

- many changes are contingent upon the approval of other papers under consideration at the June 2013 meeting of Senate;
- very minor changes that do not affect meaning are not included in this cover document. A ‘red-pen’ version of the full regulations, which shows all changes from the 2012-13 edition, is available here: www.arcs.qmul.ac.uk/governance/senate;
- readers must refer to the correct iteration of the regulations for the particular student(s) under consideration. Generally, sections 1-3 apply to all students, while sections 4-8 will only apply to students starting in 2013-14 (or falling into the categories defined at the start of each section);
- the numbers in brackets in the tables below indicate regulations’ places in the 2013/14 iteration;
- Sections 7 and 8 (Special Regulations and Collaborative Regulations) are subject to change, as Taught Programmes Board will approve further changes in June/July 2013 as an outcome of the ‘Award Rules Review’ paper (where schools have confirmed choices, these have been included, but remain provisional until Senate and TPB have met). The regulations for the new collaborative programme with Nanchang University will also be added to Section 7, once approved.
- Section 8 (Research Programmes) is not covered in this document – please contact the RDO if you have any queries on those regulations.

Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item: ‘Academic year’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text:</strong> A period running from 1 August to 31 July. The developmental years of most undergraduate programmes follow academic years, and policies and regulations are normally written by academic year. See also developmental year, and calendar year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change and reason:</strong> Previously ran from September to August. Amended to reflect current practice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item: ‘Award’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text:</strong> Undergraduate, graduate, and postgraduate certificates, diplomas, bachelors degrees (with and without honours), and undergraduate and postgraduate masters degrees. The awards offered by QM are detailed in the Ordinances and the Academic Regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change and reason:</strong> Removal of reference to bachelors degrees “with and without honours”. QM does not, and never has, issued bachelors degrees without honours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item: ‘College’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old text:</strong> Queen Mary and Westfield College, which operates under the name ‘Queen Mary, University of London (QM).’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New text:</strong> Queen Mary University of London (QM).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change and reason:</strong> Change to QM’s name. Associated changes throughout the document.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1: Framework and Governance

Regulation: 1.9 (1.9): list of awards that QM can confer

Change and reason: QM may now make any of the awards previously listed only under 'University of London awards'. In 2013/14, new entrants have the choice of QM or UoL awards, and thus the (identical) UoL awards are also listed. Higher doctorates have also been added; the details are provisional, subject to approval of the separate Senate paper on the subject.

Regulation: 1.10 (NEW): University of London and QM awards

Text: In 2013/14, QM will implement its independent degree awarding powers for the first time. New and continuing students in 2013/14 shall be given the option of receiving either a QM award or a University of London award, where appropriate. Students must make their selections before the published deadline in 2013/14 and in accordance with the stated procedure. New students from 2014/15 will not have this option, and shall be awarded QM awards where the requirements are met.

Change and reason: Exercise of independent degree awarding powers.

Regulation: 1.21 (1.21): Suspension of regulations

Text: Suspension of regulations shall be approved by the relevant authority identified by Senate, and on the recommendation of a Degree Examination Board (generally following the recommendation of a Subject Examination Board), or a Head of School or Institute. Suspensions relating to examination board matters shall normally be approved by examination boards, not by Heads of Schools or Institutes.

Change and reason: Insertion of ‘normally’ into final sentence. Heads of School can make these requests, but would only do so where the Chair was unavailable. Otherwise unchanged.

Regulation: 1.30 (1.30): SEB membership

Text: The membership of a Subject Examination Board shall be as follows:
   i. a Chair, appointed to the role by Senate, or its delegated authority;
   ii. a Deputy Chair, appointed to the role by Senate, or its delegated authority;
   iii. the programme coordinators or directors;
   iv. the internal examiners for the modules under consideration;
   v. the external and intercollegiate examiners;
   vi. the DEB Chair, who may attend any examination board under the DEB’s jurisdiction as a member;
   vii. the Vice-Principal (Teaching & Learning), who may attend any examination board as a member.

Change and reason: Addition of DEB Chairs. Minor associated changes to 1.33 and 1.35.

