



Roffey Park Institute **MSc in People and** **Organisational Development**

Programme Handbook and Regulations
July 2023

Welcome to the Roffey Park Institute MSc People and Organisational Development

This handbook provides the core information for learners enrolled on the MSc People and Organisational Development. The Handbook contains the key information about programme structure, assessment and the support available to all learners through Roffey Park Institute. It also contains the key elements of the formal regulations governing the programme developed in conjunction with the University of Sussex which accredits this programme.

Policies and procedures supporting these regulations are available on the programme Moodle site. If a situation arises that is not covered by the regulations set out in this Handbook, Roffey Park Institute will refer to existing regulations of the [University of Sussex](#).

The MSc in People and Organisational Development (P&OD) is a unique programme developed and run by Roffey Park Institute for more than 20 years. The programme is now part of a growing suite of postgraduate programmes under the Roffey Park Academy. This MSc is the preeminent master's level OD programme and has trained successive generations of OD professionals in many different industries and sectors. Although primarily aimed at those already working in OD (loosely defined) the programme is open to anyone wishing to develop an OD function within their organisation or to move into OD from other areas of specialism (e.g. HR). During the academic year 2020-21 the MSc was extensively revised and restructured to enable it to be delivered entirely online. This allows the MSc in P&OD to be offered to fully international cohorts of learners, bringing their different perspectives on OD in practice. As a master's for professionals, this potential for international sharing and networking is a key aspect of the programme and it has been structured in order to maximise the potential for participants to learn from each other.

Please note that the information in this handbook is correct at the time of printing. From time to time, arrangements may be changed to meet Roffey Park, University of Sussex or statutory requirements. Any planned changes will be communicated to students in writing in advance to ensure that they are accepted by the entire cohort.

Dr Jan Moorhouse

Programme Director, MSc People and Organisational Development
Roffey Park Institute

Contents

Welcome to the Roffey Park Institute MSc People and Organisational Development	2
1 - Introduction to the MSc in People and Organisational Development	4
2 - Programme Structure.....	7
3 - Programme Intended Learning Outcomes	7
4 - Teaching and Learning policy.....	8
5 - Dialogic Learning Groups (DLG).....	9
6 - PULSE.....	10
7 - Pastoral support.....	10
8 - Roffey Park's Online Learning Resource Centre.....	11
9 - Assessment	11
10 - The Dissertation.....	13
11 - Doing research ethically	13
12 - Marking, Moderation and Feedback.....	14
13 - General principles of marking and moderation.	14
14 - Marking of special cases.....	15
15 - Moderation: Internal and External	16
16 - Submission of Assessment and Late Submission Penalties.....	17
17 - Award regulations	18
18 - Withdrawal.....	20
19 - Resits.....	21
20 - Arrangements for compensation and condonement.....	22
21 - Exceptional Circumstances and Impaired Performance	23
22 - Students with a Declared Disability.....	27
23 - New Declaration of a Disability	28
24 - Aegrotat awards.....	28
25 - Academic Misconduct	28
26 - Student Complaints	31
27 - Appeals	32
Appendix I – Grade Criteria.....	35

1 - Introduction to the MSc in People and Organisational Development

The MSc in People and Organisational Development at Roffey Park, is a two-year part-time programme designed to improve the knowledge base, understanding, skills and therefore the practice of developers, working in the field of OD. The MSc provides a sustained long-term development opportunity and leads to a fully recognised and validated academic qualification.

Students on the programme are challenged to become effective developers of individuals, teams, and organisations through:

1. Learning how to develop themselves.
2. Working with other students on their development.
3. Working on areas that are significant to their own organisation's development.

The MSc is delivered entirely online, though most of the events involve live interaction with Roffey Park Faculty and other staff. Much of the learning in each module takes place in Dialogic Learning Groups (DLGs) which are at the core of the programme. DLGs are a form of learning set, but also constitute part of the experiential learning of the MSc. Dialogic reflective practice is a key OD method, so the MSc DLGs are an opportunity to thoroughly experience this way of working. DLGs are for the most part directed by the 5 or 6 learner members they contain. The work of the DLGs is supported by the Programme Director overall, and by DLG Advisors, who will attend approximately one DLG session per module to provide guidance and facilitation.

The programme is designed to be part-time, allowing students to undertake the programme without being away from work. Online sessions run to a standard 90 minutes with DLG sessions distributed throughout. The precise timings of programme meetings will be determined for each cohort, though the overall pattern will be standard. The programme is intended to take in diverse international cohorts, meaning that members may be in different time-zones. Wherever possible DLG members will be selected to ensure that meetings can be held at times that work for all members, though some flexibility will be necessary. To ensure the maximum dialogue among the entire cohort, in addition to whole cohort events and teaching, membership of the DLGs is changed approximately half way through the programme.

The MSc is accredited by the University of Sussex. Learners on the programme are students of Roffey Park Institute and not the University. The University is the degree-awarding body and all students who successfully complete the programme will receive a University of Sussex MSc. The University is responsible for assuring the quality of the programme including ensuring that the curriculum content, and all teaching, learning and assessment, is at a level appropriate to the award, and that Roffey Park Institute has in place mechanisms for assuring and enhancing the delivery of the programme and the overall quality of the student experience.

Students are registered directly with Roffey Park Institute, and Roffey Park Institute is responsible for all aspects of programme delivery and assessment, student support and administration.

Admissions policy

Minimum entry requirements for this MSc are:

- 2.2 Bachelor's degree or equivalent,
- Four years relevant documented professional experience

IELTS 6.5 with at least 6.0 in each of the four components for those without English as a first language or equivalent.

Application forms will be accompanied by CVs and a brief statement outlining what the applicant is looking to gain from the programme. All applicants will be interviewed online before a place on the programme is offered.

Fees and Funding

Payment of fees

Registration for, and granting of, the award is dependent on full payment of fees by the due date. Students are solely responsible for ensuring the payment of fees by the due date. Where payment is not received, the Programme Director will ask the student to withdraw from the programme.

