




UNIVERSITY OF THE  
WEST *of* SCOTLAND  
**UWS**

University  
Senate

# Regulatory Framework

2025/2026



## CONTENTS

<b>General Requirements and Student Code of Conduct</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Chapter 1: Programmes and Awards</b>	<b>8</b>
Powers	
Conferment of Awards	
Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework	
Programmes and Academic Awards of the University	
Language of Instruction and Assessment	
Award Titles	
Honours Degrees	
Masters Degrees	
Integrated Masters	
Intermediate Awards	
Combined Studies Award	
Sandwich Awards	
Collaborative Awards	
Dual Awards	
Joint Awards	
Double awards	
Franchise Delivery	
Validated provision	
Programmes of Study - Programme Specification	
Modules	
Study Abroad and Exchange	
Change of Module or Programme of Study	
Combined Studies Award	
Authorised Interruption of Study	
Academic Engagement	
Work-Based and Placement Learning	
<b>Chapter 2: Admissions and Recognition of Prior Learning</b>	<b>18</b>
Introduction	
Principles of Admission	
General Entry Requirements	
English Language Requirements	
Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL)	
Recognition for Credit	
Admission with Prior Learning	
<b>Chapter 3: Assessment</b>	<b>23</b>
Academic Standards	
Equity of Assessment	
Anonymous Marking	
Module Descriptors	
Programme Specifications	
Module Pass	
Progression	

---

Formal Examination  
Marking and Grading  
Classification of Honours Degrees  
Award of Distinction  
Compensation for Marginal Failure  
Fit to Sit and Extenuating Circumstances  
Reassessment and Reattendance  
School Assessment Boards  
School Board of Examiners  
Degree Assessment Boards  
Aegrotat Awards  
Posthumous Awards  
Academic Integrity  
Re-admission  
Lack of Academic progress

**Chapter 4: Research Degrees****29**

General Requirements  
Qualification Descriptors and Learning Outcomes  
Programmes of Supervised Research  
Application and Registration  
PhD by Publication  
Language Requirements  
Modes of Study  
Periods of Registration  
Confidentiality  
Supervision  
Progress and Transfer  
The Transfer Event  
The Thesis  
PhD by Publication - Thesis  
Examination Procedures  
Examiners  
Examination of the Thesis  
Oral Examination  
Outcomes Following First Examination  
Outcomes Following Re-examination  
Outcomes for PhD by Publication  
Outcomes for MRes  
Post-examination Corrections and Final Submission  
Posthumous Awards  
Procedural and Other Irregularities  
Copy of the Thesis and Copyright  
Appendix 1 Guidance on the Format of the Thesis  
Example Thesis Title Page

**Chapter 5: Higher Doctorates****46**

Awards  
Applicants – Criteria  
Eligibility

---

Preliminary Application  
Preliminary Consideration  
Full Application  
Outcome  
Reapplication  
Appeals Confidentiality  
Honorary Doctorates

**Chapter 6: Student Appeals****49**

Principles of Academic Appeals  
The Senate Appeals Committee  
Status of a Student During an Academic Appeal

**Appendix to Regulations:****51**

- A) Summary of Changes for the 2025/26 Edition
  - B) Procedure for Recommending Changes to Future Editions of the Regulatory Framework
-

## General Requirements and Student Code of Conduct

### General Requirements

The University's Regulatory Framework covers all aspects of the provision of programmes of study, including the admission, progression and assessment of students and applies to all students on programmes of study leading to the University's academic credit and awards, except where they are otherwise outlined in an approved collaborative or other formal Partnership agreement.

The main elements of the Regulatory Framework are:

- The Powers of the University which give authority for the award of degrees and other academic awards; and
- The Regulations which set out the University's overall requirements for programmes of study leading to its academic awards and other distinctions.

The Regulatory Framework sets out the requirements and expectations for the University's programmes and awards, and is supplemented by student policies, procedures and guidance including the Student Code of Conduct and Procedures for Student Discipline, UWS Academic Quality Framework, University Senate Committee Framework, Assessment Handbook, Recognition of Prior Learning Handbook, Doctoral College Code of Practice, student programme handbooks, programme specifications and module descriptors. Where there is a seeming conflict between the programme regulations noted in a student programme handbook, programme specifications or modules descriptors, the Regulatory Framework takes precedence. Unless an explicit condition of professional accreditation requires a deviation, University Regulations apply to all programmes of study, leading to academic awards of the University.

In the case of any seeming conflict between the University Regulatory Framework and those of any external institution or body which accredits the programme, the Dean may seek approval from the Learning & Teaching Committee or the Research and Innovation Committee for the regulations of that institution or body to take precedence.

The Regulatory Framework poses a low risk of negative impact on the groups protected under equality legislation. Equality Impact Assessment is carried out for significant changes to the regulations.

The University reserves the right to decline, defer or withdraw enrolment where applicants have not met the conditions of offer or where they cannot provide evidence that they have the appropriate immigration status to enable them to enrol, or continue as a student. The University is responsible for meeting the United Kingdom Visa & Immigration (UKVI) requirements. Students may be withdrawn by the University where they are ineligible under Home Office regulations to remain in the UK.

The University may be required to use data collected to report to UKVI on international students' attendance.

The Senate Regulations Committee carries out an annual review of the Regulatory Framework and recommends proposed changes to Senate for approval. Careful consideration is given to the impact on students of changes to regulations.

Where the word “normally” is used, the Regulation is followed unless a full and convincing case is made, and approved by the relevant Senate Standing Committee, and discussed with the University Secretary.

These Regulations may be amended or suspended due to exceptional circumstances, subject to the approval of Senate or the Chair of Senate acting on Senate’s behalf.

### **Student Code of Conduct**

Students are bound by the Regulatory Framework currently approved by Senate for implementation during the academic year in which they are enrolled. The University publishes its Regulatory Framework with a summary of all changes annually. By enrolling annually, students confirm their acceptance of the Student Enrolment Terms and Conditions and the Regulatory Framework. Student programme handbooks are provided annually and draw attention to any approved specific programme regulations.

The University is committed to creating an excellent student experience and enhancing opportunities for students to achieve success. Students are representatives of the University and are expected to behave in a way that enhances our reputation and allows us to meet our commitment to student success.

All students are expected to:

- conduct themselves in an appropriate manner, at all times, on and off campus in their interactions with staff, other students and visitors to the University;
- co-operate with all members of staff, including those responsible for the safety and security of the University community;
- uphold the values of academic integrity throughout their studies;
- comply with the expectations and commitments set out in the *Learning, Teaching and Student Success Policy Statement*.

The University’s Procedures for Student Discipline; Conduct, Competence and Fitness to Practise; Student Suspension; and Student Academic Integrity apply, and the University:

- considers all allegations of misconduct in a fair and consistent manner;
- addresses student disciplinary issues in a proportionate, timely and transparent way;
- respects the need for confidentiality;
- gives students the opportunity to respond to any charge(s);
- makes sure students have their cases heard impartially by members who have had no previous involvement in the matter; and
- allows students a right of appeal to the Senate Appeals Committee.

A number of procedures sit under the Code. These outline the expected conduct and possible disciplinary action for breaches of the code for both academic and non-academic misconduct.

- Procedure for Student Discipline
- Conduct, Competence and Fitness to Practice procedure
- Student Suspension procedure
- Criminal Convictions procedure
- Student Academic Integrity procedure

A student may be withdrawn from a programme or module, or their progression paused, for academic or non-academic reasons as outlined in the Student Code of Conduct and Procedures for Student Discipline.



## Chapter 1: Programmes and Awards

### Powers

- 1.1 The Power to award certificates, diplomas, degrees and other academic distinctions is vested in the University by the Privy Council under the provisions of the University of the West of Scotland Order of Council 2019, Article 5, Schedule 1.
- 1.2 The Powers are vested in the University's Court by the authority of the Statutory Instrument approved by the Scottish Parliament. Any changes to the Powers are subject to the approval of the Scottish Ministers and/or the Privy Council of the United Kingdom, as required by Statute.
- 1.3 The Powers described below relate specifically to the provision of programmes of study and do not include all the Powers which relate to the University's academic work.
- 1.4 The University's Court has the Power:
  - To admit students, and to manage all aspects of their education at, and relationship with the University;
  - To grant higher education awards including degrees, diplomas, certificates and other academic awards or distinctions including honorary degrees and titles;
  - To deprive a recipient of a degree, diploma, certificate or another academic award or distinction, including honorary degrees and titles, previously conferred by the University;
  - To create and maintain codes of conduct and regulations required for the maintenance of standards and good order within the University;
  - To frame such regulations as are necessary or desirable to maintain the academic freedom of staff and students in the institution;
  - To merge with or form relationships, associations or affiliations with other educational institutions and other bodies both public and private.
- 1.5 The Powers enable the University:
  - To determine the requirements for the enrolment and admission of persons to the University or to any particular programme, module or programme component or programme of supervised research in the University or delivered in any affiliated or associated institution, and to establish appropriate Regulations;
  - To grant and confer degrees, diplomas, certificates and other academic awards and distinctions on students who meet the requirements;
  - To provide lectures, tutorials and other forms of instruction as the Senate approve, and to make provision for research, scholarship and the advancement and dissemination of knowledge as the University deems appropriate;
  - To validate, approve, monitor and review programmes, modules, programme components, programmes of study and programmes of supervised research, whether or not they lead to the conferment of the University's degrees, diplomas, certificates or other academic distinctions; and to stipulate any conditions;

- To accept in partial fulfilment of the requirements for awards of the University as outlined in the Regulations for Prior Learning (see Chapter 2) and the Recognition of Prior Learning Handbook.

### Conferment of Awards

- 1.6 Academic awards are granted by the School Board of Examiners (or Degree Assessment Board for validated awards), with the authority of Senate when students have met the requirements for an award. Awards are conferred by the Chancellor or nominee (see Regulations 1.22-1.25 for intermediate awards).
- 1.7 The University's Research and Doctoral Degrees are granted with the authority of Senate by the Doctoral College Board following confirmation from a Doctoral College Review Board that students have met the requirements for an award. Awards are conferred by the Chancellor or nominee (see Chapter 4).
- 1.8 The University's Higher Doctorates are granted with the authority of Senate by the Research & Innovation Committee following confirmation that applicants have met the requirements for an award. Awards are conferred by the Chancellor or nominee (see Chapter 5).

### Scottish Credit & Qualifications Framework

- 1.9 The University of the West of Scotland follows the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF) in these regulations. University awards are designed and structured according to the expectations of the SCQF.
- 1.10 The University has established processes for the approval, monitoring, and review of the University's awards, which are included in the UWS Academic Quality Framework.

### Programmes and Academic Awards of the University

- 1.11 The University offers the following programmes and awards. The awards are rated for general credit against the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF).