Regulation: 1.31 (1.31): SEB attendees

Text: The following may be in attendance:
   i. the Secretary to the SEB;
   ii. representatives from other SEBs, where students on joint programmes are under consideration;
   iii. the Academic Registrar (or nominee);
   iv. the Principal, Faculty Vice-Principal & Executive Dean, and Faculty Dean for Taught Programmes;
   v. assistant internal examiners;
   vi. administrative staff associated with the SEB.

Change and reason: Addition of administrative staff associated with the SEB.

Regulation: 1.37 (1.37/38): Appointment of SEB Chairs and Deputies

Text: The Chair shall be an experienced senior member of academic staff, but not a serving Head of School or Institute, or a Faculty Dean for Taught Programmes, or an honorary member of academic staff. Programme directors shall not normally act as Chairs for SEBs where their programmes are under consideration. A Deputy Chair shall fulfil the duties of the Chair in the Chair’s absence. Chairs and Deputy Chairs shall be appointed by Senate, or its delegated authority.

Change and reason: No change to the regulation, but the delegated authority for appointment has changed from the Dean for Taught Programmes to the Head of School (or Dean for PG, for SMD). Appointments must be sent to ARCS. The Deans have been consulted and given agreement.
**Regulation: 1.46 (1.46): DEB quorum**

**Text:** The quorum for a DEB shall comprise 50 per cent of the total membership for the SEBs under consideration, excluding the Vice-Principal (Teaching & Learning).

**Change and reason:** Quorum remains 50 per cent, but this accommodates boards where not all SEBs have business to be discussed, notably the summer postgraduate DEB.

**Regulation: 1.51 (1.51): External examiner terms of office**

**Text:** The period of appointment for external examiners shall be four years. Exceptionally, this may be extended to a fifth year. External examiners who have completed terms cannot be reappointed until five years have elapsed.

**Change and reason:** Previously three years, with the possibility of extension for a fourth year. Most contracts are extended, and the QAA gives four years as the norm. Refer to separate June 2013 Senate paper on external examining for more details.

**Regulation: N/A (1.52.ix): External examiner duties (vivas)**

**Change and reason:** Old clause ix deleted. This read: ‘to attend - or conduct - oral examinations, where applicable (note: QM only approves the use of viva type examinations as approved elements of assessment with detailed marking schemes that form part of a module’s assessment. They are not normally used for making decisions in classification)’.

Vivas can no longer be used in discretion under any circumstances (SE2012.42c), and externals should not be conducting any assessments directly. Where vivas are used as part of the approved assessments, externals can still sit in, in the same way that they can moderate any assessment.

**Regulation: 1.57 (1.57): External member terms of office**

**Text:** The period of appointment for external members shall be four years. Exceptionally, this may be extended to a fifth year. External members who have completed terms cannot be reappointed until five years have elapsed.

**Change and reason:** Previously three years, with the possibility of extension for a fourth year. Amended in line with the changes for external examiners, above.

## 2: General Regulations

**Regulation: 2.12 (NEW): Replacement award certificates**

**Text:** When a student requests a duplicate award certificate, the student must confirm with QM that the original certificate has been lost. Only one copy of each award certificate may be in circulation at any time.

**Change and reason:** Clear statement of QM's policy in this area.

**Regulation: 2.14 (2.13): Advanced standing – credit expiry**

**Text:** An applicant for a programme of study who, in the judgement of Senate or its delegated authority, has a cognate prior qualification or certified learning may be admitted with advanced standing as described in the following regulations. In all cases the following three provisions apply:

i. such admission shall not normally be permitted where the advanced standing has counted towards a previously achieved qualification at the level of the qualification of the programme of study;

ii. advanced standing shall normally be no more than one half of the full programme of study (excluding Level 3 study)

iii. credit may only be accepted as advanced standing towards a QM programme within five years of the date of the original award of credit.

**Change and reason:** Only (iii) is new. The proposal is in line with other University of London Colleges. QM currently has no 'credit expiry' policy, and is unusual in this regard.

**Regulation: 2.16 (NEW): Reapplication**

**Text:** Students who have been awarded qualifications of QM or the University may not subsequently present themselves for re-examination for that award in the same subject or branch of study.