Payment Structure

Invoices are dispatched at the time a confirmed booking is made and 60% of the total fee is due payable in 30 days. The remaining 40% of the total fee is due payable at the beginning of the second year. Where a booking is made less than 30 days prior to the programme start date then payment must be made before the commencement of the programme. Students may not normally progress to the second year of the programme until the 60% fee payment has been made.

Cancellation notice Charge

Cancel before the start of the programme	100% refund
Cancel within 4 weeks of the start of the programme	80% refund
Cancel within 12 weeks	50% refund
Cancel within 26 weeks	40% refund
Cancel within 52 weeks	25% refund
Cancel between 52 weeks and end of MSc programme	10% refund

Definition of Terms

Assessment period	Designated resit periods are held for each 60-credit block of study.
Award	The academic award for the successful completion of a programme e.g. MSc.
Capped marks/capping	Capping is where the mark for a resit assessment is restricted to the minimum pass mark of 50%.
Classification	The process by which the University categorises students' overall performance into classes of degree. This includes Pass, Merit and Distinction at postgraduate level.
Compensated credit	The automatic award of credit for a failed module where the criteria are met, in recognition of a candidate's overall performance. An optional resit of the module may be offered. The mark achieved on the module will stand.
Condoned credit	The decision of the PAB to confer condoned credit at the final award stage where the criteria are met. An optional resit of the module may be offered. The mark achieved on the module will stand.
Conflation	The arithmetical process of producing a final mark based on the weightings of assessment components.
Contributory assessment	Assessment that contributes to the mark for a module.

Core module	A module taken by all students on the programme.
Credit	Credit is awarded for the successful completion of a credit-bearing module.
Cycle of assessment	Comprises one first attempt and one resit attempt at module assessment in a stage of study.
FHEQ	Framework for Higher Education Qualifications
Level	Refers to the difficulty of the module aligned to the FHEQ. These levels are usually taken in the following stages of study: Level 3 – Foundation stage Level 4 – UG stage 1 Level 5 – UG stage 2 Level 6 – UG stage 3 Level 7 – Postgraduate
Marginal fail	The University defines marginal failure in a module as follows: At levels 3 to 6: Marks of 35 – 39% At level 7: Marks of 45 – 49%
Mode of assessment	The description of an assessment type
Moderation (internal and external)	The process that is required by the University to confirm that the marking process has been conducted appropriately. It is undertaken independently of the marking team following the completion of the marking process. Internal moderation is followed by external moderation by the External Examiner.
Module	A self-contained block of learning with defined aims, learning outcomes and assessment. The building blocks of courses.
Module Assessment Board (MAB)	The exam board responsible for considering and assuring marks achieved on a module by a cohort of students.
Non-contributory work (formative)	Refers to assessment exercises which should be taken as part of the learning process, but for which the mark does not contribute to the overall mark for the module.
Programme	An approved 'course of study' comprising a defined number of modules and credits which leads to an award of the University. Students are registered on a programme
Progression and Award Board (PAB)	The exam board responsible for considering the assessment outcomes of students and for applying the regulations. It has the power to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend awards and confirm progression • Compensate or condone module failure • Agree retrieval requirements
Repeat	Where a student is given a repeat cycle of assessment including all the teaching, learning and assessment for a stage. Marks for repeat modules are not capped.
Resit	Where a student is given an opportunity to resit the module assessment, without repeating the teaching. Resits are scheduled during the resit assessment period. Resit marks are capped at the minimum pass threshold.

Rounding of marks	The process by which the mark for a module or grand mean is made into a whole number rounded up (≥ 0.45) or down (≤ 0.44).
Stage	A period of study at the end of which students are considered for an award; at postgraduate level, there is only one stage.
Stage mean	Includes all marks achieved on modules taken during the stage of study including marks of zero and fail marks.

2 - Programme Structure

The MSc in People and Organisational Development is delivered online over two years. The first year is made up of a series of thematic modules. These are delivered through a combination of whole cohort taught components and Dialogic Learning Groups (DLGs).

PROGRAMME STRUCTURE – Year 1			
Module Title	FHEQ Level	Credit weighting	Core or Option
Academic Reading and Writing	7	15	Core
People and Dialogic Practice	7	15	Core
Mapping the Field of OD	7	15	Core
Change Expertise	7	15	Core
Values and influence	7	15	Core
Organisational Consulting	7	15	Core

PROGRAMME STRUCTURE – Year 2			
Module Title	FHEQ Level	Credit weighting	Core or Option
Case Study	7	30	Core
Research Methods and Ethics	7	15	Core
Dissertation	7	45	Core

3 - Programme Intended Learning Outcomes

On successfully completing the MSc in People and Organisational development a learner will be able to do the following:

LO1 Express a thorough knowledge of Organisational Development theory and its evolution.
LO2 Lead the application of group dynamics and dialogic methods as key OD tools
LO3 Function as a professional OD practitioner

LO4 Critically analyse change dynamics within an organisation
LO5 Critically analyse and demonstrate the relationship between Organisational <i>Development</i> and Organisational <i>Design</i> .
LO6 Develop and critically evaluate plans for OD interventions.
LO7 Generate and integrate a variety of media and materials to build a reflective OD portfolio.
LO8 Conduct independent research using primary and secondary resources to produce reflective long-form written assessments (essays and dissertation).

These programme level learning outcomes are delivered throughout the programme, connected to module level learning outcomes, all of which are demonstrated through the assessment structure laid out below.

4 - Teaching and Learning policy

The MSc is designed to take advantage of the fact that learning is most effective when individuals have a high degree of ownership of the learning process (content, methods, knowledge and skills) and work closely with others to further develop that learning. Students on this MSc all have some experience as OD practitioners, but at different stages of development, in different organisational and cultural contexts and in varied industrial, public, not for profit, and commercial sectors. The MSc uses that very rich and varied experience through the medium of dialogic learning in small groups, to move from practice to theory. Although learners will explore the existing literature on OD as it has evolved in recent decades, this is used as context for thought and action rather than a source of truth to be absorbed. At all stages of the programme learners will be encouraged to use their practical experience to critique and reshape existing OD theory.

This approach recognises the fast-changing and unpredictable nature of the organisational environment in the 21st century in the public, private and voluntary sectors and highlights the importance of learning as key individual and organisational competences.