Programmes	Abbreviation	SCQF Level	Credit Minima
International Foundation Programme	IFP		120 credit points equivalent to SCQF Level 6
Undergraduate Awards	Abbreviation	SCQF Level	Credit Minima
Certificate of Higher Education	CertHE	7	120 credit points at SCQF Level 7 or above
Diploma of Higher Education	DipHE	8	240 credit points of which a minimum of 90 are at SCQF Level 8 or above

Scottish Bachelor's Degree (Ordinary)  Bachelor of Accounting Bachelor of Arts Bachelor of Divinity Bachelor of Engineering Bachelor of Laws Bachelor of Science	BAcc BA BD BEng LLB BSc	9	360 credit points of which a minimum of 90 are at SCQF Level 9 or above
Scottish Bachelor's Degree (with Honours)  Bachelor of Accounting (with Honours) Bachelor of Arts (with Honours) Bachelor of Divinity (with Honours) Bachelor of Engineering (with Honours) Bachelor of Laws (with Honours) Bachelor of Science (with Honours)	BAcc (Hons)  BA (Hons) BD (Hons) BEng (Hons)  LLB (Hons) BSc (Hons)	10	480 credit points of which a minimum of 90 are at SCQF Level 9 and a minimum of 90 are at SCQF Level 10 or above

Graduate Awards	Abbreviation	SCQF Level	Credit Minima
Graduate Certificate	Grad Cert	9	60 credit points at SCQF Level 9 or above
Graduate Diploma	Grad Dip	10	120 credit points at SCQF Level 10 or above
Professional Graduate Diploma in Education	PGDE	10	120 credit points at SCQF Level 10 or above

Postgraduate Awards	Abbreviation	SCQF Level	Credit Minima
Postgraduate Certificate	PgC	11	60 credit points of which a minimum of 40 are at SCQF Level 11 and none less than SCQF Level 10
Postgraduate Diploma	PgD	11	120 credit points of which a minimum of 90 are at SCQF Level 11 and none less than SCQF Level 10
<b>Taught Masters</b> Master of Arts Master of Business Administration Master of Education Master of Engineering Master of Professional Practice Master of Public Administration Master of Public Health Master of Science	MA MBA MEd MEng MProf MPA MPH MSc	11	At least 180 credit points of which a minimum of 150 are at SCQF Level 11 and none less than SCQF Level 10
Integrated Masters Integrated Masters with Honours		11	600 credit points of which a minimum of 120 credit points are at SCQF Level 11

Research Degrees	Abbreviation	SCQF Level	Credit Minima
Master of Research	MRes	11	
Master of Philosophy Doctor of Business Administration Doctor of Philosophy Professional Doctorate Engineering Doctorate	MPhil DBA PhD DProf EngD	12	

Higher Doctorates			
Doctor of Letters Doctor of Music Doctor of Science Doctor of Technology	DLitt DMus DSc DTech		

**Language of Instruction and Assessment**

- 1.12 English is the standard language of instruction and assessment for programmes leading to awards of the University. Any programmes seeking exemption from this regulation requires approval by the Pro Vice-Chancellor Learning, Teaching & Student Success at the earliest opportunity, and prior to programme approval.

**Award Titles**

- 1.13 The title of the award defines a coherent programme in which the modules reflect the subject content.
- 1.14 Where two or more subjects are reflected in the title, there is an appropriate balance of credit from each subject area, e.g., equal balance for a joint title and two thirds to one third for major/minor titles.
- 1.15 The validation or review panel confirms the appropriateness of the title.

**Honours Degrees**

- 1.16 An approved Honours award must include a dissertation element (or equivalent evidence of substantial independent work) that is equivalent to at least 30 credit points at SCQF Level 10. For guidelines on Honours and Masters Dissertations, see the UWS Assessment Handbook.
- 1.17 Each copy of the Honours dissertation is the property of the University, but the copyright of the thesis belongs to students.

**Masters Degrees**

- 1.18 An approved taught Masters programme must include evidence of sustained independent work (a substantial dissertation or equivalent) that normally calibrates to at least 60 SCQF Level 11 credit points. Further guidance on what constitutes 'sustained independent work' is in the UWS Assessment Handbook.
- 1.19 Each copy of the Masters Dissertation or project is the property of the University, but the copyright belongs to students.

**Integrated Masters**

- 1.20 An integrated Masters is an undergraduate degree followed by an additional year of study at Masters Level (SCQF Level 11), with a minimum of 120 credits at SCQF Level 11.
- 1.21 The award is granted at the end of study as a full Masters – intermediate awards are outlined in the programme specification. The programme specification outlines progression, award, and classification criteria (see Regulations 1.38, 3.6-3.8).

**Intermediate Awards**

- 1.22 Non-continuing students who have gained the necessary number of credit points and satisfied any other specific requirements may be granted an award intermediate to the final award for the programme on which they were enrolled.

- 1.23 Programme specifications clearly specify the learning outcomes required for each intermediate award. Students receive only one award from any programme.
- 1.24 Normally no intermediate award is granted to students who have met the requirement for a final award, or to students who immediately proceed to the next SCQF Level of the award.
- 1.25 The University may grant intermediate awards to students who have met the requirements but are no longer enrolled on the programme of study leading to a higher SCQF Level qualification.

### **Combined Studies Award**

- 1.26 A School Board of Examiners is empowered to grant an award in Combined Studies where students have gained the credit required for an award in line with SCQF credit minima (see Regulation 1.11) but have not met the requirements for the named award.

### **Sandwich Awards**

- 1.27 Degree or Honours Degree programme of study 'with sandwich' includes not less than thirty-six weeks of supervised work experience in addition to the period required for the learning outcomes for full-time study leading to the award.
- 1.28 The period of learning that constitutes the work placement or work experience forms a compulsory element in the programme of study. Its learning outcomes are specified and related to the objectives of the whole programme. The performance of students is appropriately assessed. Achievement of the expectations of the supervised work experience is a requirement for the University's 'with sandwich' award.
- 1.29 Distinct learning outcomes are required for an award 'with sandwich' which distinguishes it from the full-time award (see Regulations 1.49-1.59 for work-based and placement learning).

### **Collaborative Awards**

- 1.30 Collaborative awards include dual, joint and double. Collaborative delivery models include franchise and validated. Responsibility for each award and its academic standard remains with the body awarding it. The arrangements for quality assurance, programme content, delivery and assessment, and student conduct are outlined in the collaborative agreement. Collaborative award proposals are subject to initial scrutiny, and approval, in line with the requirements outlined in the UWS Academic Quality Framework.
- 1.31 Awards are granted by the School Board of Examiners (see Regulation 1.6), for all collaborative provision except for validated delivery, the awards for which are granted by the Degree Assessment Board (see Regulation 3.41).

**Dual Awards**

- 1.32 Dual awards involve the granting of two separate awards by both the University and a collaborative partner, for a single programme of study. The two awards are based on the same assessed student work and are only granted when the requirements for the programme have been met at the same point in time. The programme of study may enable students to achieve more than one set of criteria (e.g., learning outcomes or distinction).

**Joint Awards**

- 1.33 Joint awards involve the granting of a single award by the University with one or more collaborating awarding bodies when students have met the requirements for the programme of study. The programme of study means that students must achieve a single shared set of criteria (e.g., learning outcomes or distinction).

**Double Awards**

- 1.34 Double awards involve the granting of two separate awards by the University and a collaborative partner, for a single programme of study. Students must fulfil the requirements of the programme of study and the requirements of the award by both degree-awarding bodies.

**Franchise Delivery**

- 1.35 Franchise delivery where the programme of study is delivered by an approved partner as part of a franchise arrangement may be in place for dual, joint and double awards or for a single award of the University.

**Validated Provision**

- 1.36 Validated provision involves the granting of awards of the University for the delivery of programmes where the University is assured that a partner organisation is able to deliver programmes that meet expected University academic standards.
- 1.37 A Collaborative Programme Board (CPB), with representation from both the University and the partner organisation, manages the collaborative arrangements. The Degree Assessment Board (DAB) is responsible for managing assessment processing.

**Programmes of Study - Programme Specification**

- 1.38 All programmes leading to an award of the University have a programme specification, set out on the approved University template, and are approved annually by the relevant School Board or the body assigned by the School Board. The programme specification includes the following:
- the core modules and learning outcomes required at each SCQF Level and for each qualification, including intermediate awards;
  - specific attendance requirements;
  - the period within which students normally complete the programme and the associated assessments (including any reassessments);
  - any exemption from application of compensation due to professional, statutory or regulatory bodies (PSRB) requirements;
  - any specific requirements, including elements that must be passed or

have a higher threshold pass than University Regulations to qualify for professional accreditation.

### **Modules**

- 1.39 Modules are formally structured learning experiences with a coherent content and explicit learning outcomes and assessment criteria. The credit value, content, learning outcomes and assessment details are documented in an approved module descriptor.
- 1.40 The number of credits assigned to a module is based on the estimated student learning hours, i.e. the number of hours that students spend to achieve the intended learning outcomes. One SCQF credit point represents a notional 10 hours of learning.
- 1.41 The credit rating is confirmed at validation or approval. Students gain academic credit in respect of their achievement of the learning outcomes for a module.

### **Study Abroad and Exchange**

- 1.42 Students taking a period of study abroad or at another UK institution, as part of an exchange programme, require to have the modules they are taking at the other institution approved and signed off by the Programme Leader, as meeting the required SCQF Level and learning outcomes for the University's award.
- 1.43 To enable exchange credit to count towards total credit at the appropriate SCQF Level, the Programme Leader completes a translation of the partner institution's credit system prior to students attending the partner institution. The procedures for Approval of Study Abroad are followed to enable the credit to contribute towards the award of the University.

### **Change of Module or Programme of Study**

- 1.44 Students are allowed to seek approval for a change to their selection of modules consistent with the programme specification, for approval by the relevant Programme Leader.
- 1.45 Students are allowed to seek approval for a change to their programme of study. Any such change is subject to the approval of their existing Programme Leader and the Programme Leader for the programme to which they wish to transfer.

### **Authorised Interruption of Study**

- 1.46 Students enrolled on programmes are allowed to apply for a period of Authorised Interruption of Study, approved by the relevant Dean of School, and be re-admitted thereafter to complete the requirements for an award (see also procedures for Students with Parental Responsibilities).
- 1.47 The maximum period of authorised interruption is normally one academic session. Throughout the programme of study, the total period of Authorised Interruption of Study is normally a maximum of two academic sessions.



**Academic Engagement**

- 1.48 Students are expected to meet the requirements of the University's academic engagement and attendance procedures.

**Work-Based and Placement Learning**

- 1.49 The University recognises and awards credit to different types of learning derived from a work environment or work-related activities. This includes modules that are entirely work-based learning or placement learning or practice based. The requirements for 'Sandwich' awards are outlined in Regulations 1.27-1.29. Further details and definitions are contained within Work-Based and Placement Learning Handbook.
- 1.50 All Work-based and Placement Learning (sometimes known as practice learning) is credit rated, whether as part of credit counting towards a University award or as placement credit in addition to the credit for the award. As noted above, there are specific requirements for awards 'with sandwich'.
- 1.51 The University is responsible for the academic standards of its awards and the quality of the provision leading to them. Therefore, the University puts in place policies and procedures to ensure its responsibilities and those of providers of Work-Based and Placement Learning opportunities are clearly identified and met.
- 1.52 Where Work-Based/Placement Learning is part of a programme of study, its learning outcomes are clearly identified, contribute to the overall aims of the programme, and are assessed appropriately.
- 1.53 Where a Work-Based/Placement Learning route and University route are available within the same programme, the programme learning outcomes for each route are the same.
- 1.54 Up to 120 points at any SCQF Level allowed be available via Work-Based or Placement Learning. If Work-Based or Placement Learning is in place for the full Honours year, the normal University Regulations for Honours dissertations apply (see Regulations 1.16-1.17).
- 1.55 The design of the assessment of Work-Based or Placement Learning for the award of academic credit remains the responsibility of the University and is not devolved to partner employers. If the employer is involved in assessment of Work-based or Placement Learning, this is specified in the module descriptor and learning agreement. However, the award of a grade is the responsibility of the University.
- 1.56 Credit is only awarded when a tripartite learning agreement has been agreed with the employer, University and student prior to the commencement of the Work-Based or Placement Learning experience that defines the intended learning outcomes, methods of assessment and arrangements for reassessment.