**Change and reason:** This regulation has been in Sections 4 and 5 for many years but, given the direct impact on admissions, it has now been copied here, too (unchanged). This regulation also prevents students who failed and left with an exit award from reapplying with advanced standing for the original programme.
Regulation: 2.20 (2.18) and 2.22 (2.20): Advanced standing – top-up

Text (2.20 refers to graduate awards and 2.22 – quoted – to postgraduate ones, but the text is otherwise identical): A QM graduate who has completed a QM Postgraduate Certificate or Postgraduate Diploma may be admitted to a programme leading to the associated PGDip or master’s degree with advanced standing. A period of twelve months must elapse between the award of the PGCert/PGDip and registration for the PGDip or master’s degree. In such cases, a student shall study only the elements of the programme yet to be completed for the PGDip or master’s award, and the amount of academic credit to be taken shall be reduced accordingly. The award regulations shall take account all marks and modules taken during both registration periods.

Change and reason: Only the final sentence has changed. Previously, such students were classified only on the modules taken during the second registration (often a single module), which produced odd results that did not reflect students’ overall profiles, and was markedly out of line with the sector.

Regulation: 2.28 (2.26): Registration statuses

Text: In addition, subject to the decision of the relevant Subject Examination Board, a student may be registered to:
   i. resit out of attendance;
   ii. retake (attendance required);
   iii. first take (attendance required);

Change and reason: Points iv and v deleted (iv - resubmit a dissertation or project through reworking, with minimal supervision; v - resubmit a dissertation or project through undertaking a new topic, with full supervision). These are simply descriptions of a resit (iv) and retake (v) and as such constitute unnecessary duplication. Minor associated change to 2.29.

Regulation: 2.46-48 (2.42-44): Registering for resits when in attendance

Text: Resit and first sit registrations for enrolled students in attendance must be confirmed by the published deadline, and in accordance with the stated procedure. Any such student who opts-out or does not confirm their registration by the published deadline shall forfeit any remaining attempts to pass the relevant module.

Resit and first sit registrations for students designated ‘resitting out of attendance’ must be confirmed by the published deadline, and in accordance with the stated procedure. Any such student who opts-out or does not confirm their registration by the published deadline shall forfeit any remaining attempts to pass the relevant module, and may have their registration terminated and cease to be a student.

Where a student is registered for resits or first sits but does not attempt the required assessment, the registration shall count as one of the permitted attempts at the module; for a student designated ‘resitting out of attendance’, the Subject Examination Board may also recommend that the student’s registration and enrolment be terminated.

Change and reason: Students resitting in attendance were previously automatically registered for any resits and had to opt out if they did not wish to take them, while those resitting out of attendance had to opt in. The policy has now been amended as detailed above – please contact Registry if you have any queries on these regulations.

Regulation: 2.49-50 (NEW): reassessment and first sits for associate students

Text: 2.49 Associate students shall be subject to the provisions detailed above; however, the next available assessment opportunity for associate students shall be as follows:

- Semester one-only associates: by the end of semester two, with results approved at the June SEB.
- Semester two-only and full year associates: by the end of the late-summer examination period, with results approved at the August SEB.

Change and reason: To allow progression at the home institutions for visiting associates.

Regulation: 2.57 (2.54): Debtors and results release

Old text: A student in debt to QM shall not be entitled to receive confirmed results, notification of progression from one year to the next, or any award of QM or the University.

New text: A student in academic debt to QM shall not be entitled to receive formal confirmation of results or progression from one year to the next, or any award of QM or the University. Academic debts include tuition fees, library debts, field course fees, and bench fees.

Change and reason: Clarification that only academic debts affect results release. Change of
phrasing allows release of limited information (for example, that a student needs to take a late summer resit), while still restricting access to formal notifications of results, including transcripts. From 2013/14, students will be required to pay 100 per cent of their tuition fees by 31 January, which should substantially reduce the number of debtors at the point of results notification.

**Regulation: 2.76 (NEW)**

*Text:* A student may not interrupt and return from interruption during the same academic year (for example, a student cannot interrupt for the autumn semester only, returning in semester two).

*Change and reason:* Codification of existing advice into a regulation. Such requests create considerable visa issues for students, and do not work well with the academic cycle, as they always result in students taking semester two before semester one.

**Regulation: 2.96-2.138: Regulations for Assessment Offences**

*Change and reason:* Reviewed by a task and finish group; the full recommendations for changes are detailed in a separate paper for Senate, June 2013. The major changes are:

**Offences:**
- Communicating with another candidate while under examination conditions (ADDED);
- Copying, or attempting to copy, the work of another candidate (ADDED);
- Entering an examination venue with writing on the body (ADDED).