The pedagogic assumptions on which the design of the MSc is based include:

- Learning and development need to take account of the context, and connect with the changing experience of organisations and communities
- Learning and development arise from the ability to critically reflect on experience
- Learning is *a social process* enhanced by working with others, in both a small peer group and a wider community
- Learning and development are strengthened by recognising and working with individual and cultural differences
- Learning and development form a continuous creative process
- Learning and development have a significant influence on individuals, organisations and communities achieving their potential

MSc People and Organisation Programme Map



DLGs = Dialogic Learning Groups
Each DLG or Lecture = 90 mins

5 - Dialogic Learning Groups (DLG)

The purpose of the DLG is to provide a forum for mutual support and challenge to further the learning and development of each individual in the set, and to provide comment, feedback and assessment on the work being undertaken in meeting the requirements of the MSc. Members of the DLG have a key role in the assessment process.

DLGs typically consists of five or six students (up to a maximum of 8) allocated by the Programme Director at the start of the programme, taking into account factors such as diversity and time-zone compatibility. Training is provided in the early stages of the programme as to how DLGs are expected to work, what records need to be kept of DLG meetings and how learners can access support for their DLG, for example, from their DLG Advisors

There is a requirement of 80% attendance at whole cohort and DLG meetings, all of which are conducted online. Timetable of the online lectures will be published on our website prior to booking the programme to allow participants make arrangement in order to attend them. DLGs will be arranged by the participants themselves to allow them to find a time that is convenient for everyone in that group. Attendance records need to be maintained and submitted to the Programme Director after each meeting.

Where learners know they are unable to attend a particular meeting in advance, they are required to notify both their DLG colleagues and the Programme Director in case alternative arrangements need to be made. If attendance is not possible for unanticipated reasons – ill-health, connectivity problems, intermittent power supply, etc. – an explanation (with evidence if possible) should be submitted as soon as possible after the event. Exceptional circumstances will be considered by the Programme Director and Programme Staff.

6 - PULSE

To support all our learning activities, Roffey Park makes use of our PULSE adult learning framework. PULSE is a five-stage descriptor of the learning process as illustrated in the diagram below:



As you can see, PULSE consists of a series of questions that guide a learner through the key stages of any programme intended to deliver skills and/or knowledge. These are derived from a wide range of adult learning theory and are intended to support you on your learning journey at every stage of the programme and across the programme as a whole. PULSE is a simple, but powerful tool that will help you make the greatest impact in the programme and get the most out of it for yourself and your organisation. Instruction and support on how to use PULSE will be given in the early stages of the programme, through online materials and at key stages (e.g. during dissertation preparation).

7 - Pastoral support

The Programme as a whole is managed by a combination of the Programme Director and members of Roffey Park's Client and Technical Support staff. Wider support is available through Roffey Park's Client Programme Management (CPM) Team for general and administrative matters. Roffey Park's CPM Team will:

- Remind you of programme start dates and payment deadlines
- Provide guidance and support for all non-academic areas of the programme
- Help you with any questions or queries around the administration of your programme
- You can contact the CPM Team using this email: enquiries@roffeypark.ac.uk

Your DLG Advisor also acts as a personal tutor to provide both academic and pastoral support. The DLG Advisor will meet individually with each student to assess progress, provide feedback and address any welfare issues.

Student Voice

It is essential that students should have every opportunity to feedback to Roffey Park Institute on all aspects of their learning experience. The following opportunities for student voice to be heard run

throughout the programme:

DLG Reps

Each DLG will nominate a representative who will provide feedback from the group to the Programme Director at regular monthly meetings. In the event that the DLG representative is unable to attend, either an alternative DLG member can attend in her/his place, or feedback can be submitted in writing.

Progress Meetings with your DLG Advisor

Progress meetings are held at the 60 credit and 120 credit stage for feedback to learners and to gather feedback from them as individuals about their learning journey. Issues arising from these meetings may, with the students' consent, be shared anonymously with the Programme Director or other senior member of Roffey Park staff.

Client and Programme Management Services

For administrative, financial or other non-academic matters, the Client Programme Management (CPM) Team is available to answer student queries and address any immediate problems. CPM Team will respond to any request within 24 hours of contact being received. You can contact the CPM TEAM using this email: enquiries@roffeypark.ac.uk

Programme Director

Where students feel they have exhausted the lines of communication above, they are free to contact the Programme Director directly at any time. The PD will either deal with the issue her/himself or refer it to the appropriate person or group. Students will be kept informed at all times how their queries or problems are being addressed.

8 - Roffey Park's Online Learning Resource Centre

During your programme the Learning Resource Centre (LRC) supports your online learning needs.

The LRC staff can support student literature searches and help locate materials that students are unable to track down. The LRC website allows students access to a wide range of electronic resources (e-books, academic journals, industry content, etc.) and the programme is designed around wholly electronic material. As part of this programme you will be given information in how to make effective searches for information and literature through the LRC and wider internet-based resources. Students on the programme are expected to find their own research materials. Access to the LRC website is via the Online Learning Platform.

Once your programme comes to an end you may wish to continue using the LRC, for your personal development only, under our LRC Alumni Membership Scheme.

9 - Assessment

Overview and Principles

The MSc People and OD (MSC P&OD) uses a range of assessment methods throughout the programme. The function of assessment is to enable students to demonstrate their learning. The assessment structure has been carefully designed to ensure that all the stated learning outcomes (at both programme and module levels) are tested in a variety of ways. The range of assessment

methods has been selected to give all of our learners the opportunity both to demonstrate their knowledge to others and, just as importantly, be able to track their own learning journey. While individual modes of assessment differ, the following principles apply to all:

- That assessment should be a process that promotes effective learning;
- That assessment should foster the development of critical self-awareness and independent practice;
- That all assessment documentation should be expressed in clear, non-technical language;
- That any particular needs of learners be acknowledged and adjusted for as far as possible;
- That published and implemented principles and procedures for, and processes of, all assessment are explicit, valid and reliable;
- That assessment is conducted with rigour, probity and fairness and with due regard for security;
- That the criteria for success in any assessment event should be clearly stated in terms of Intended Learning Outcomes, assessment rubrics, grade descriptors, feedforward and feedback (both formative and summative);
- That it should ensure an equitable distribution of the student workload across the year.