- 1.57 The impact of failure or non-completion of any Work-Based or Placement Learning on student progression within the overall programme, and the provision of reassessment opportunities, is made clear in the student programme handbook and approved at the approval event.
- 1.58 Where the Learning & Teaching Committee accepts that, for PSRB reasons, credit for WBL/PL is not allowed to be integrated into the credit required for the award, general placement credit is awarded and recorded on students' transcripts.
- 1.59 Where there is no PSRB requirement preventing it, the full spectrum of assessment marks is used for the assessment of WBL (i.e. not pass/fail – see Regulation 3.10).

## Chapter 2: Admissions and Recognition of Prior Learning

### Introduction

- 2.1 This chapter governs the admission of students to all programmes of study leading to the University's academic credit and awards, except for Research Degrees and Doctoral Programmes, which are covered in Chapter 4.

### Principles of Admission

- 2.2 There is an expectation that students admitted to programmes of study are able to achieve the learning outcomes of the programme and meet the requirements for the award.
- 2.3 In considering applications for admission to programmes of study, evidence is sought of personal, professional and educational qualifications and/or experiences that provide indications of applicants' capacity successfully to complete the programme.
- 2.4 To support the admission of students from wide and diverse backgrounds, UWS considers a number of additional contextual indicators as a means of assessing applicants' suitability for entry to programmes, for example, applicants who have care experience; applicants who live in priority postcode areas such as Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation 20/40; applicants who are progressing from Schools for Higher Education or similar; and applicants who have successfully completed access and participation programmes (see Admissions procedure).
- 2.5 Applicants whose qualifications do not conform to the general entrance requirements but who present other evidence that demonstrates personal educational advancement and an aptitude for academic study at the SCQF Level concerned may be admitted to programmes of study at the discretion of the University (see Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) below).

### General Entry Requirements

- 2.6 All applicants are expected to be proficient in Mathematics and English language as indicated by programme specific admissions criteria (see Regulation 2.10).
- 2.7 The University's general entry requirement for admission to a programme of study at degree level (SCQF Level 9) is passes in the Scottish National Qualifications in five subjects, including three at Higher Level subjects or other academic, vocational or professional qualifications that are equivalent.
- 2.8 The University's general entry requirement for admission to a taught postgraduate programme is an undergraduate degree. Some Masters programmes require at least an Upper Second Class (2:1) degree and some specify the relevant subject required.
- 2.9 The University's general entry requirements for admission to CertHE/DipHE and Graduate Certificates and Diplomas are considered in accordance with

the qualification descriptors and equivalencies in the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework.

- 2.10 In addition to the above, programme documentation sets out appropriate requirements for specific prior qualifications and/or experience, and any competitive entry requirements. The University's equality and diversity procedures and guidance apply, and equivalent qualifications and/or experience are accepted in place of those specified. PSRBs may set particular entry requirements, e.g., for Protection of Vulnerable Groups.
- 2.11 The University assesses potential applicants' entry qualifications and their suitability for individual programmes of study in accordance with the Admissions procedure. The University subscribes to other national qualification recognition bodies which provide definitive information on the comparison of international qualifications in relation to those of the UK (see RPL below).

### **English Language Requirements**

- 2.12 For all programmes of the University, except for International Foundation, research and doctoral programmes, a minimum International English Language Testing System (IELTS) comparable score of 6.0 or above (with a minimum of 5.5 in each component) is acceptable as evidence of proficiency in English. The English language requirements for the International Foundation Programme are set out in the programme specification. The requirements for English Language for Research Degree and Doctoral programmes are set out in Chapter 4 of this Framework. Students may be offered a programme of study that includes pre-sessional English language training in addition to their formal academic programme.

### **Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL)**

- 2.13 Appropriate learning, wherever acquired, provided that it has been subject to reliable and valid methods of assessment, is accepted for the purpose of gaining academic credit towards an award of the University. This includes:
- Accreditation of Prior Learning (APL): certificated learning of full or part completion of academic qualifications for which there is an agreed, general credit rating or recommendation,
  - Accreditation of Prior Experiential Learning (APEL): learning that has its source in experience, for example at work or in the community.
- 2.14 The assessment of APEL is carried out by the University.
- 2.15 All claims for APEL are double marked.
- 2.16 APEL assessments are open to external examination and confirmation by School Assessment Boards (see Regulation 3.36) on the same basis as the formal assessment and examination of students.
- 2.17 Detailed information on the University's APL arrangements and procedures is available in the University's Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) Handbook.

**Recognition for Credit**

- 2.18 Recognition for credit is defined as the process where a judgement is made about the extent to which qualifications or experience is accepted in partial fulfilment of the University's requirements for an academic award.
- 2.19 Students are expected to build on or broaden prior learning. Recognition for credit up to the maxima stated in Regulation 2.22 is only applied when programmes broaden or develop the learning that students have already acquired. This includes prior credit gained through successful completion of UWS programmes and modules.
- 2.20 Students are not allowed to use the same credit towards more than one qualification as this would constitute double counting of credit.
- 2.21 Where credit has been gained at the University, current or former students are allowed to transfer credit greater than that allowed in Regulation 2.22 below, in the following circumstances: to enable completion; the learning is current; they are continuing on the programme previously studied; or, where this is not possible, there is a direct 'fit' between prior and current study.
- 2.22 Where credit has been gained external to the University a maximum of half the credit points required at the SCQF Level at which applicants wish to complete the programme of study with an academic award is awarded through RPL. Imported credit must be directly relevant to students' proposed programme of study.
- 2.23 As RPL is not graded, it is not possible to import it into a programme at Honours SCQF Level 10.
- 2.24 Normally, the following maxima for importing credit to postgraduate awards applies:
- Postgraduate Certificate 30 credit points at SCQF Level 11;
  - Postgraduate Diploma 60 credit points at SCQF Level 11;
  - Masters Award 120 credit points at SCQF Level 11;
  - Doctor of Business Administration 120 credit points at SCQF Level 11; and
  - Professional Doctorate 120 credit points at SCQF Level 12.
- 2.25 Prior to an admission direct to the dissertation stage of a Masters or MBA programme, the relevant Admissions Officer considers:
- the appropriate research underpinning to carry out the dissertation;
  - the equivalence of core modules or learning outcomes;
  - the need to consult with relevant subject experts to establish if appropriate underpinning is in place and academic guidance on what additional modules might need to be taken;
  - the title of the University award in relation to the prior study taken at another institution; and
  - the availability of resources for dissertation supervision.

**Admission with Prior Learning**

- 2.26 Applicants who have successfully completed a programme of certificated learning at a recognised UK awarding institution are considered for admission with credit, at an appropriate point on the programme of study for which entry is being sought.
- 2.27 Offers for direct entry to SCQF Level 8 of a programme are normally on condition that the applicants hold 120 credit points at SCQF Level 7. Applicants holding an HNC of 96 credit points are admitted with advanced standing.
- 2.28 An HNC, three Advanced Highers, or three A Levels, are considered equivalent to SCQF Level 7. Where there is an agreement to admit to SCQF Level 8 of a programme, 120 credit points at SCQF Level 7 are added to the student's record at the point of admission to the programme of study.
- 2.29 As qualifications such as Scottish Baccalaureate International Baccalaureate, European Baccalaureate, Diplome Universitaire de Technologie, or qualifications considered comparable, vary in volume and SCQF Level of credit, they may not comprise the 120 credit points normally required for direct entry to SCQF Level 8. Therefore, direct entry to SCQF Level 8 may require completion of an additional module.
- 2.30 Credit awarded for RPL is noted on the student's record and academic transcript.
- 2.31 Offers for direct entry to SCQF Level 9 of a programme are normally on condition that the applicant holds 240 credit points, at least 100 credit points of which are at SCQF Level 8 or above.
- 2.32 The maximum credit awarded for a first degree towards a subsequent non-related degree is 120 credit points at SCQF Level 7 plus 60 credit points at SCQF Level 8.
- 2.33 Students are not allowed to count credit from a first degree towards a lower SCQF Level qualification, e.g. DipHE (see Regulation 2.20).
- 2.34 When incorporated into a programme of study, prior credit does not carry a grade or mark. Therefore, awards with distinction are not granted where credit is transferred in at the SCQF Level where distinction is applied. This is made clear to applicants at the time of admission (see Regulation 3.24).
- 2.35 Where students have been admitted with prior learning, minor differences in credit points (up to 5 credit points) (see Regulation 1.11) are tolerated and added to the transcript at the point of admission.
- 2.36 Students are allowed to import credit from a partially completed postgraduate programme of study in line with the maxima allowed (see Regulation 2.24), provided it is directly relevant to the proposed undergraduate programme.

## Chapter 3: Assessment

### Academic Standards

- 3.1 Assessment that is related to credit and/or to awards of the University demonstrates the achievement by students of the relevant academic standards.
- 3.2 The academic standards of the University are as stated in the learning outcomes of modules and programmes of study, as set out in the relevant module descriptors and programme specifications.

### Equity of Assessment

- 3.3 All students enrolled on a module are subject to the application of the same academic standards, rules and procedures with respect to assessment and reassessment, irrespective of the programme of study or mode of delivery (see Regulation 3.27 for compensation).

### Anonymous Marking

- 3.4 Procedures for anonymous marking are outlined in the Assessment Handbook and are used in all assessments except where the nature of the assessment itself renders anonymity impossible to achieve, for example, in placement observations, presentations or practical assessment.

### Module Descriptors

- 3.5 Module descriptors specify the learning outcomes for each module. They describe the number and type of components of assessment and a mechanism of assessment for deciding whether a student should be awarded a pass in the module.

### Programme Specifications

- 3.6 Programme specifications for each programme specify the aims of the programme, a mechanism for deciding how the associated qualification(s) are awarded, and the requirements for progression from one SCQF Level of the programme to the next.
- 3.7 Programme specifications define which modules are core or optional.
- 3.8 Passes in core modules are necessary to meet the requirements for an award (except for Combined Studies exit award – see Regulation 1.26). If a pass in a core module is necessary to meet progression requirements (for example for PSRB accreditation), this is outlined in the programme specification.

### Module Pass

- 3.9 A pass is achieved in a module, and the credit is gained, when the School Assessment Board has awarded:
- In SCQF Levels 7-10, a grade of C or above, and an aggregate mark of at least 40%, with no component of assessment lower than 30%. Where there is a single component of assessment in a module the pass is 40%;

- In SCQF Levels 11-12, a grade of B2 or above, or an aggregate mark of at least 50%, with no component of assessment lower than 40%. Where there is a single component of assessment in a module the pass is 50%. (See Regulation 3.16 for marking and grading).
- 3.10 Where specifically validated, some modules do not have marks or grades and are recorded as 'pass' or 'fail' (see Regulation 3.2-).
- 3.11 Where a professional or accrediting body explicitly requires it (see Regulation 1.39), other criteria may be used for a pass in one or more modules. Full details of these criteria and the reasons for them are included in the programme specification and confirmed at validation and cross referenced to any relevant module descriptors.
- 3.12 A pass in one term is not allowed to be specified as a prerequisite for starting a module in the following term unless there is a PSRB requirement that is clearly outlined in the programme specification.