**Changes to penalties:**
- a formal reprimand (ADDED);
- a requirement that the element of assessment be reworked and resubmitted (this shall not count as an additional attempt at the assessment) (DELETED);
- failure (a mark of 0) in the element of assessment in which the offence occurred, with a resubmission permitted with no limit to the mark that may be obtained (DELETED);
- failure (a mark of 0) in the element of assessment in which the offence occurred, with no permission to resubmit the assessment (DELETED);
- failure (with marks of 0X) of a portion of the diet of modules taken during the academic year in which the offence occurred, but with no limit on the marks that may be awarded on resit, irrespective of the regulations for that programme of study (DELETED);
- failure (with marks of 0X) of a portion of the diet of modules taken during the academic year in which the offence occurred, with the maximum mark on any resits or retakes limited to the minimum pass mark (DELETED).

**Regulation: 2.139-180 (2.132-171): Appeal Regulations**

*Main changes:*
- name amended to ‘Appeal Regulations’ (formerly College Appeal Regulations/CAR);
- removal of the ‘Final Review by the Principal’s Nominee’ stage;
- normal maximum period for processing appeals changed from 28 days to two months;
- roles of the Secretary and the QM representative split out;
- refinements and clarifications to the appeals process (see separate paper);
- clarifying process for dealing with out-of-time appeals.

*Change and reason:* Please refer to the separate June 2013 Senate paper on these regulations.

### 3: Regulations for the Conduct of Assessment

**Regulation: 3.56 (replacing 3.56) and 3.86 (NEW): ECs for students who fall ill in an examination**

*Old text:* Where a student is taken ill during an examination, the senior invigilator shall record this in their report. In such cases, the student must still submit an extenuating circumstances claim with supporting documentary evidence at least three working days before the meeting of the appropriate examination board’s extenuating circumstances sub-board if they wish the circumstances to be considered.

*New text:* Where a student is taken ill during an examination, the senior invigilator shall record this in their report. In such cases, the student must submit an extenuating circumstances claim with supporting documentary evidence in the normal manner if they wish the circumstances to be considered. Such claims shall only be accepted if the student was fit to sit on entering the
examination venue, but – for unforeseen reasons – became ill during the examination. Where a student leaves the venue in these circumstances, any work completed up to the point of departure shall become null and void, irrespective of whether the extenuating circumstances claim is subsequently upheld; the student shall be treated as if they had never attended the examination.

**Change and reason:** The old text was unclear, implying that students should submit claims, but that these would not be considered as they had attempted the exams. QM generally resorted to suspension of regulations in valid cases (which are and should remain extremely rare). The new policy effectively applies ‘fit to sit’ to the full duration of the exam, rather than a single decision on fitness to sit at the start. The penalty for non-valid ECs here (work becomes null and void) is the same as for students who miss an exam entirely without valid ECs – a mark of 0NS and the loss of an attempt; this acts as a check against abuse of the system. Added at 3.56 to specifically cover exams, and at 3.86 with minor wording additions to cover all timetabled assessments (e.g. in-class tests, etc).

### Regulation: 3.85 (NEW, largely replicating 3.54, which covers exams): Fit to sit rule
**Text:** QM operates a ‘fit to sit’ policy. If an assessment of any type is attempted or submitted, that attempt will be marked and counted as the student is deemed to be fit to sit (or submit). Any subsequent claim for extenuating circumstances shall not normally be considered.

**Change and reason:** Clarifies that the fit to sit policy applies to all types of assessment, not just to exams, in-class tests etc. Extenuating circumstances for coursework etc are often handled by extensions, but the criteria for extension should match those for ECs and, once a student does submit an assignment, that assignment will count and be classed as an attempt.

### 4: Regulations for Undergraduate & Graduate Programmes

**Regulation: 4.3 (4.3):** List of undergraduate and graduate awards that QM can confer
**Change and reason:** With the exercise of independent degree awarding powers, QM can now make any of the awards previously listed only under ‘University of London awards’. In 2013/14, new entrants have the choice of QM or UoL awards, and thus the (identical) UoL awards are also listed.