Most assessments will involve both *formative* and *summative* feedback. Formative feedback on this MSc programme is primarily given by students to each other in their DLGs.

All assessments are to be submitted by 17:00 GMT on the specified date.

Formative feedback takes the form of constructive and positive suggestions as to how a piece of work in progress might be improved. It is not intended to be used to correct spelling or grammar, or to relay negative or hostile opinion. Training will be given to students in the People and Dialogue module and in the early facilitated DLG sessions about how to give effective formative feedback. The provision of such feedback is an important skill for OD practitioners and is therefore an integral part of the programme learning.

Summative feedback is provided by qualified faculty in the form of a numeric grade (0-100), linked to clearly stated grade descriptors (see Appendix 1) and written or audio feedback explaining what worked in a particular mode of assessment and what could be improved. The graded assessments, once confirmed by internal moderation and ratified at the Progression and Awards Boards (PABs) contribute to students' progression through the programme and to the overall final grade.

The assessment strategy has been developed to deliver a range of programme and module learning outcomes through varied exercises and media. Across the programme students will be required to use a mixture more formal 'academic' modes of assessment (essay, literature review) and a range of exercises, presentations and activities to demonstrate their knowledge and skills. These are built into the programme structure and monitored by faculty but are also managed by DLGs. Individual module assessments are aligned to both module and programme learning outcomes. Each module generates assessed outputs that the learner will 'curate' into a portfolio that constitutes part of the final submission for the MSc. Individual elements of the portfolio will not be reassessed (to avoid issues of double-marking), but a grade will be given for the quality of integration and selection of material. The aim of all of this is to allow learners to graduate from the programme with a set of practical tools, findings and knowledge appropriate to their professional roles.

10 - The Dissertation

The culmination of the MSc is the Dissertation submitted at the end of the programme. The Dissertation allows students to bring all their acquired learning from the programme together in the analysis of a particular aspect of OD. There are many sources of information appropriate to a Dissertation, but in all cases some original research will need to form part of it. The design and conduct of that research will be supported by individual Dissertation Supervisors.

The dissertation is a substantial piece of work (10,000 words) that needs careful planning and design. Support for the dissertation runs throughout the MSc, starting with the first module (re)introducing learners to Academic Reading and Writing. Research and writing skills appear at many different points in the programme - particularly the case study module. More intensive support comes in the form of the Research Methods and Ethics module, and one-to-one project supervision. The Research Methods and Ethics module provides general guidance on the appropriate and safe conduct of original research and requires all students to conform to Roffey Park's ethical research process (see section 11 below). Project supervision is carried out by qualified Roffey Park Faculty or Associate Faculty under the general guidance of the Programme Director. Each student is allocated a total of 15 hours of supervision throughout the dissertation process. This will consist of a series of scheduled supervision meetings at the start of the process, followed by further meetings arranged between student and supervisor. This is in recognition of the inherently varied nature of dissertation research, needing different inputs at different times. Students are advised to work with their supervisor to plan the best use of supervision time. Except in the case of exceptional circumstances no additional supervision time will be available beyond the 15 hours – this is to ensure equity of support across all our learners.

11 - Doing research ethically

Doing primary research requires that the researcher pays attention to potential ethical issues. For the protection of everyone involved in the research process – students, research subjects (interviewees, etc.), Roffey Park Faculty, employers, etc. – all research projects are subject to an ethical approval process. The general principles of this are:

- Research should be designed, reviewed and undertaken to ensure integrity and quality
- Research subjects must participate in a voluntary way, free from any coercion
- The confidentiality of information supplied by research subjects and the anonymity of respondents must be respected
- Research subjects must be informed fully about the purpose, methods and intended possible uses of the research, what their participation in the research entails and what risks, if any, are involved
- Even when students are using their own organisation, good practice suggests that they should state that all data will be kept in a secure (password protected) online drive accessible only by the researcher. On completion of the dissertation process (i.e., once it has been submitted, graded and the mark confirmed by the Progression and Awards Board), all original data should be permanently destroyed.
- Wherever possible research subjects should be anonymous so that by participating they will not be disadvantaged in any way. In some instances, subjects may wish to be identified and that is entirely their choice. This issue is particularly pertinent when researchers are conducting research in their own organisations - to protect subjects.
- The independence of research must be clear, and any conflicts of interest or partiality must be explicit.

12 - Marking, Moderation and Feedback.

Moderation is undertaken by reviewing a sample of assessments following the completion of the marking and marks checking process. The purpose of moderation is to ensure that all marking at Roffey Park is carried out to a consistently high standard compliant with the demands of a master's level programme. For that reason, all moderation is carried out by members of RPI staff qualified to doctoral level (PhD, EdD, DBA, etc) and with previous experience of education in Higher Education. All markers are required to hold at least a master's qualification and are trained in the methods and standards of marking expected at Roffey Park.

Internal moderation is conducted by an internal member of faculty who is not involved in the marking process. They determine if the marking and feedback are appropriate based on the assessment outcomes in the sample and the statistical data.

External moderation is conducted by the External Examiner using the same sample as for internal moderation. The External Examiner will also determine if the marking and feedback are appropriate based on the assessment outcomes in the sample and the statistical data.

13 - General principles of marking and moderation.

- The Module Leader is responsible for overseeing marking and marks checking on their modules.
- Marks and feedback may be changed or agreed as part of the marking process but not as part of the moderation process.
- Marking and feedback must clearly indicate the rationale for the proposed mark.
- Markers should use the 0 -100 scale.
- Markers must not accept written assessments directly from students.
- Marking should be conducted anonymously whenever possible. Some modes of assessment (e.g., presentations cannot be anonymous by nature). Formative assessment within DLGs will not be anonymous to the group, but do not contribute directly to the final grade.
- Markers should not mark any assessed work where they have any personal interest, involvement or relationship with a student.
- Markers should be alert to signs of Academic Misconduct and instigate relevant procedures.
- Details of the size and range of the sample of assessed work for moderation are given in the regulations.
- Only moderated marks can be published to the cohort. These are provisional and subject to external moderation until assured by an exam board.
- Where the moderator does not confirm that the sample marks and feedback are robust, a different sample must be reviewed by the Programme Director acting as second moderator. Where the second moderator does not approve the sample, the marks for the cohort are discounted and the marking process restarted with a different marker not involved in the first marking process.