### **Progression**

- 3.13 Progression is the transition from one SCQF Level of a programme to the next. For progression between SCQF Levels 7-8 and SCQF Levels 8-9, students who have not achieved passes in all modules may be allowed to progress to the next SCQF Level of study ("progression with deficit") provided:
- they have gained at least 80 credit points in the current SCQF Level; and
  - they take the reassessment (or reattend the module while studying at the next SCQF Level); and
  - they meet all prerequisites for the next SCQF Level of study; and
  - they have taken the full set of modules as identified in the programme specification at their current SCQF Level.
- 3.14 Students may be allowed to progress from SCQF Level 9 to SCQF Level 10 ("progression with deficit") provided:
- they have gained at least 100 credit points at SCQF Level 9; and
  - they meet all prerequisites for study at SCQF Level 10; and
  - they have taken the full set of modules as identified in the programme specification at SCQF Level 9.

### **Formal Examination**

- 3.15 Where a formal examination is specified in the approved module descriptor as a final summative assessment for a module, this takes the form of a single paper of either two or three hours duration.

### **Marking and Grading**

- 3.16 All work that contributes to a module mark and grade is assessed according to the following standard marking and grading scheme. Grade points are then allocated automatically as follows:



Grade	Numerical Range	Grade Points
A1	90-100	4.0
A2	80-89	3.5
A3	70-79	3.0
B1	60-69	2.5
B2	50-59	2.0
C	40-49	1.5
D	30-39	1.0
CP	35-39 compensated pass	1.0
E	1-29	0.5
N	0	0

- 3.17 The UWS Marking and Grading Scheme provides grade descriptors at undergraduate and postgraduate SCQF Levels.

### Classification of Honours Degrees

- 3.18 The minimum criterion for the award of an Honours degree is a grade C or above in each of the modules studies at SCQF Levels 9 and 10 according to the programme specification and subject to the credit minima outlined in Regulation 1.11. Where a programme enables students to take a module from other SCQF Levels as part of the programme of study at SCQF Level 9 or 10, these are treated as if they are at SCQF Level 9 or SCQF Level 10 respectively when calculating the classification.
- 3.19 Normally, degree classifications are determined by the higher of:
- The average of all 120 credit points studied at SCQF Level 9 (weighted (33.3%) plus all 120 credit points studied at SCQF Level 10 (weighted 66.7%); or
  - The average of all 120 credit points studied at SCQF Level 10; where modules are weighted according to their credit value; and, in either case;
  - if the average as calculated above falls within 2 percentage points (out of 100) of a higher classification boundary, and at least half of the credit points studied at SCQF Level 10 are in the higher classification, students are awarded the higher classification.

First class	Average mark of 70% or above	OR Average mark of at least 68% and at least half of the credits in the final year stage (SCQF Level 10) at grade A
Upper second class	Average mark of 60% or above	OR Average mark of at least 58% and at least half of the credits in the final year stage (SCQF Level 10) at grade B1 or better
Lower second class	Average mark of 50% or above	OR Average mark of at least 48% and at least half of the credits in the final year stage at grade B2 or better
Third class	Average mark of 40% or above	

- 3.20 Modules using Pass/Fail grades are excluded from the calculation of the Honours classification. If there is any imported credit at SCQF Level 9, including credit gained during student exchange or study abroad, the calculation of Honours classification is based on SCQF Level 10 study only.
- 3.21 The calculation of Honours is based on the modules taken at SCQF Levels 9 and 10 as outlined in the programme specification. This is a minimum of 90 credit points at SCQF Level 9 or above, and a minimum of 90 credit points at SCQF Level 10.
- 3.22 Where students have a resit or a reattend in one or more modules, the resit/reattend mark is recorded on the transcript but a mark of 40% and grade C for those modules is used in the calculation of the classification of the Honours award. Where students have a compensated pass, this is recorded on the transcript and a mark of 40% for those modules is used in the calculation of the classification of the Honours award (see Regulation 3.27).

### Award of Distinction

- 3.23 For CertHE, DipHE, Ordinary Degree, Graduate Diploma, PGDE, PgD and Masters awards, Distinction is awarded to students who meet the following criteria:
- A mean mark of 70% or above at their first attempt at the assessments comprising the SCQF award Level (i.e. 120 credit points or, for Masters, 180 credit points), weighted according to credit value;
  - All credits at the SCQF Level at which Distinction is being awarded were gained at UWS;
  - Pass/Fail grades in the final year stage (up to 40 credit points) are excluded from the calculation.
- Where students have a compensated pass in one or more modules, this is recorded on the transcript and a mark of 40% for those modules is used in the calculation of distinction (see Regulation 3.27).
- 3.24 Imported credit is not used for the calculation of distinction (see Regulations 2.34 and 3.20).

### Compensation for Marginal Failure

3.27 Compensation is the 'permitting of a marginal failure to gain credit at specific academic SCQF Levels up to a maximum of 60 credits, on the basis of good overall academic performance'. If, at SCQF Levels 7-9, students have achieved a mark of between 35-39% (with no component mark lower than 30%) compensation is awarded for up to 20 credits at each SCQF Level of study. The maximum compensation across a whole undergraduate programme is 60 credits. This does not apply to programmes or modules where PSRB requirements do not permit it.

The underpinning principles are:

- Where PSRBs do not permit compensation, it is not applied;
- A compensated pass for up to 20 credit points per Level (SCQF 7-9) is applied to a marginal fail mark of between 35-39%;
- To achieve a compensated pass, the requirements for components of assessment for a module pass are applied (see Regulation 3.9);
  - no component of assessment lower than 30%;
  - in modules with both graded and pass/fail components, (compulsory) pass/fail components are passed;
- Compensation is only applied to SCQF Levels 7-9, and only when students have met all the requirements for that SCQF Level of study other than the module(s) to be compensated;
- Compensation is applied as an automatic academic decision, and is not discretionary;
- Full credit is given for a Compensated Pass;
- Where compensation has been applied, students have no right to resit/reattend to improve their mark (see Regulation 3.31).

### Fit to Sit and Extenuating Circumstances

3.28 In submitting each piece of coursework or completing an examination or class-test, students confirm that they are 'fit to sit' the assessment and any mark achieved for that assessment stands.

3.29 If students' academic performance has been affected by extenuating circumstances and they do not want their submission to be marked, they may withdraw it within 48 hours by completing an Extenuating Circumstances Submission (ECS). (Refer to the Procedure for Completing an Extenuating Circumstances Submission).

3.30 If, due to extenuating circumstances, students are not able to complete assessment requirements, they are expected to complete an Extenuating Circumstances Submission (ECS) within 48 hours of the assessment deadline.

### Reassessment and Reattendance

3.31 If modules have not been passed at the first attempt, students are normally allowed to be reassessed for the module. The forms of reassessment equivalent to the first attempt. Components that were passed at the first attempt are carried forward. If a module or component part has been passed or compensation has been applied, there is no right to reassessment for the purposes of improving a module mark.

- 3.32 All assessments and reassessments for a module occur within two years of taking the module. When a period of authorised interruption has been approved (see Regulations 1.46-1.47), the two-year assessment period is extended by the length of the authorised interruption.
- 3.33 Some programmes and modules do not permit reassessment. This is normally to meet requirements of professional, statutory or regulatory bodies. PSRBs may also have requirements related to reattendance.
- 3.34 The maximum number of attempts at assessment for a module is three for undergraduate (SCQF Levels 7-10) and two for postgraduate (SCQF Level 11- 12). One further attempt is allowed when an extenuating circumstances submission (ECS) for one or more of these attempts meets the criteria of the Extenuating Circumstances Procedure subject to Regulation 3.32. An attempt is counted whether a submission of assessment is made or not, and an ECS submission counts as an attempt.
- 3.35 A reattend decision allows students the same number of attempts at assessment as if taking the module for the first time. Students are allowed to reattend a module only once. Previously passed components of assessment are carried forward.

### **School Assessment Boards**

- 3.36 School Assessment Boards consider the performance of students registered for modules assigned to the Board by the Dean of School, and decide upon the confirmed marks and grades for students on each module. The membership and terms of reference of School Assessment Boards are in the Senate Committee Framework.

### **School Board of Examiners**

- 3.37 School Boards of Examiners decide the eligibility of students for progression between SCQF Levels of study, and for awards of the University. The membership and terms of reference of the School Boards of Examiners are in the Senate Committee Framework.
- 3.38 All students on a named programme of study are assigned to a specified School Board of Examiners.
- 3.39 Decisions of the School Board of Examiners that students are eligible for awards of the University at SCQF Level 9 or above (or the highest SCQF Level of award if that is below SCQF Level 9) require confirmation by the relevant School Board of Examiners External Examiner.
- 3.40 External examiners are appointed in accordance with the criteria and procedures outlined in the UWS Academic Quality Framework.

### **Degree Assessment Boards (Validated Programmes)**

- 3.41 Degree Assessment Boards (DAB) confirm marks and grades for modules on validated programmes and determine the eligibility of students for progression between SCQF Levels of study, and for awards of the University.

**Aegrotat Awards**

- 3.42 Where the School Board of Examiners or Degree Assessment Board is satisfied that a student has demonstrated achievement in over half of the credit for the final stage and, but for illness or other valid cause would have successfully completed their programme, it may exceptionally grant an Aegrotat Award. Such an award is made without classification or distinction and only at the request of the student.

**Posthumous Awards**

- 3.43 Aegrotat awards and awards granted by a School Board of Examiners or Degree Assessment Board may be made posthumously.

**Academic Integrity**

- 3.44 All students are expected to uphold the principles of academic integrity and Student Code of Conduct. Breaches of academic integrity are investigated under the Student Code of Conduct and Procedures for Student Discipline.
- 3.45 All written coursework assignments are submitted in electronic format via the University's similarity detection software. This software searches the internet and assignment databases for matching text and is used in conjunction with other means of detection to analyse assessment submissions in all modules where text-based plagiarism may be an issue.
- 3.46 Marks that have been capped as a result of a decision by a Student Academic Integrity Panel are carried forward in subsequent attempts and are recorded on transcripts.

**Readmission**

- 3.47 Students who have been granted an award by the School Board of Examiners or Degree Assessment Board are not allowed to be readmitted to the same award at that SCQF Level with a view to improving their marks, the eligibility for the award of distinction, or the classification of Honours.

**Lack of Academic Progress**

- 3.48 If no credit has been awarded for a period of more than two calendar years, students are treated as new applicants and go through the University's procedures for Recognition of Prior Learning to check on the currency of their learning. They are offered the most appropriate SCQF Level of entry based on that learning.

## Chapter 4: Research Degrees

### General Requirements

- 4.1 The degree of Master of Research (MRes), Master of Philosophy (MPhil), Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), Doctor of Business Administration (DBA), Professional Doctorate (DProf) or Engineering Doctorate (EngD) is awarded to research degree students on successful completion of a programme of supervised research.

### Qualification Descriptors and Learning Outcomes

- 4.2 A Master of Research (MRes SCQF Level 11) is a research degree with a key emphasis on preparing and training students to conduct independent research at an advanced Level. The learning outcomes are:
- Advanced research skills and knowledge including understanding of methods, data analysis techniques and research ethics.
  - Ability to conduct independent research, which may use established frameworks and methodologies.
  - Originality in the application of knowledge, although research may not necessarily lead to an original contribution to the field of study.
  - Critical evaluation of existing knowledge and methodologies.
- 4.3 A Master of Philosophy (MPhil SCQF Level 12) is a research degree with an emphasis on conducting a substantial research project with a depth of understanding and analysis. The learning outcomes are:
- Advanced understanding of a specialist area of knowledge.
  - Ability to conceptualise, plan and conduct independent, original research which may be within established frameworks or methodologies.
  - Critical evaluation of existing knowledge and methodologies.
  - Some contribution to the field, but not necessarily novel.
- 4.4 A Doctor of Philosophy (PhD SCQF Level 12) is a research degree which involves a substantial independent research project leading to the creation of new knowledge and making an original contribution to the field of study. The learning outcomes are:
- Creation of new knowledge or advancement in the field.
  - Ability to conceptualise, plan and conduct independent, original research and apply advanced research techniques and methodologies.
  - Original contribution to the discipline.
  - Ability to theoretically and practically challenge existing knowledge.
  - Development of research leadership and the ability to uphold high professional standards in relation to research integrity and ethics.