**Regulation: 4.10 and 4.11 (4.10 and 4.11):** Minimum and maximum registration periods

**Text:**

(4.10) A student must be registered for a minimum of one third of the normal duration of a programme of study in order to be eligible for award.

(4.11) A student must not be registered for a programme of study for a period longer than double the normal duration for the programme of study.

**Change and reason:** Previously read ‘A student must normally be registered…’. The ‘normally’ has been removed – exceptions have only been made by suspension of regulations and the old phrasing indicated flexibility within the normal application of the regulation that was never there.

**Regulation: 4.61 (4.68):** Revocation of award

**Text:** QM may revoke an award made under these regulations, in accordance with the relevant procedures of QM or the University. Such cases shall be considered on a case-by-case basis by Senate or its delegated authority.

**Change and reason:** The second sentence is new. The delegated authority is the Principal (or nominee), on the recommendation of the Academic Registrar.

**Regulation: 4.67.ii (4.74.ii) and throughout Sections 4 and 5: Next available opportunity**

**Text:** A student who passes the required value of academic credits but does not meet the programme or pathway requirements for progression due to failure in core modules may, subject to the approval of the Subject Examination Board:

i. transfer to another pathway or programme for which they meet the requirements.

ii. resit the required modules at the next available opportunity, where attempts remain.

**Change and reason:** The change is to (ii), which previously read “resit the required modules in the next academic year’. The new phrasing takes account of differences between SEBs (notably late summer resits), and makes it clear that resits are only permitted where attempts remain.

**Regulation: 4.68 (4.75):** Discretionary progression on less than the normal number of credits

**Old text:** Exceptionally, at the discretion of the Subject Examination Board, a student who has passed modules to the value of 75 credits at the end of developmental year one or passed modules to the value of 165 credits at the end of developmental year two may be permitted to progress and resit while studying for the next developmental year.
New text: Exceptionally, at the discretion of the Subject Examination Board, a student with outstanding first sits who has passed modules to the value of 75 credits at the end of developmental year one or passed modules to the value of 165 credits at the end of developmental year two may be permitted to progress and take the first sit while studying for the next developmental year.

Change and reason: Now only permitted where the student has an outstanding first sit, rather than a first sit or a resit. The regulation was designed when students had three attempts at a module, and with the reduction to two attempts it discriminates against students in schools with late summer resits (as they would use up all attempts before the start of the next year). The new proposal is fair, as any student might have outstanding first sits. SEBs can still use their discretion in these cases to allow or disallow such progression, generally by review of students’ overall profiles.

Regulation: 4.69 (4.76) and throughout Section 4: Eligibility for award
Text: Unchanged except for addition of: vii. achieve a minimum College Mark of 40.0
Change and reason: QM introduced this requirement last year. It is covered elsewhere, but has been added for clarity in this section against each set of awards (except MBBS, BDS, LLB).

Regulation: 4.73 (NEW): Award eligibility for programmes with compulsory placement years in EECS
Text: To be eligible for award, a student registered for a programme with a compulsory placement year in the School of Electronic Engineering and Computer Science must:
   i. take modules to a total value of 390 credits, equivalent to 120 credits per developmental year;
   ii. take modules to a minimum value of 90 credits at Level 6;
   iii. take modules to a maximum value of 150 credits at Level 4, of which 30 credits may be at Level 3;
   iv. pass modules to the value of 270 credits (excluding modules at Level 3).
Change and reason: An existing exception to the standard rules that had not previously been included in the Academic Regulations. Minor related change to 4.71.

Regulation: 4.77 (4.83): Year weightings
Text: The College Mark shall be calculated by one of the following methods:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Weighting of each developmental year (and percentage weightings)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSc, BA, BEng, BSc(Eng), BSc(Econ)*</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEng/BSc programmes in SEECS with a compulsory placement year*</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA programmes in SLLF with a compulsory year abroad</td>
<td>1 (9.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The year three weighting of 60% for BEng/BSc(Eng) programmes in Electronic Engineering shall comprise ‘Project: 20%’ and ‘other modules: 40%’, weighting the project at 20% of the degree.

Change and reason: BA, BEng and BSc(Eng) were previously weighted 1/2/4 (excepting Geography and EECS). The BEng/BSc with compulsory placement in EECS was an existing provision that was not documented in the Academic Regulations. This change results from the consultation on award rules – please see the separate June 2013 Senate paper for details.