Policy on provision of marks and feedback on module assessments

- A mark must be given where the assessment contributes to award.
- Marks and feedback will normally be published within 15 working days on Moodle (Roffey Park's online learning platform).
- Roffey Park will inform students at least 24 hours before the expected date of publication if the marks cannot be published on time.

- Written feedback should be given on all contributory module assessments and must relate to the marking criteria. Markers are asked to ensure that the comments are appropriate as 'feed forward' for future assessments.

Assessments must be submitted in English. The format, location and deadline for submitting is published on the programme Moodle site.

Feedback is also provided to students through review meetings with personal tutors at regular intervals across the programme. These occur at the start and close of each of the three award levels (i.e. at intervals of 60 credits) and are used to review progress to date and/or plan for successful outcomes in the subsequent stage of the programme.

14 - Marking of special cases

Where an assessment has been unanswered or the answer is illegible, a zero on the marks sheet should be entered for each question.

Where an assessment has been partly answered, Markers must mark the incomplete answer as it stands and not try to estimate what mark might have been merited had it been answered in full.

The maximum length for each assessment is published to students. Where a student has marginally (within 10%) exceeded the word length the Marker should penalise the work where the student would gain an unfair advantage. In excessive cases (>10%) the Marker need only consider work up to the designated word limit. Students are requested to state the word count on submission.

Unless specifically allowed, the use of the same material in more than one assessment exercise will be subject to penalties.

Where a student has been assessed as having dyslexia, consideration of this will be taken in the marking. Student will be asked to include at the beginning of their submitted work that they are dyslexic.

The Marker is asked to try to separate marking of transcription errors and marking of content. However, while sympathetic treatment of assessed work submitted by students with a specific learning difference implies the disregarding of errors of spelling and grammar, the communication itself must be effective. If academic standards are to be safeguarded, sympathetic treatment cannot extend to written expression so poor that coherence and intelligibility are at issue. In effect, the Marker ought not to penalise errors that a good copy editor could put right.

The written work of students with specific learning differences may be characterised by one, or in some cases, several, of the following:

- (i) omitted words or punctuation;
- (ii) excessive or misplaced punctuation;
- (iii) repeated information or phrases – this would not be detected by a spellchecker or by a student with specific learning differences proofreading their own draft;
- (iv) unsophisticated language structures – in order to avoid grammatical errors, students with specific learning differences may adopt simplified language structures, which do not necessarily denote unsophisticated thinking;

- (v) simplified vocabulary – in order to avoid spelling errors, students with specific learning differences may adopt a simplified vocabulary when writing;
- (vi) difficulties with sequencing or word-finding may produce a stilted style of writing

Although assessed work, other than examination scripts for exams held on campus, is likely to be word-processed and spell-checked, markers should be aware of the limitations of a spellchecker. Some of the problems likely to remain in the work of students with specific learning differences after spell-checking include:

- (i) homophone substitutions (such as there/their, effect/affect);
- (ii) phonetic equivalents (such as frenetic for phonetic, homerfone for homophone);
- (iii) incorrect word substitution (distance for disturbance);
- (iv) American spelling (such as colorful, fueling).

15 - Moderation: Internal and External

Internal moderation

Once initial grading is complete, a suitably qualified (PhD) member of Faculty who has not been involved in the marking process will review a sample of the assessment to ensure consistency of marking between candidates and alignment of marks to grade descriptors. The sample will consist of all marking bands, totalling 10% or a minimum of 7 (whichever is higher). All fails will also be included in the sample.

The moderator does not re-grade the assessments. Where discrepancies appear in the initial marking, A different sample must be reviewed by a second moderator.

If the marks are not approved by the second moderator, marking will be done again by another marker not involved in the first marking process. The moderation process will repeat again by a new moderator who was not involved in the first round. Students should be advised of a second date when marks are expected to be published.

External verification

External moderation is conducted by the External Examiner using the same sample as for internal moderation. The sample will show evidence of marking and feedback and a comment regarding internal moderation. The External Examiner will determine if the marking and feedback are appropriate based on the assessment outcomes in the sample and the statistical data. An External Examiner may request access to larger samples of work from particular modules or cohorts, at the discretion of the Programme Director.

The minimum number of External Examiners for each cohort is currently one.

The Progression and Award Board

The Progression and Award Board (PAB) is formally constituted to:

- (i) Confirm the assessment outcomes and recommend to the University the award of PG Cert, PG Dip and MSc for those candidates exiting the programme who have satisfied the assessment requirements for the award.

- (ii) Confirm, in the event of failure of assessed work, the resubmission requirements for individual candidates, in accordance with published procedures.
- (iii) Make academic judgements in relation to general exceptional circumstances cases submitted to the Board by the Exceptional Circumstances Panel and to grant further resits as sits to allow students a fair chance to demonstrate academic ability. Individual exceptional circumstances claims are submitted to the Programme Director at Roffey Park who then constitutes an Exceptional Circumstances panel to review any such cases. The outcome of these reviews is reported anonymously to an exam board for confirmation.
- (iv) Confirm, in the event of late submission, the appropriate penalties.
- (v) Consider the reports from the Programme Director and External Examiner
- (vi) To authorise the *Programme Director* to produce an annual report from the examination board for submission to the Roffey Park Academic Board and the University

Prior to the PAB, a Module Assessment Board will be held, the terms of reference for which include to:

- (i) Determine action to be taken in the case of assessments about which there is dispute or complaint.
- (ii) Consider and make recommendations on any changes to the assessment of the programme.
- (iii) Confirm and ensure the maintenance of standards across learner cohorts within each iteration of the programme.

The PAB will be convened following each 60 credit phase of study to consider performance and progress and agree any resits/sits to ensure that sufficient credit has been achieved to enable an award to be made on completion of the full stage.

The PAB will consider students for an award on the first occasion that they have completed the minimum required modules.