### Programmes of Supervised Research

- 4.5 Proposed programmes of supervised research are capable of leading to scholarly outputs and assessment by appropriate examiners. The approval of an application for a research degree is based on consideration of the following points.
- The suitability of the applicant to carry out research, including the applicant's qualifications.

- The viability of the proposed programme of supervised research.
  - The appropriateness of the proposed supervision arrangements.
  - The availability of the facilities and resources to support the proposed supervised research.
- 4.6 A proposal to carry out a programme of supervised research may be based on the preparation of a scholarly edition of a text or texts, musical or choreographic work, or other original artefacts. Where the proposed programme of supervised research includes the applicant's own creative work, the application is expected to propose the intended form of the final submission and examination.
- 4.7 Large projects may provide the opportunity for multiple programmes of supervised research. For such programmes, each proposal clearly states how the proposed research is distinguishable from other proposed programmes and the specific contribution to the large project.
- 4.8 Where the proposed programme of supervised research forms part of a funded project, the terms of the funding must be consistent with the Regulatory Framework of the University and the requirements for the award.
- 4.9 Students on research degree programmes are permitted to register for another programme of study concurrently subject to approval by the Doctoral College Review Board, provided that either the research degree registration or the other programme of study is in the part-time mode and that the dual registration does not slow down the progress of the programme of supervised research.

### **Application and Registration**

- 4.10 Students are registered for one of the following programmes of study.
- Master of Research (MRes)
  - Master of Philosophy (MPhil)
  - Master of Philosophy (MPhil) with the intention of transferring to Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) (MPhil/PhD)
  - Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) by publication
  - Doctor of Business Administration (DBA)
  - Professional Doctorate (DProf)
  - Engineering Doctorate (EngD).
- 4.11 Applicants for registration for the degrees of MRes, MPhil, and MPhil/PhD are required to hold a first-class or second-class Honours degree from a UK university, or equivalent qualification.
- 4.12 Applicants with equivalent qualifications are expected to provide the names of two referees who can confirm the applicant's suitability to carry out the proposed programme of supervised research. Applicants are also expected to provide evidence of ability and relevant background knowledge such as details of professional experience, publications and written reports.

- 4.13 A person who holds an appropriate Masters degree from a UK university or equivalent, and is in appropriate professional employment or equivalent, may be eligible for direct registration for the degree of DBA, EngD, or DProf.

### **PhD by Publication**

- 4.14 The University offers a route of PhD by publication whereby candidates submit a portfolio of retrospective work.
- 4.15 A candidate pursuing the PhD by Publication route must be a member of staff of the University at the date of application.
- 4.16 For PhD by Publication, the thesis submitted is based on material published not more than ten years prior to the date of registration.
- 4.17 Applications for PhD by Publication are approved by the Chair of the Doctoral College Board.
- 4.18 Permission to register is not normally granted to candidates who already have obtained a PhD or other doctoral qualification.
- 4.19 For PhD by Publication, the application consists of the following:
- a list of the publications or creative outputs (minimum of four) on which the proposed thesis will be based; and
  - a statement of where and when the work was carried out.
- For publications with multiple authors, a statement of the contribution of the candidate to the publications must be included.

### **Language Requirements**

- 4.20 Applicants for research degrees are required to satisfy the University of their competence in the English language. The minimum requirement is an overall IELTS score of 6.5 or above with a minimum of 6.0 in each component, or equivalent.
- 4.21 For the award of a research degree, the thesis submitted is normally written in English and the oral examination must be conducted in English. Any publications submitted as part of the thesis must be in English.
- 4.22 When the subject matter of the research involves languages and related studies, it may be preferred to write the thesis in a language other than English. In such cases, permission from the Chair of the Doctoral College Board is required. The student's transcript records the language of the thesis. The abstract must be written in English.
- 4.23 Permission from the Chair of the Doctoral College Board to present the thesis in a language other than English is requested in the application for registration.



## Modes of Study

- 4.24 Students are registered on research degrees on a full-time or part-time basis. Full-time and part-time status applies until the point of submission of the thesis.
- 4.25 It is possible to move between full-time and part-time registration (see Regulation 4.34), at any point before the final year of the normal period of registration. Changes to registration status are implemented with immediate effect, and relevant fee changes are implemented at the beginning of the next year of study. The period of registration is calculated on a pro-rata basis.
- 4.26 A person proposing to carry out a programme of supervised research outwith the University may be registered as a research degree student on a distance mode if:
- there is satisfactory evidence that the facilities available to the applicant within and outwith the University meet the University's requirements; and
  - the arrangements for supervision enable frequent and substantial contact between the student and the supervisor(s) based in the University.

## Periods of Registration

- 4.27 The normal and maximum periods of registration for research degree students are as follows.

Registration		normal	maximum
MRes	Full Time	12 months	24 months
	Part Time	24 months	48 months
MPhil	Full Time	24 months	36 months
	Part Time	48 months	72 months
MPhil/PhD	Full Time	36 months	48 months
	Part Time	72 months	96 months
PhD by publication	Part time	12 months	24 months
*DBA	Full Time	24 months	36 months
	Part Time	48 months	72 months
*DProf	Part time	48 months	72 months
*EngD	Part time	48 months	72 months

*\*These programmes contain a taught element. The periods listed above refer to the research phase only.*

- 4.28 It may be possible to complete a research degree programme in less time than the normal period of registration. The minimum period is two-thirds of the normal period of registration.
- 4.29 A student is allowed to apply for an extension to the normal period of registration, justifying their request on academic grounds, but is not allowed to be registered for longer than the maximum period of registration. Students are able to apply for one or more periods of extension up to the maximum periods of registration stated in Regulation 4.27.

- 4.30 A student registered for a research degree is allowed to request an Authorised Interruption of Study, for a period of up to 12 months. The student is entitled to be readmitted following a period of interruption, to complete the requirements for the award. A period of Authorised Interruption of Study is not included in the period of registration.
- 4.31 Changes to registration, including Authorised Interruption of Study, extension to period of registration, change of mode of study, and change of supervision arrangements, must be approved by a member of the supervisory team, the Dean of School (or nominee), and the Chair of Doctoral College Board (or nominee).
- 4.32 Exceptionally, if an applicant has previously carried out research as a registered research-degree student, a shorter period of registration than that required by Regulation 4.27, may be approved by the Chair of Doctoral College Board. The approved period takes account of all, or part of the time already spent on the research.
- 4.33 Where an MPhil/PhD student who has successfully completed transfer to PhD (see Regulation 4.54) subsequently decides to submit the thesis for the award of MPhil and has exceeded the maximum period of registration for MPhil registration (see Regulation 4.27), the Doctoral College Review Board may approve a six-month extension to the maximum period of registration.
- 4.34 The Doctoral College Board must be notified of any change in the programme of supervised research being carried out by a registered research degree student.

### **Confidentiality**

- 4.35 Where there is a need for confidentiality in relation to the programme of supervised research or the thesis, approval must be sought for an agreed period of confidentiality from the Chair of the Doctoral College Board.

### **Supervision**

- 4.37 Each student has a supervisory team of two or three supervisors. One member of the team is designated as Lead Supervisor. Supervision meetings are held at least once per month for full-time students and once every two months for part-time students. Students are responsible for arranging supervision meetings.
- 4.38 The supervisory team includes members with:
- a research degree of the same Level or higher than, the degree being supervised;
  - experience of supervision of at least one research student to successful completion at a UK university;
  - experience of research-degree supervision at the University;
  - specialist knowledge of the research area.
- 4.39 The supervisory team as a whole needs to cover the expectations in Regulation 4.38, but individual supervisors do not need to cover all points.

- 
- 4.40 For PhD by Publication, in place of a supervisory team, an Advisor is appointed to support the candidate. The Advisor is a member of academic staff with PhD experience.
- 4.41 It is the responsibility of the Dean of School or nominee to approve the allocation of the supervisory team.
- 4.42 In addition to academic staff of the University, the supervisory team may include members who are not employed by the University such as former members of staff, emeritus professors, honorary or visiting appointees (staff from other academic institutions), and recognised supervisors, who are active in research in the field of study.
- 4.43 In addition to the supervisors, one or more advisors may be appointed to contribute particular specialist knowledge or a link with an external organisation.
- 4.44 Changes to the supervisory arrangements are approved by the Dean or nominee.

### **Progress and Transfer**

- 4.45 Students are required to complete progress reports as outlined in the Doctoral College Code of Practice. Timely completion of milestones is monitored by Doctoral College Review Boards.
- 4.46 A full-time student is required to spend on average, 35 hours per week on the programme of supervised research.
- 4.47 A part-time student is required to spend on average 18 hours per week on the programme of supervised research.
- 4.48 Distance learning students are expected to visit the University at least once a year for a period of in-person supervision.
- 4.49 Students are allocated an independent Assessor. The Assessor is appointed for the duration of the programme and assesses the student's progress and the transfer of registration from MPhil to PhD.
- 4.50 The Assessor is not a member of the supervisory team and may not be appointed as the Internal Examiner (see Regulation 4.96). An Assessor must have at least 12 months' experience of research-degree supervision before being appointed.
- 4.51 Students must submit progress reports as required by their programme of study. Students who fail to complete timely or satisfactory progress reports may risk their continued registration.
- 4.52 For DBA and DProf students, the School Board of Examiners recommends progression from the taught component to the research component after consideration of module performance.

- 4.53 The Doctoral College Review Board may recommend withdrawal of a student on the basis of unsatisfactory progress. The withdrawal must be approved by the Chair of the Doctoral College Board.

### **The Transfer Event**

- 4.54 The Transfer Event is the milestone where an MPhil/PhD student transfers to registration as a PhD candidate. Passing the Transfer Event indicates that the work is likely to lead to an original contribution to knowledge corresponding to with the award of PhD (see Regulation 4.4).
- 4.55 The Transfer Event is carried out between 12 and 18 months for full-time students or 24 and 36 months for part-time students.
- 4.56 The Transfer Event consists of the assessment of the Transfer Report and an oral presentation. The assessment is conducted by the Assessor.
- 4.57 At the Transfer Event the Assessor must be satisfied that that the programme of supervised research is at doctoral Level.
- 4.58 The outcome of the Transfer Event is:
- transfer of registration to PhD; or
  - a second and final Transfer Event within three months; or
  - change to MPhil registration; or
  - termination of registration.

### **The Thesis**

- 4.59 The thesis must be submitted by the student before the end of the normal period of registration, unless an extension to the thesis submission deadline is approved. Any extension must be within the maximum period of registration (see Regulation 4.27).
- 4.60 Alternative thesis formats may include a thesis involving traditional peer-reviewed publications or a portfolio involving creative outputs. Creative work, which forms part of the submission must be clearly presented in relation to the written content and set in its relevant context.
- 4.61 The thesis submitted for examination is checked by the Doctoral College, using the University's plagiarism-detection software, and the similarity report is shared with the examiners.
- 4.62 An abstract of approximately 300 words in length is included in the thesis (see Appendix to Chapter 4 for guidance on the format of the thesis).
- 4.63 The thesis must include appropriate referencing.
- 4.64 The thesis must include a declaration by the candidate that the work has not been submitted for another comparable academic award.
- 4.65 Where the research is part of a collaborative project, the thesis must define the candidate's individual contribution.