Regulation: 4.79 (4.83) and throughout section 4: Classification
Text: The classification of honours shall be made according to the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Mark</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70.0 – 100.0</td>
<td>First Class Honours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.0 – 69.9</td>
<td>Second Class Honours, Upper Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.0 – 59.9</td>
<td>Second Class Honours, Lower Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.0 – 49.9</td>
<td>Third Class Honours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0 – 39.9</td>
<td>Fail (no award)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Change and reason:** New classification scheme for all UG programmes except LLB, MBBS, BDS, and programmes with special regulations (for new students only). Outcome of award rules consultation (see separate June 2013 Senate paper).

**Regulation:** 4.91 (4.94): MSci/MEng progression

**Text:** To progress from the one developmental year to the next, a student must meet any programme and pathway requirements and take and pass modules as detailed below:

i. foundation year to developmental year one: take modules to the value of 120 credits and pass modules to the value of 105 credits.

ii. developmental years one to two: take modules to the value of 120 credits, pass modules (excluding modules at Level 3) to the value of 105 credits from developmental year one, and meet any specified threshold mark requirement;

iii. developmental years two to three: take modules to the value of 120 credits, pass modules (excluding modules at Level 3) to the value of 210 credits from developmental years one and two, and meet any specified threshold mark requirement;

iv. developmental years three to four: take modules to the value of 120 credits, pass modules (excluding modules at Level 3) to the value of 315 credits from developmental years one, two, and three, and meet any specified threshold mark requirement;

**Change and reason:** Recommendation from the Award Rules Review. Previously only required 90 credits passed to progress from foundation year. Raised to 105 to reflect higher difficulty level of the MEng/MSci vis à vis the BEng/BSc. References to threshold marks added for progression to years two, three and four. MEng and MSci regulations combined into a single set – previously, the MSci only required 300 credits passed to enter the final year.

**Regulation:** 4.92 (NEW): MSci/MEng progression

**Text:** There shall be an approved threshold requirement, requiring an average mark of 60.0 (weighted to the scale 1:3:6:6) to progress to the next year of the integrated masters. This threshold will always apply for progression to either or both of year three and year four. It may also apply to progression to year two; consult the Special Regulations for details of specific programmes.

**Change and reason:** New, standardised provision around progression as an outcome of the award rules consultation (see separate June 2013 Senate paper for more details).

**Regulation:** 4.95 (NEW): MSci/MEng progression for programmes with a placement year

**Text:** For programmes with a compulsory year abroad or compulsory placement year, the progression requirement from the year abroad or placement year to the next developmental year shall be to take and complete modules to the credit value prescribed in the appropriate programme regulations. Individual programme regulations may specify exceptions to this rule.

**Change and reason:** Previously under the bachelors degree regulations. It remains there, but has been copied here as it applies equally to integrated masters programmes.

**Regulation:** 4.98 (NEW): Discretionary progression on less than the normal number of credits

**Text:** Exceptionally, at the discretion of the Subject Examination Board, a student with outstanding first sits who has passed modules to the value of 90 credits at the end of developmental year one, or passed modules to the value of 205 credits at the end of developmental year two, or passed modules to the value of 300 credits at the end of developmental year three may be permitted to progress and take the first sit while studying for the next developmental year.

**Change and reason:** Refer to 4.68.

**Regulation:** 4.108 (4.109): Year weightings – MSci/MEng

**Text:** The College Mark shall be calculated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Developmental year weightings (and percentage weightings)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEng, MSci*</td>
<td>1 (6.25%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*The year four weighting of 37.5% for MEng programmes in Electronic Engineering shall comprise ‘project: 20%’, and ‘other modules: 17.5%’, weighting the project at 20% of the degree.

**Change and reason:** Common scheme replaces five variant schemes, as an outcome of the award rules consultation (see separate June 2013 Senate paper).

**Regulation:** 4.170-171 (NEW) and 4.214-215 (replaces 4.228): BDS/MBBS exit awards

**Text:** Failure to meet award requirements

A student who does not meet the requirements for BDS, but meets the requirements for the lower level award of BSc (Hons), DipHE, or CertHE shall be conferred the award for which the requirements have been met, unless the student has been deregistered. Where a student has been deregistered, the nature of the deregistration shall be considered in deciding whether to recommend an exit award. Where an exit award is conferred upon a student registered on the BDS programme, the field of study shall be ‘Dental Sciences’.