Where performance is such that a future award is precluded, after any resits offered, the PAB will determine any retrieval opportunities prior to continuation.

The PAB will make awards in accordance with these regulations and will offer retrieval opportunities and consider exit awards where appropriate.

16 - Submission of Assessment and Late Submission Penalties

Students are supported by both the faculty team and DLG members to submit work and complete their studies within the published and agreed timeframes. However, the observance of submission deadlines is a requirement of the exam board, in order to ensure the proper conduct of the assessment process and to maintain equity of treatment of students, and failure to observe deadlines without an acceptable reason will result in the application of penalties as detailed below. It should be noted that dispensation from deadline requirements will not normally be granted for any particular needs relating to students' employment or occupation.

The deadline for submission of assessment items is always 17:00 GMT on the specified date.

The latest date on which any part of an item of assessment is submitted will be recorded as the date of submission of the whole item of assessment; if this is after the deadline, a penalty may be incurred.

Late submission – up to 24 hours late

A penalty deduction of 5 percentage points (not 5% of the actual mark) will be applied to all work submitted up to 24 hours after the submission deadline.

The application of this penalty should not reduce the overall conflated mark for the module below the minimum pass mark. Penalties will not be applied where this would result in the assessment component not being passed. This means that such penalties cannot in themselves require the student to resit assessments that have been academically passed.

Non-submission or submission after 24 hours

Work submitted beyond the 24hr submission deadline will not be considered. A mark of 0% will be recorded.

When any contributory assessment is not submitted, it will be counted as an attempt and marked as 0%.

Work that has been submitted on time, or during the late submission period, will be marked once the deadline has passed. Students are not permitted to submit revised versions of their submission or additional elements once the original deadline has passed.

Protocols in the case of an e-submission error

Where there has been an error in the e-submission process for a Submission mode with a late submission period, an application may be made to the Programme Director to replace the file. Where the file is accepted, the standard penalties apply for submissions made during the late submission period. For accepted submissions made after the end of the late submission period, the mark will be capped at the module threshold mark.

Roffey Park recognises that there are circumstances where late submission is unavoidable. Students with a declared disability can submit within the 24-hour late submission period without a penalty. Submission deadlines will be set for all students at the start of the programme. In such cases, the actual submission deadline will be decided in advance of the assessment. All other occurrences that cause late submission beyond a students' control (illness or other exceptional circumstances) need to be submitted with supporting evidence to the Programme Director to be considered by the Exceptional Circumstances Panel.

17 - Award regulations

Master's Standards

The standards required of a UK MSc programme are defined by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) as follows:

Master's degrees are awarded to students who have demonstrated:

- (i) A systematic understanding of, knowledge and a critical awareness of current problems and /or new insights, much of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of their academic discipline, field of study, or area of professional practice;

- (ii) A comprehensive understanding of techniques applicable to their own research or advanced scholarship;
- (iii) Originality in the application of knowledge, together with a practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline;
- (iv) Conceptual understanding that enables the student:
- (v) To evaluate critically current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline; and
- (vi) To evaluate methodologies and develop critiques of them and, where appropriate, to propose new hypotheses.

Typically, holders of the qualification will be able to:

- a. Deal with complex issues both systematically and creatively, make sound judgements in the absence of complete data, and communicate their conclusions clearly to specialist and non-specialist audiences;
- b. Demonstrate self-direction and originality in tackling and solving problems, and act autonomously in planning and implementing tasks at a professional or equivalent level;
- c. Continue to advance their knowledge and understanding, and to develop new skills to a high level;

and will have:

The qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring:

- The exercise of initiative and personal responsibility;
- Decision-making in complex and unpredictable situations; and
- The independent learning ability required for continuing professional development.

QAA Framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland, (2nd edition revised August 2008)

The maximum period of registration for this programme is 4 years.

There are three levels of award for students enrolled on this programme:

1. Master's Award

A student who is registered for a master's degree will be considered for the award where they have achieved not less than 180 credits at the prescribed level as set out in the University's Academic Framework and a capped stage mean of 50% across the stage. The credit requirement may include condoned and compensated credit where this has been given by an exam board.

Master's awards will be classified using the following framework:

Distinction – an overall grand mean of 70-100% plus 50% of the credit at 70 or above.

Merit – an overall grand mean of 60-69% plus 50% of the credit at 60 or above.

Pass – an overall grand mean of 50-59%.

2. Postgraduate Diploma (exit award)

A student who fails to achieve the standard required for their registered award will be considered for a Postgraduate Diploma exit award where they have achieved not less than 120 credits, at the

prescribed level as set out in the Academic Framework, and a capped stage mean of 50% across the stage. The credit requirement may include condoned and compensated credit where this has been given by an exam board.

3. Postgraduate Certificate (exit award)

A student who fails to achieve the standard required for their registered award will be considered for a Postgraduate Certificate exit award where they have achieved not less than 60 credits, at the prescribed level as set out in the Academic Framework, and a capped stage mean of 50% across the stage. Compensation and condoned credit may not contribute to the award of a PG Certificate exit award.

The mean mark for an exit award should be calculated from the taught modules contributing to the award only. Credit achieved on a research-based dissertation cannot contribute to the credit requirements of a Postgraduate Diploma or Certificate awarded as an exit award.

Postgraduate exit awards are not classified.

In all cases the capped stage mean is used for award purposes. The stage mean includes all contributory marks achieved on modules taken during the programme, including marks of zero and fail marks.

Borderline criteria

Roffey Park Institute operates a borderline zone, so where a student meets the following criteria the PAB has the discretion to award the higher classification:

A grand mean mark of up to 1% below the higher classification boundary and at least 50% of the credit that contributes to classification in the higher class, or;

A grand mean in the higher class with less than 50% of the credit that contributes to classification in the higher class.

When considering borderline students, the PAB has discretion to reclassify based on the individual student profile. Consideration may be given to performance in the taught modules and performance in the dissertation/project/module.

18 - Withdrawal

We recognise that students' circumstances can change unexpectedly, meaning that they may have to withdraw from the programme temporarily or permanently. The procedures for each are slightly different.