- 4.66 Where the work presented in the thesis has been published by the candidate, any publications must be referenced in the thesis.
- 4.67 The length of the thesis in science, technology, engineering and mathematics excluding any ancillary data, is normally within the following range.
- MRes 15,000 - 18,000 words
  - MPhil 20,000 - 25,000 words
  - PhD 40,000 - 60,000 words
- 4.68 The length of the thesis in all other disciplines, excluding any ancillary data, is normally within the following range.
- MRes 18,000 - 22,000 words
  - MPhil 40,000 - 45,000 words
  - PhD 75,000 - 85,000 words
  - DBA 55,000 - 65,000 words
- The length of a thesis that includes creative work is normally within the range of 20,000 to 40,000 words.
- 4.69 For the degree of DProf or EngD, the submission consists of a thesis or a report and portfolio. The length of the thesis is normally within the range of 50,000 to 60,000 words. The length of the report is normally within the range of 10,000 and 20,000 words. The report must show how the portfolio submitted forms a contribution to the creation and interpretation of new knowledge and must be set in the context of current understanding in the field.
- 4.70 Once the thesis is submitted for examination, changes are not permitted unless required by an examiner.
- 4.71 Any unauthorised changes in the thesis either before or after the examination may render the examination null and void.
- 4.72 Submission of the thesis is normally agreed with the supervisory team. Where there is no agreement, the candidate is allowed to submit the thesis against the advice of the supervisory team.

### **PhD by Publication - Thesis**

- 4.73 The thesis submitted for PhD by Publication must comprise of a substantial and coherent body of work equivalent to three years of full-time study. The body of work is expected to make a significant and original contribution to knowledge corresponding to the award of PhD.
- 4.74 The thesis submitted for PhD by publication must consist of:
- all items of work on which the submission is based,
  - an extended narrative of between 10,000 and 25,000 words that brings the publications into context and highlights the original contribution to knowledge. The extended narrative may be divided into chapters as appropriate (see separate guidance on PhDs by publication for more detailed information),

- where jointly authored works are included a declaration must be attached indicating the role of the candidate and where possible this statement should be endorsed by co-authors,
- an abstract of approximately 300 words.

The total submission should not normally exceed 100,000 words.

### **Examination Procedures**

- 4.75 The examination for MPhil, PhD, DProf, DBA and EngD is in two stages:
- scrutiny of the thesis;
  - an oral examination (often referred to as a viva) or approved alternative.
- 4.76 The examination for MRes is normally by thesis only.
- 4.77 Exceptionally, examiners for the award of the degree of MRes may recommend that an oral examination is held. In this case, the Internal Examiner informs the University of the recommendation to hold an oral examination and the reasons for this recommendation.
- 4.78 No examination of a research degree thesis is held until the arrangements, including the appointment of examiners and non-examining Chair have been approved in accordance with these regulations.
- 4.79 It is the responsibility of the Lead Supervisor to propose the examiners for approval at least three months before the expected submission date.
- 4.80 The Lead Supervisor is responsible for ensuring that the student, the non-examining Chair and the examiners are informed of the date of the oral examination. The Doctoral College sends each examiner a copy of the thesis and the University's Regulations and procedures, and ensures that all the examiners are fully briefed on their duties and responsibilities.
- 4.81 A non-examining Chair is appointed by the School. The non-examining Chair is required to:
- approve the format and location of the oral examination;
  - ensure that the oral examination is conducted in a fair manner and is of a reasonable duration;
  - assist the examiners to reach a consensus;
  - ensure that the Joint Examiners' Report, the Preliminary Examiner's Reports and the non-examining Chair's report are submitted to the Doctoral College within three working days of the oral examination.
- 4.92 The non-examining Chair is an academic member of staff or Emeritus Professor with knowledge of the University's Regulatory Framework and:
- is an active researcher with experience of examining research students;
  - is independent of the student's work;
  - has completed UWS research-degree non-examining Chair training.

- 4.93 Either the non-examining Chair or the Internal Examiner must be a current member of academic staff of the University.

### **Examiners**

- 4.94 Research degree students are examined by at least two, but normally not more than three examiners.
- 4.95 The team of examiners must include at least one Internal Examiner and at least one External Examiner. The composition of the team must cover the breadth of experience, knowledge and skills required. In relation to practice-based studies, at least one of the examiners must be experienced in examining such studies.
- 4.96 An Internal Examiner must not be (or have been) a member of the student's supervisory team or the Assessor. The Internal Examiner must be a member of academic staff of the University or an Emeritus Professor. Where the Internal Examiner has no previous experience in the examination of research degrees, an additional Internal Examiner must be appointed.
- 4.97 Where the candidate is a member of permanent staff of the University, a second External Examiner must be appointed. A second External Examiner is not required for a student employed by the University on a fixed-term contract.
- 4.98 Where the External Examiner is inexperienced in the examination of research degrees, an additional External Examiner must be appointed.
- 4.99 Recognised Teachers of the University (RTUs) and Recognised Supervisor of the University (RSUs) may not be appointed as Internal or External Examiners.
- 4.100 To ensure independence, External Examiners must:
- be independent of the University or any establishment which holds a formal partnership agreement with the University;
  - not have been the candidate's supervisor or advisor;
  - not be a supervisor of another candidate in the School during the academic year of the examination;
  - not be an External Examiner on a taught programme in the School during the academic year of the examination;
  - not have been a member of staff of the University during the past three years; and
  - not have acted as an External Examiner of research degree candidates in the School within the previous 12 months.
- 4.101 All examiners and the independent non-examining chairs must have experience of supervision of doctoral students.
- 4.102 For PhD by Publication, the thesis is examined by at least two External Examiners. An Internal Examiner may also be appointed. Co-authors or Advisors are not eligible to be appointed as examiners.

**Examination of the Thesis**

- 4.103 Each examiner must scrutinise the thesis and submit a Preliminary Examiner's Report to the independent non-examining Chair (see Regulations 4.76-4.77 for MRes).
- 4.104 A candidate submitting a thesis for examination has the right to defend the work in an oral examination. In the case of a suspected breach of academic integrity, the investigation must be concluded before an oral examination is held (see Student Academic Integrity Procedure).
- 4.105 Submission of the thesis is considered as agreement that the work proceeds to examination.

**Oral Examination**

- 4.106 The oral examination may be held on-campus, online, or a combination of on-campus and online (hybrid). The non-examining Chair can only be online if all other participants are online.
- 4.107 Exceptionally, an in-person oral examination may be held off-campus, with the approval of the Chair of the Doctoral College Board or nominee.
- 4.108 At the student's request, one member of the supervisory team may attend the oral examination as a non-participatory observer. The member of the supervisory team must leave prior to the deliberations of the examiners.
- 4.109 An alternative form of examination may be approved by the Chair of the Doctoral College Board in cases where a student is not able to take part in an oral examination due to disability or other valid reason.
- 4.110 By attending the oral examination, the student is confirming that they are 'fit to sit' the examination and that the outcome of the examination should stand. If a student is not in a position to attend the oral examination they should complete an Extenuating Circumstances Submission (ECS) prior to the start of the planned examination.
- 4.111 An Extenuating Circumstances Submission is not acceptable after the oral examination.
- 4.112 If the non-examining Chair, the student, or the examiners report misconduct or that the examination has not complied with University Regulations, the Chair of the Doctoral College Board may declare the examination null and void. The Chair of the Doctoral College Board decides the arrangements for any rescheduled examination, including whether new examiners and/or independent non-examining Chair are appointed.
- 4.113 The student must not be involved in the arrangement of the examination and must have no contact with the External Examiner(s) between their appointment and the date of the oral examination.



- 4.114 Following completion of the scrutiny of the thesis and oral examination of the candidate, the possible recommendations of the examiners are listed below.

### Outcomes Following First Examination

<b>Unconditional pass</b> - the candidate is granted the degree for which they have been examined.
<b>Pass with minor corrections</b> - the candidate is granted the degree for which they have been examined, subject to minor corrections being made to the thesis within three months.
<b>Pass with major corrections</b> - the candidate is granted the degree for which they have been examined, subject to major corrections being made to the thesis within six months. ( <i>Exceptionally, examiners may agree to a 12-month correction period where the candidate would be unable to complete their corrections within six months</i> ).
<b>Re-examination oral only</b> - the thesis is satisfactory, but the candidate must undergo a second oral examination within two months. This is deemed to be part of the first examination of the candidate.
<b>Re-submit thesis with oral examination</b> - the thesis must be re-submitted, and the candidate must undergo a second oral examination within 12 months.
<b>Fail</b> - the candidate is not granted the degree for which they have been examined and is not permitted to be re-examined.
<p><b>Change of award</b></p> <p>In the case of examination for the degree of PhD, the candidate is granted the degree of MPhil subject to the presentation of the thesis being amended to the satisfaction of the examiners. Minor corrections to be made within three months and major corrections within six months.</p> <p>In the case of an examination for the degree of MPhil there is no opportunity for change of award.</p> <p>In the case of an examination for the degree of DBA the candidate is granted an award as outlined in the approved Programme Specification.</p> <p>In the case of an examination for the degree of DProf the candidate is granted the degree of MSc subject to the presentation of the thesis being amended to the satisfaction of the examiners. Minor corrections to be made within three months and major corrections within six months.</p>

## Outcomes Following Re-examination

One re-examination may be permitted, subject to the Joint Examiners Report from the first attempt providing the candidate with written guidance on the deficiencies of the first submission.

**Unconditional pass** - the candidate is granted the degree for which they have been examined.

**Pass with minor corrections** - the candidate is granted the degree for which they have been examined, subject to minor corrections being made to the thesis within three months.

**Fail** - the candidate is not granted the degree for which they have been examined and is not permitted to be re-examined.

Where the examiners agree that the resubmitted thesis is fundamentally deficient, they may recommend to the Chair of the Doctoral College Board that this decision is made without a second oral examination, on the grounds that such an examination would serve no purpose.

### Change of award

In the case of an examination for the degree of PhD, the candidate is granted the degree of MPhil subject to the presentation of the thesis being amended to the satisfaction of the examiners. Minor corrections to be made within three months and major corrections within six months.

In the case of an examination for the degree of DProf the candidate is granted the degree of MSc subject to the presentation of the thesis being amended to the satisfaction of the examiners. Minor corrections to be made within three months and major corrections within six months.

In the case of an examination for the degree of DBA the candidate is granted an award as outlined in the approved Programme Specification.

## Outcomes for PhD by Publication

At the conclusion of the examination the examiners may recommend to the Chair of the Doctoral College Board that:

- the degree of PhD is granted;
- the degree of PhD is granted subject to corrections to the extended narrative part of the thesis within three months;
- the degree is not granted.

There is no opportunity for re-examination.

## Outcomes for MRes

<b>Unconditional pass</b> - the candidate is granted the degree for which they have been examined.
<b>Pass with minor corrections</b> - the candidate is granted the degree for which they have been examined, subject to minor corrections being made to the thesis within one month
<b>Pass with major corrections</b> - the candidate is granted the degree for which they have been examined, subject to major corrections being made to the thesis within three months
<b>Fail</b> - the candidate is not granted the degree for which they have been examined and is not permitted to be re-examined.  There is no recommendation for Change of Award
There is no opportunity for re-examination.