BDS exit awards shall be classified according to the following scale, using a College Mark calculated by taking a flat average of the most recently passed 120 (CertHE), 240 (DipHE), or 360 (BSc) credits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Mark</th>
<th>CertHE/DipHE classification</th>
<th>BSc (Hons) classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70.0+</td>
<td>Distinction</td>
<td>First Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.0-69.9</td>
<td>Merit</td>
<td>Second Class (Upper Division)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.0-59.9</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Second Class (Lower Division)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0-49.9</td>
<td>Fail (no award)</td>
<td>Fail (no award)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Change and reason:** New exit arrangements, approved by Taught Programmes Board in April 2013. The MBBS text is the same, save that the exit title is ‘Medical Sciences’. Please note that there is no Third Class BSc, and that the CertHE/DipHE Pass range only runs from 50.0-59.9. This reflects the minimum pass mark of 50.0 throughout these programmes.

**Regulation:** N/A - deleted (previously 4.281-285): Pre-Masters Diploma award regulations

**Change and reason:** These regulations have been removed. The programmes resulting in this award have been reconfigured as FHEQ compliant GradDips, and follow the standard GradDip regulations.

**5: Regulations for Postgraduate Programmes**

**Regulation:** 5.3 (5.3): List of postgraduate graduate awards that QM can confer

**Change and reason:** With the exercise of independent degree awarding powers, QM can now make any of the awards previously listed only under ‘University of London awards’. In 2013/14, new entrants have the choice of QM or UoL awards, and thus the (identical) UoL awards are also listed.

**Regulation:** 5.9 and 5.10 (5.9 and 5.10): Minimum and maximum registration periods

**Text:**
A student must be registered for a minimum of one third of the normal duration of a programme of study in order to be eligible for award.

A student must not be registered for a programme of study for a period longer than double the normal duration for the programme of study.

**Change and reason:** Previously read ‘A student must normally be registered…’. The ‘normally’ has been removed – exceptions have only been made by suspension of regulations and the old phrasing indicated flexibility within the normal application of the regulation that was never there.

**Regulation:** 5.16 (5.15): Module marks and grades (PG)

**Text:** Module marks shall be awarded for student performance as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module mark</th>
<th>Module grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70.0 – 100.0</td>
<td>Distinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.0 – 69.9</td>
<td>Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.0 – 59.9</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0 – 49.9</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Change and reason: Previously, the Pass grade ran from 50-64.9, and the Merit from 65-69.9. This has been changed as an outcome of the recent award rules consultation (see separate June 2013 Senate paper). A reference to the LLM as an exception has also been removed – the same system now applies to all programmes.

Regulation: 5.62 (5.61): Revocation of award
Text: QM may revoke an award made under these regulations, in accordance with the relevant procedures of QM or the University. Such cases shall be considered on a case-by-case basis by Senate or its delegated authority.
Change and reason: The second sentence is new. The delegated authority is the Principal (or nominee). Minor phrasing change to the first sentence so that the UG and PG versions match.

Regulation: 5.63-79 (5.92-106): MRes regulations
Change and reason: The separate MRes regulations have been deleted, and this award is now subject to the same provisions as the MA, MSc, MPA and MBA. This is a consequence of the award rules review (see separate June 2013 Senate paper).

Regulation: 5.64 (5.63): MA/MSc/MRes/MBA/MPA progression to project
Text: Individual programme regulations may specify that the taught component must be taken and passed before a student progresses to the dissertation or project (programmes using the hurdle are listed in the Special Regulations). Where this is the case, progression shall be considered and agreed by the relevant Subject Examination Board. In such cases, a student must:
   i. take modules to the value of 120 credits; and,
   ii. pass modules to the value of at least 90 credits; and,
   iii. achieve an average mark of at least 50.0 across all taught modules; and,
   iv. achieve module marks of at least 30.0 in all modules.
Change and reason: Previously specified that, where used, the hurdle would ‘normally be the requirement for the award of Postgraduate Diploma’. The new provision standardises QM’s approach, and was developed through the award rules review (see separate June 2013 Senate paper).