Permanent Withdrawal

Students can request to permanently withdraw from a programme at any time. Wherever possible, this should be planned to coincide with one of the exit award thresholds so that at least part of the award can be made. It is possible for students taking 'permanent' withdrawal to apply to re-join the MSc in a later cohort if circumstances allow. This is only possible, however, if a suitable cohort is available and if there has been no substantial change to the programme. This is at the discretion of the Programme Director of the Roffey Park Academy.

Temporary Withdrawal

Students can request to withdraw temporarily from the programme for a short period. Students wishing to take temporary withdrawal must inform the Programme Director in advance to discuss the period of absence, the re-entry point, and any other issues. A temporary withdrawal does not suspend a student's registration on the programme, so care needs to be taken to ensure that the withdrawal does not push overall registration beyond the maximum limit for this kind of programme (4 years).

The impact of any period of Temporary Withdrawal on any outstanding assessments and/or incomplete modules will be considered carefully on a case-by-case basis to ensure that the period of absence does not penalise an affected student inadvertently, nor hinder their re-joining the programme. It is also recognised that the absence of a member of a DLG for any period may have consequences for the other members. Again, care will be taken to identify and, wherever possible, mitigate any such effects.

It is the responsibility of the Progression and Award Board (PAB) to confirm the re-entry date and any assessments that will be set before or after re-entry, as appropriate. Marks for module/s completed before the temporary withdrawal will be ratified by the PAB.

19 - Resits

Each module taken by a student provides a single assessment cycle comprising one first attempt and one resit attempt.

Following failure of a module at the first attempt, a PAB will normally give a resit.

A resit is an opportunity to retrieve an initial fail without having to repeat the original period of teaching and learning. Once a resit opportunity is confirmed by the appropriate PAB, resits will take place in the resit assessment period for the module.

Resit opportunities will only be offered for modules where the relevant conflated mark for the module has not been achieved (50%) and/or credit has not been awarded by an exam board. A student who has passed a module at the first attempt will not be offered the opportunity to resit to improve the mark, unless exceptional circumstances are accepted for impairment.

Where a module is initially assessed by a single assessment mode the resit should, where practical, normally be assessed by the same mode. Where a module is initially assessed by more than one assessment mode to test different learning outcomes, the resit modes should normally map to the original assessment modes and weightings. This ensures that all module learning outcomes are assessed at the resit.

All students taking the resit will take the approved resit assessment mode/s. Where there are two or more resit assessment mode types which map to the original assessment mode types and weightings, a resit of the failed assessment mode will be given. For example, for a failed module initially assessed by presentation 30% and report 70%, a resit of the presentation and/or report will be given weighted at 30% and 70% respectively, depending on the assessment/s failed. This enables the mark for a passed assessment to be carried forwards.

Where there is a single resit mode designed to test all the learning outcomes and the mode is the same as the highest weighted original mode, the resit mode may be weighted in accordance with

the failed assessment. For example, for a failed module initially assessed by presentation 30% and essay 70%, a resit assignment could be weighted at 100%, 70% or 30% depending on the assessment/s failed. This enables the mark for a passed assessment to be carried forwards and for a single resit assignment to be set.

The resit mark achieved will stand even where it is lower than the mark achieved at the first attempt. The original mark will stand where the resit has not been taken.

The mark achieved on the resit will be capped at the pass threshold for the module. The resit mark will be conflated with any passed assessment mark/s which are carried forwards and/or with any failed assessment marks where a resit has not been taken.

Any resubmissions must take place within the maximum period of registration (4 years) and during designated resit periods; deadlines to be set by the Programme Director.

Students whose exceptional circumstances claim affecting a failed assessment has been accepted may be offered a sit rather than a resit, at the discretion of the Progression and Award Board. A sit is an opportunity to take the resit mode weighted in proportion with the accepted exceptional circumstances. Marks achieved on a sit will not be capped. Should a student fail a sit, they will have one opportunity to resit.

These resit regulations also apply to sits and to discretionary second resits. A sit is an opportunity to take the resit mode weighted in proportion with the accepted exceptional circumstances. Marks achieved on a sit will not be capped. (See 'Exceptional circumstances' for further details)

Resit periods

Resits (and, where exceptional circumstances allow, sits) are confirmed by Progression and Award Boards that meet several times per year. Designated resit periods for each cohort, during which any failed assessments that have been awarded a sit or resit must be submitted, will be set out at the start of the programme.

20 - Arrangements for compensation and condonement

Automatic compensation

When a student is considered for award, a module/s with a marginal fail mark (45-49%) of up to 30 credits will be automatically compensated, where the criteria below have been met. This allows a student's overall performance to compensate for failure. No resit is then required. The mark for the compensated module will remain as the actual mark achieved for award purposes.

The following stage mean criteria must also be met:

- an uncapped stage mean of 50%

The mean requirement for compensation will not include the dissertation module.

Discretionary condoned credit

When a student is considered for award, the Progression and Awards Board (PAB) may consider the overall performance and decide that without incurring a penalty, a part of the programme that has been failed need not be redeemed. No resit for the failed module is then required. The mark

achieved for the module will remain as the mark for award purposes.

The PAB has discretionary authority to award up to a maximum of 30 condoned credits where:

- the programme learning outcomes have been met and
- a fail mark on the module of at least 1% has been achieved and
- an uncapped stage mean of 50% has been achieved in the final stage (i.e. across the programme)

A failed dissertation may not be condoned. The PAB may not condone a module failed because of misconduct.

A maximum of 30 credits may be granted via a combination of compensated and condoned credit in the final award stage.

Optional resits

Where automatic compensation has been applied or the PAB has condoned a credit shortfall, Roffey Park Institute will provide a single optional resit which a student may choose to take instead of receiving the credit via compensated or condoned credit. This is to enable the pass threshold to be achieved. Optional resits will only be given where a resit for the module has not yet been offered.

The mark achieved on the optional resit will be capped and will stand even where it is lower than the original mark achieved. This may result in the PAB confirming a different award decision.

21 - Exceptional Circumstances and Impaired Performance

These are circumstances that are sudden, unforeseen which may temporarily affect a student's module assessments, resulting in non-submissions, incurring lateness penalties or significant adverse effects on work submitted on time. It does not include absence from study or ongoing and longer-term conditions or circumstances.