## Post-examination Corrections and Final Submission

- 4.115 The examiners indicate the outcome of the examination verbally to the candidate at the completion of the oral examination, but make it clear to the candidate that the final decision rests with the University.
- 4.116 Following the oral examination, the examiners submit a Joint Examiners' Report to the non-examining Chair within three days.
- 4.117 Where examiners are not in agreement, they must submit separate reports to the non-examining Chair.
- 4.118 Where the examiners are not unanimous in their recommendations, the University may:
- accept a majority recommendation provided that the majority recommendation is made by at least one external examiner; or
  - accept the recommendation of the external examiner(s); or
  - appoint an additional external examiner.
- 4.119 An additional External Examiner appointed in accordance with Regulation 4.118 above prepares an independent report on the thesis and, if considered necessary, conducts a further oral examination. That examiner is not informed of the recommendations of the other examiners.
- 4.120 Normally, the examiners from the first examination conduct the re-examination. However, at its discretion, the University may appoint new or additional examiners for the re-examination.
- 4.121 Where a thesis is resubmitted and examiners are not satisfied, a deadline of six weeks maximum is granted to complete outstanding corrections. The examiners are not entitled to request additional corrections.

- 4.122 Candidates who do not submit the corrected thesis by the deadline set by the Doctoral College may be withdrawn. Exceptionally, the Chair of the Doctoral College Board (or nominee) may approve an extension to the resubmission deadline.

### **Posthumous Awards**

- 4.123 Any degree listed in Regulation 4.1 may be granted posthumously on the basis of a thesis completed by a candidate and submitted, or which is ready for submission, and evidence suggests that the candidate would have been successful at the oral examination.

### **Procedural and Other Irregularities**

- 4.124 Where there is evidence of procedural or other irregularity in the conduct of the examination, the Chair of the Doctoral College Board may declare the examination invalid and may appoint new examiners, if necessary.

### **Copy of the Thesis and Copyright**

- 4.125 Following the recommendation of the award by the examiners, an electronic copy of the thesis must be submitted to the Doctoral College for upload to the University's online repository and in the case of a thesis submitted for the degree of DBA, DProf, EngD or PhD, to an open access online repository for doctoral research.
- 4.126 Where an application for a thesis to remain confidential has been approved, the thesis is only retained by the Doctoral College, with access restricted to those directly involved in the research until the expiry of the period of confidentiality. The thesis is not submitted to the libraries of the University or of any collaborating establishment(s).
- 4.127 Each copy of the thesis remains the property of the University, but the copyright of the thesis belongs to the candidate.

## **Appendix 1: Guidance on the Format of the Thesis**

The format of a thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the University's requirements for the award of the degree of MRes, DBA, DProf, EngD, MPhil or PhD conforms with the following, with reference to the British Standards Institution's Specification BS 4821 (1990):

- the thesis is in A4 format; approval may be given for a thesis to be submitted in another format if it is established that the contents will be better accommodated in that format;
- the electronic copy of the thesis is submitted as one complete file, including any appendices and supplementary material, in PDF format;
- all margins not less than 15 mm;
- 2.0 or 1.5 line spacing used in the formatting except for indented quotations or footnotes where single spacing may be used;
- pages are numbered consecutively in the main text including photographs, figures or tables included as whole pages;
- the title page must give the following information, presented as specified by the University:
  - the full title of the thesis;
  - the full name of the author;
  - the degree for which the thesis is submitted in partial fulfilment of its requirements;
  - that the degree is granted by the University;
  - the name(s) of any collaborating establishment(s); and
  - the month and year of first submission to the Doctoral College, unless there is a substantial delay before the final submission (more than twelve months) when the date of the final submission shall be the accepted date.
- An example title page is appended to these Regulations.

[Example thesis title page]

A POLITICAL-ECONOMY OF SAFETY AND HEALTH IN THE  
BRITISH CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY WITH SPECIAL  
REFERENCE TO FATAL INJURIES IN THE WEST OF  
SCOTLAND

ERIK WILLIAM HUGH SUTHERLAND

Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of  
the requirements of the University of the  
West of Scotland  
for the award of Doctor of Philosophy

## Chapter 5: Higher Doctorates

### Awards

5.1 The University awards the following Higher Doctorates:

- Doctor of Letters (DLitt)
- Doctor of Music (DMus)
- Doctor of Science (DSc)
- Doctor of Technology (DTech)

### Applicants - Criteria

5.2 The applicant must have carried out work of the absolute highest distinction which evidences:

- substantial, original and outstanding contribution in scale and time to the advancement of knowledge or to the application of knowledge or to both;
- that the applicant is demonstrably an internationally leading authority in the field(s) of study concerned; and
- authoritative impact on the work of others, global reach and significance.

5.3 The contents of the submission must be in the English language unless specific permission to the contrary has been given by the University.

### Eligibility

5.4 Current members of staff or graduates of the University are eligible to apply.

### Preliminary Application

5.5 An applicant for a Higher Doctorate must make a preliminary application to Research Services.

5.6 An initial application must consist of:

- completed application form;
- proof of payment of the application fee;
- a pdf copy of the applicant's Curriculum Vitae;
- a pdf copy of the list of representative publications for consideration; and
- a pdf supporting document of 5,000 words (minimum 11pt, single spaced), stating and demonstrating how the applicant meets the criteria for the award, including a signed full statement of the extent of the applicant's contribution to any of the work submitted which involves joint authorship or any other collaboration.

### Preliminary Consideration

5.7 On receipt of a preliminary application for a Higher Doctorate, the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) as Chair of the Research and Innovation Committee (RIC) will convene a Higher Doctorates Review Panel (HDP) to consider whether a *prima facie* case for proceeding to a formal examination of the submission has been established, taking whatever advice it deems to be appropriate.

5.8 Should HDP conclude that a *prima facie* case is not established, the applicant is notified by Research Services. In any such case, the University retains 10%

of the fee and the remainder is returned to the applicant. There is no right of appeal in relation to the HDP decision.

- 5.9 If satisfied that a *prima facie* case has been established, HDP nominates two External Assessors for current members of staff, or one External and one Internal Assessor for all other applicants. Each External and Internal Assessor is required to make an independent report to the University. In the event of any disagreement between the Assessors, the University may appoint an additional External Assessor (see Regulation 5.17).
- 5.10 All appointed External Assessors must be wholly independent of the University, have no declared conflict of interest with the applicant and their identities not disclosed to the applicant at any time.

### Full Application

- 5.11 The applicant is invited by Research Services to make a full application only if *prima facie* case has been established and once all the Assessors are appointed.
- 5.12 Following the invitation, the applicant provides Research Services with two copies of the publications listed on the list of representative publications for consideration, preferably electronically or as e-links, or exceptionally as hard copies (see Regulation 5.6).
- 5.13 All submitted information during the Preliminary Application (see Regulation 5.6) is submitted to the appointed Assessors at this stage for the purpose of producing Independent Assessor's Reports with their individual recommendations on the merits of the applicant's submission.
- 5.14 The Independent Assessor's Reports is received and considered by the Research and Innovation Committee (RIC).
- 5.15 One copy of the submission remains the property of the University and is deposited in the Library unless the application is unsuccessful (see Regulation 5.20) in which case the copy of the submission is retained by Research Services only.

### Outcome

- 5.16 If the appointed Assessors unanimously decide that the applicant's submission merits the award of a Higher Doctorate, as evidenced in the Independent Assessor's Reports, and this is endorsed by RIC at the next regular meeting, then the Chair of RIC forwards the respective recommendation of the Assessors to the Principal and Vice-Chancellor (as the Chair of Senate and the Chief Executive of the University), and informs HDP.
- 5.17 If the appointed Assessors are not able to reach a unanimous decision on the applicant's submission, as evidenced in the Independent Assessor's Reports, and this is endorsed by RIC at the next regular meeting, then Chair of RIC advises HDP to seek an additional External Assessor in order to arrive at a majority decision by the Assessors whether the applicant's submission merits the award of a Higher Doctorate or not. If, following this appointment, the



majority decision is that the applicant's submission merits the award of a Higher Doctorate and this is endorsed by RIC at the next regular meeting, then Chair of RIC forwards the respective recommendation of the Assessors to the Principal and Vice Chancellor (as the Chair of Senate and the Chief Executive of the University), and informs HDP.

- 5.18 The Chair of RIC ensures that each confirmation of the recommendation to award a Higher Doctorate of the University is reported to the Senate.
- 5.19 Regardless of the outcome, all applicants receive anonymised copies of the Assessors' reports for feedback.

### **Reapplication**

- 5.20 Unsuccessful applicants at the preliminary and full application stages may re-apply in the following academic year, demonstrating how they took into consideration any feedback that they received during the application process.

### **Appeals**

- 5.21 Unsuccessful applicants at the full application stage may appeal against the decision of RIC on the grounds of procedural irregularity only. The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation nominates two members of academic staff who have not been involved in either the prima facie or assessment stages to conduct a review.

### **Confidentiality**

- 5.22 All applications are treated in strict confidence. Any canvassing by, or on behalf of, an applicant automatically disqualifies the applicant concerned.

### **Honorary Doctorates**

- 5.23 The conferment of Honorary Doctorates is not subject to these regulations.

## Chapter 6: Student Appeals

### Principles of Academic Appeals

- 6.1 An academic appeal is a request to review a University decision on student engagement, assessment, progression, award, withdrawal from a programme, and student disciplinary cases.
- 6.2 This covers an academic appeal made by a student against a decision of:
- The Senate Disciplinary Committee
  - A Conduct, Competence and Fitness to Practise Committee
  - A Doctoral College Review Board
  - A School Assessment Board (SAB)
  - A School Board of Examiners (SBE)
  - A School panel (for engagement/attendance)
  - A Student Academic Integrity Panel
  - An Extenuating Circumstances deadline (see Regulations 3.28-3.30)
  - Any other Committee, Board or Panel of the University that makes decisions on the matters listed in 6.1 above.
- 6.3 Only the individuals directly affected (not a third party, such as a parent or other representative) are allowed to lodge an appeal. The only exceptions to this are students who have permanent or temporary disabilities preventing them from submitting an appeal independently.
- 6.4 The privacy and confidentiality of students are respected at all stages of the appeals process. The circulation of personal or medical evidence provided by students submitting an appeal is restricted to staff directly involved in the appeal decision process.
- 6.5 Where an academic appeal also contains within it a complaint and vice versa, the appeal or complaint is reclassified either by students or the University (at whatever stage they may have reached) and processed under the most relevant regulation or procedure if this is likely to lead to a more appropriate outcome for the person(s) appealing or complaining.
- 6.6 Students are not allowed to lodge an academic appeal after their award has been conferred by the University.
- 6.7 Appeals are only considered if they meet the grounds for appeal set out in the Student Appeals Procedure.

### The Senate Appeals Committee

- 6.8 The constitution, terms of reference, and standing orders of the Senate Appeals Committee are set out in the University Senate Committee Framework.
- 6.9 Where an appeal has been referred to the Senate Appeals Committee, the Student Appeals Procedure is followed.