Regulation: 5.65 (NEW): MA/MSc/MRes/MBA/MPA part-time progression
Text: Individual programme regulations may specify that a progression hurdle must be passed before a part-time student can progress to the second developmental year (programmes using the hurdle are listed in the Special Regulations). Where this is the case, progression shall be considered and agreed by the relevant Subject Examination Board. In such cases, a student must:
   i. take modules to the value of 120 credits; and,
   ii. pass modules to the value of at least 90 credits; and,
   iii. achieve an average mark of at least 50.0 across all taught modules; and,
   iv. achieve module marks of at least 30.0 in all modules.
Change and reason: A small number of programmes previously had special regulations covering this situation. A single approach was recommended through the award rules review (see separate June 2013 Senate paper).

Regulation: 5.66.ii (5.64.ii) and throughout Sections 4 and 5: Next available opportunity
Text: Where a student meets the requirements for progression based on the value of academic credit taken and passed, but does not meet the programme or pathway requirements for progression due to failure in a core module, the student may, subject to the approval of the Subject Examination Board:
   i. transfer to another pathway or programme for which they meet the requirements; or,
   ii. resit the required modules at the next available opportunity, where attempts remain. Failure at resit of a core module is likely to lead to deregistration if there is no suitable programme to which the student may transfer.
Change and reason: The change is to (ii), which previously read ‘resit the required modules in the next academic year’. The new phrasing takes account of differences between SEBs (notably late summer resits), and makes it clear that resits are only permitted where attempts remain.

Regulation: 5.68 (5.66) and throughout Section 4: Eligibility for award
Text: Unchanged except for addition of:
vii. achieve a minimum College Mark of 50.0

**Change and reason:** Longstanding requirement. Covered elsewhere, but added here for clarity.

---

**Regulation:** 5.75 (5.73) and throughout Section 5: MA/MS/MRes/MPA/MBA/MSc Euromasters/ classification

**Text:** The classification of the degree shall be made according to the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Mark</th>
<th>Dissertation or project module mark</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70.0 – 100.0</td>
<td>65.0 or higher</td>
<td>Distinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.0 or higher</td>
<td>60.0 or higher</td>
<td>Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.0 or higher</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Change and reason:** Previously, the standard scheme was as given below, with numerous variations under special regulations. These have been harmonised as part of the award rules review (applicable to 2013/14 starters and later only).

**Old scheme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Mark</th>
<th>Dissertation or project module mark</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70.0 – 100.0</td>
<td>65.0 or higher</td>
<td>Distinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.0 or higher</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.0 – 64.9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Regulation:** 5.76 (NEW) and throughout Section 5: LLM/MClinDent/PGCert/PGDip classification, and (by special regulations) classification for other PG awards with dissertation/project modules valued at <60 credits

**Text:** A variant classification scheme applies to certain programmes with a dissertation or project valued at fewer than 60 credits. These programmes are detailed in the **Special Regulations**, and shall be classified according to the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Mark</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70.0 – 100.0</td>
<td>Distinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 – 69.9</td>
<td>Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.0 – 59.9</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Change and reason:** Harmonised as part of the award rules review (see separate June 2013 Senate paper). No actual change for the LLM or MClinDent. The PGDip/PGCert previously gave the Merit at 65.0, and the non-standard programmes were subject to various special regulations.

**Regulation:** 5.79 (NEW): No exit awards for the MPA

**Text:** There are no exit awards for the MPA. An MPA student may not elect to exit with a lower award where attempts remain, and shall not receive an exit award if the MPA award requirements are not met with all attempts exhausted.

**Change and reason:** Policy agreed by Taught Programmes Board when approving the MPA.

**Regulation:** 5.93 (5.91): LLM exit awards

**Text:** An LLM student who does not meet the requirements for award and has exhausted all attempts, but who meets the requirements for the award of Postgraduate Diploma or Postgraduate Certificate, shall be conferred the award for which the requirements have been met, unless the student has been deregistered. Where a student has been deregistered, the nature of the deregistration shall be considered in deciding whether to recommend an exit award.

**Change and reason:** What remains is unchanged. A final sentence, ‘In such instances, the classification shall be determined according to the same scale as the LLM’ has been removed. All PGCerts/PGDips will be classified according to the same scale in future.