**Status of Students During an Academic Appeal**

- 6.10 If students submit an academic appeal part way through an SCQF Level or year, they are allowed to continue provisionally until a decision has been reached. This is to ensure that students are not academically disadvantaged, if the appeal is subsequently upheld. Continued attendance on placements is at the discretion of the relevant School.
- 6.11 If students submit an academic appeal at the end of an SCQF Level or year of study they may be allowed to enrol on the next SCQF Level but only on a conditional basis. They are informed that if the appeal is subsequently upheld, their enrolment is confirmed and. If their academic appeal is not upheld, their enrolment may be terminated.
- 6.12 If students are granted an award and they subsequently submit an appeal, they are allowed to graduate and to receive the award agreed by the appropriate School Board of Examiners. If their appeal is successful and results in a different award being granted, they are required to return any degree parchment before a new award is sent to them.

## Appendix A

## SUMMARY OF CHANGES TO REGULATORY FRAMEWORK FOR SESSION 2025/26

**Throughout**

Continued application of Language Style Guide and Glossary for plain English and clarity.

In most cases replace 'credits' with 'credit points'. Some instances where singular 'credit' is appropriate.

**New Introduction - General Requirements and Student Code of Conduct**

	Addition of <b>General Requirements and Student Code of Conduct</b>
	Relocation of <b>Code of Discipline for Students</b> from Chapter 5 Reframed as <b>Student Code of Conduct and Procedures for Student Discipline</b>
	<p>Sections previously in <b>Chapter 1 – Programmes and Awards</b> relocated</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction to Regulatory Framework (previously Regulations 1.1-1.3)</li> <li>• Equality Impact Assessment (previously Regulation 1.4)</li> <li>• Implementation of Regulations (previously Regulation 1.5)</li> <li>• Use of 'normally' (previously Regulation 1.6)</li> <li>• Eligibility to Study in the UK (previously Regulations 1.7 and 4.86)</li> <li>• Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies and professional accreditation requirements (previously Regulations 1.38-1.39)</li> </ul>

**Chapter 1: Programmes and Awards**

<b>REGULATION</b> Previous no. (New no.)	<b>AMENDMENT</b>
1.13 (1.5)	<b>Conferment of awards</b> Clarification that Degree Assessment Boards apply only to validated provision, not all collaborative and TNE
1.16- 1.19 (1.11)	<b>Programmes and Academic Awards of the University</b> Consolidation of headings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (1.16)</li> <li>• Approval of Programmes which lead to Academic Awards (1.17)</li> <li>• Awards of the University (1.18 – 1.19)</li> </ul>
New Table	Addition of table in Regulation 1.11 listing all approved qualifications (e.g., Bachelor of Accounting, Bachelor of Divinity, Bachelor of Arts), SCQF Level and credit minima

1.12 <b>NEW</b>	<b>Language of Instruction and Assessment (NEW)</b> Addition of new Regulation stating that the language of instruction and assessment for UWS awards is English.
1.20-1.21	<b>Programme Specifications</b> – removed – duplicated in Regulation 1.48 (new 1.38)
1.40 – 1.45 (1.30-1.37)	<b>Collaborative awards</b> – new title  New Introduction and updated descriptions Addition of Double awards to join existing joint and dual awards, to increase flexibility and opportunity. Update to descriptions of franchise and validated delivery.  For <b>validated awards</b> , removal of reference to ‘direct competition with awards on the University’s own campus’ and to joint programme panel (JPP)
1.54	<b>Lack of academic progress on a programme</b> Removed – covered in Regulation 3.57 (3.47)

## Chapter 2: Admissions and Recognition of Prior Learning

REGULATION	AMENDMENT
2.12	<b>English Language Requirements</b> Some re-ordering of content for clarity.
2.34	<b>Admission with Prior Learning</b> Clarification that awards with distinction are not granted where credit is transferred in at the SCQF level where distinction is applied.

## Chapter 3: Assessment

REGULATION	AMENDMENT
3.8	<b>Programme Specifications – core modules</b> Clarification that passes in core modules are required for the award but not necessarily for immediate progression. Additional reference to outlining requirements for progression in the programme specification.
3.15	<b>Award</b> Propose delete - Role of School Board of Examiners for granting of awards already covered in 1.13 (1.5)
3.16	Delete - reference to external examiner approval for individual awards. See 3.37 below.

REGULATION	AMENDMENT
<b>3.25</b>	<p><b>Award of Distinction</b> For awards <b>other than</b> Foundation programmes, Graduate Certificate, Honours (SCQF level 10), and Postgraduate Certificate, Distinction is awarded to students who meet the following criteria:</p> <p>change to</p> <p>For CertHE, DipHE, Bachelors, Graduate Diploma, PGDE, PgD and Masters awards, distinction is awarded to students who meet the following criteria:</p>
<b>3.27</b>	<p><b>Intermediate awards</b> Remove – covered in Chapter 1 (1.22-1.25)</p>
<b>3.30</b>	<p><b>Joint and Dual awards (collaborative)</b> Remove – moved to Chapter 1 (1.33-1.34)</p>
<b>3.39</b> (3.31)	<p><b>Reassessment</b> Revised – ‘forms of reassessment are normally the same as for the first attempt’ to ‘equivalent to first attempt’</p>
<b>3.47</b> (3.37)	<p><b>School Board of Examiners</b> Requirement for ‘written consent’ of external examiner for awards changed to ‘confirmation’.</p>
<b>Add new</b> (3.41)	<p><b>Degree Assessment Boards</b> Added to follow School Assessment Boards and School Boards of Examiners</p>

## Chapter 4: Research Degrees and Higher Doctorates

### RESEARCH DEGREES

Substantial review of Chapter 4 – Research Degrees.

- Removing the description of 'PhD by prospective publication' as a route of study. The route previously called 'PhD by retrospective publication' has been retained but is now simply called 'PhD by publication'. The Doctoral College Board has endorsed a set of guidelines to further support candidates seeking the PhD by publication route.
- Revised scope of those who are eligible to apply for PhD by publication route.
- Addressing key gaps in regulations, which primarily relate to the post-oral examination (viva) period.
- Changing examination outcomes to allow all outcomes (Change of Award and Fail) to be given at the first viva and remove the outcome 'resubmission no viva' whilst allowing a longer correction period to be negotiated for 'major corrections'. Failure to resubmit after a 're-examination' outcome is a common reason for PGR student withdrawal.
- Thesis length described as a range rather than an absolute word count.
- Ensuring the regulations allocate responsibility appropriately, considering the role of Schools, the Doctoral College Board and Doctoral College Review Boards.
- Ensuring the regulations signpost to the Doctoral College Code of Practice.
- Removing the route of PhD Direct that allows students to enrol on a PhD without the need for a Transfer Event.
- Removing Recognised Supervisors and Recognised Teachers from those who can act as Internal Examiner or Chair for doctoral candidates.
- Current regulations require examiners to have a doctoral qualification **or** experience of supervision; updated regulation for examiners to have experience of supervision of research students.
- Addition of 3 months' timeframe for amendments for PhD by publication.
- Addition of examination outcomes for MRes - with removal of re-submission within 12 months.

### Regulations for Higher Doctorates – minor amendments

in line with language style guide – Regulations for Higher Doctorates relocated to Chapter 5

## Chapter 5: Code of Discipline for Students

REGULATION	AMENDMENT
------------	-----------

<p><b>Code of Discipline for Students</b> to be reframed as <b>Student Code of Conduct</b>, and located in a separate document along with the various procedures for dealing with breaches of academic and non- academic conduct procedures. These include:</p>	
---	--

- Procedure for Student Discipline
- Conduct, Competence and Fitness to Practice procedure
- Student Suspension procedure
- Criminal Convictions procedure
- Student Academic Integrity procedure

Reference is made to Student Code of Conduct and procedures for Student Discipline in the introduction to the Regulatory Framework – General Requirements

**From 2025/26, Chapter 5 comprises the Regulations for Higher Doctorates.**

## Chapter 6: Student Appeals

Minor amendments for plain English



## Appendix B: PROCEDURE FOR PROPOSING AMENDMENTS TO FUTURE EDITIONS OF THE REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

### General Requirements

The Senate Regulations Committee is responsible for advising on the operation and development of the University's Regulatory Framework for Academic programmes and Awards and makes recommendations to Senate on new or amended regulations.

Proposed revisions to the Regulatory Framework may emerge from:

- annual monitoring and periodic monitoring;
- sector benchmarking;
- monitoring of data and evidence;
- student feedback; or
- external factors.

There is an expectation that all changes are made to improve understanding and operation of the Regulatory Framework such as

- ensuring clarity and understanding (plain English);
- correcting an anomaly arising from application of the regulations;
- responding to new information or sector developments; and
- applying a principle of 'no detriment' – that is, any change to the Regulations is for improved outcomes or experience (example - two different ways to calculate Honours classification).

### Process for Recommending Changes

The colleague initiating a proposed new or amended regulation needs to liaise with the Secretary to the Regulations Committee at the earliest opportunity for advice on next steps.

If it is a minor update, such as a clarification, or plain English amendment, this is addressed through the Regulations Committee.

Significant updates or amendments require consideration and recommendation through the relevant Senate Standing Committee (Learning and Teaching Committee, Research & Innovation Committee, or Portfolio Strategy Group), with the endorsement of the relevant Executive member (Pro Vice-Chancellor), prior to recommendation to Senate.

Proposers/authors need to be aware of timescales.

### Timescales

Proposers/authors need to notify the Regulations Committee of new or amended regulations by March each year at the latest for recommendation to Senate by the Regulations Committee in June. This informs the subsequent edition of the Framework which is generally published in the first week of August for the academic

year ahead, in time for student enrolment<sup>1</sup>.

The Regulations Committee needs time to engage with proposed changes and to consider unforeseen consequences or interdependencies with other regulations. Key indicative dates are below:

October/November:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initial indication of potential change/liaison with Secretary to Regulations Committee</li> <li>• Initial proposal to relevant Senate Standing Committee</li> <li>• Included in report to Senate (December)</li> </ul>
January/February	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refinement of proposals</li> <li>• Consultation with colleagues/students/stakeholders</li> <li>• Short briefing paper for relevant Committees/School Boards</li> </ul>
March	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft final proposals to Regulations Committee</li> <li>• Headline proposals to Senate via report from Regulations Committee</li> </ul>
April/May	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final drafting of Regulations by Secretary to Regulations Committee</li> <li>• Scrutiny by Regulations Committee</li> <li>• Draft proposals available for consultation</li> <li>• Potential use of workshops to engage with colleagues/students on proposed changes</li> </ul>
June	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final recommendations to Senate from Senate Regulations Committee</li> </ul>

### Evidence and Benchmarking

There is an expectation that changes to the Regulatory Framework are evidence-based and data-informed. Evidence and data needs to accompany proposals through the Committee cycle.

### Consultation

Consultation with colleagues and students on proposed changes is initiated once the proposals are clear. It is the responsibility of the proposer/paper author to engage as appropriate and to reflect feedback in the paper recommending the proposed change.

The Regulations Committee arranges consultation on the full Draft Framework once the initial proposals have been endorsed by the key Committees in the February/March Committee cycle.

---

<sup>1</sup> Note that students who commence their studies in Terms 2 or 3 are bound by the Regulatory Framework as currently published on [University Senate | UWS | University of the West of Scotland](#)

**Impact on Students**

Where the proposed change has a potential significant impact, such as changes to progression requirements, it may be advisable to delay implementing the new or amended regulations to allow sufficient time for awareness-raising or phased implementation with affected groups.

**Equality Impact Assessment**

The Regulatory Framework seeks to ensure equity for students, but where any potential changes may have an impact on the protected characteristics of colleagues, students, or stakeholders, an EIA needs to be carried out as part of the development and consultation phase.