The circumstances themselves are not the focus of consideration in the process, instead the focus is on the impact on the module assessment to ensure that the student has been given a fair and equal chance.

An exceptional circumstances claim is the record by which the student provides details of the sudden and unforeseen circumstances affecting specific module assessments. A claim may be submitted as a result of:

- Missing an assessment deadline with subsequent late submission or non-submission
- Absence from in-person examination or practical assessment
- Work that has been submitted or an in- person assessment attended as scheduled, where performance is seriously and unexpectedly impaired. Impairment may not be claimed on a late submission.
- A forthcoming in-person assessment where absence is anticipated, and an anticipated non-submission or late submission, where the evidence covers this. Claims in advance may not be made for impaired performance.

Types of evidence

The evidence to support a claim must be robust and dates must correspond to the assessment deadlines/scheduled examination.

Examples of acceptable written evidence include:

- (i) A medical certificate with dates of recent consultation and diagnosis. It is the responsibility of the student to arrange for any medical evidence to be sent to the Institute; the Institute does **not** undertake to obtain medical certificates on behalf of students.
- (ii) A letter from a member of RPI Faculty, the Police, a Counsellor, DLG Advisor or other authorities, etc. provided on behalf of a student.

Examples of rejected claims and insufficient evidence (an opportunity to submit additional evidence will be given):

- (i) Student indicates an acute medical condition but no medical evidence is submitted or medical certificate lacks detail to support claim.
- (ii) 'Retrospective' medical note –consultation dates do not confirm that a consultation took place at the time of the assessment and therefore do not support the claim.
- (iii) Long term events and conditions which have already been claimed for and the Institute has offered to review and/or consider reasonable adjustments.

Examples of inadmissible cases and evidence (no further opportunity to submit evidence will be given):

- (i) Circumstances that could have reasonably been foreseen or prevented (such as suspension, intoxication or conviction for illegal activity)
- (ii) Minor illness or ailment (cold, minor allergy)
- (iii) Holiday arrangements.
- (iv) Wedding arrangements.
- (v) Financial issues (including employment or visa related issues).
- (vi) Religious observance, competitive sporting event, work placement.
- (vii) Personal computer problem, theft/loss, data loss and/or printer problems (students should ensure that work is backed up separately).
- (viii) Jury service.
- (ix) Roffey Park administrative error (student to seek appropriate solution with Roffey Park or to refer to the appeals process).
- (x) Technical failures and power outages are not normally accepted as constituting exceptional circumstances, but will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Exceptional circumstances claim deadlines

A claim must normally be submitted online within 7 days of the first assessment deadline cited and the evidence within 21 days.

Being sensitive to the reality of contexts students are living and working in, there may be exceptional circumstances that cannot be easily evidenced. As such

- Students will be able to submit up to two self-certified claims per year without the need for evidence. Each claim can cover a period of seven days and will be approved following completion of a self-declaration form.
- For self-certified claims, students will only be required to supply minimal information in addition to the self-declaration form.
- For subsequent claims, students will be required to supply evidence of their circumstances (not including a self-declaration form) but will still benefit from a simplified claim process.
- Students who suffer a bereavement will no longer be required to provide evidence when making an EC claim at any time.

A claim is late when either the claim or the evidence is not submitted within the deadlines given above. Late claims may only be made within the registration period for a particular cohort. A student wishing to submit a claim after the PAB has met may do so via an Appeal following the decision of a PAB where there is good reason for withholding the claim. Students should be referred to the appeal process where the claim is submitted after the final submission date for claims prior to the PAB.

Process for handling claims

Claims are considered in relation to the evidence submitted by the Exceptional Circumstances Panel (normally comprised of Programme Director, Module Leader and one other PhD qualified member of Faculty). The Panel will consider the detailed evidence and make recommendations to the PAB, which will make the final decision.

Notification of outcome of a claim

Students will be notified of the outcome as soon as possible via email. In some cases, an email may be sent to request additional evidence, or to notify the student that the claim is inadmissible. Evidence will be judged to be accepted, rejected or inadmissible. Where additional documentation is required the period allowed is 21 days from the date of the email requesting this.

Waiving of late submission penalties

The penalty will be removed where the evidence submitted to support a claim is accepted.

Progression and Award Board (PAB) consideration of an exceptional circumstances claim

Where a claim is accepted, the Progression and Award Board (PAB) will be notified of the weighting of accepted exceptional circumstances on the module assessment and will determine cases where a sit for an uncapped mark may be offered as a result. A sit is an opportunity to take the resit mode weighted in proportion with the accepted exceptional circumstances.

Only the PAB has the authority and the responsibility for all academic decisions relating to award, including determining cases where a sit may be offered as a result of accepted exceptional circumstances.

The PAB has discretion on the awarding of sits in the event of accepted Exceptional Circumstances:

- No setting aside of missed, failed or impaired assessments, or components of assessment, is permitted.
- The marks achieved at the first attempt will be removed from the student record and replaced with the mark achieved at the sit, even where this is lower than the original mark achieved. The mark achieved for a sit of a component of the module assessment will be conflated with any existing marks achieved for any non-affected assessment components and with any marks

achieved where exceptional circumstances were not accepted. In cases where the sit offered is not taken, the original mark(s) achieved will stand for progression and award purposes.

- The PAB may decide not to offer a sit if the mark achieved on the module is not significantly out of line.
- The PAB may consider that due to the extent of the missed, failed or impaired assessments across the stage that it is more appropriate to offer a repeat stage instead, providing the full cycle of assessment has been offered.

In all cases the PAB must consider the academic performance overall and offer further retrieval opportunities where there is evidence on the marks array that the student is able to achieve the programme intended learning outcomes within the maximum period of registration. In cases where a sit/resit opportunity has not been taken and there is an accepted claim, the PAB may determine that no further assessment opportunities are given.

In all cases the PAB must ensure that the academic standards of the award are upheld in accordance with these regulations.

Criteria for retrieving credit

The Progression and Award Board (PAB) may consider the following mechanisms for the retrieval of credit, which are discretionary.

Discretionary second resit

The Progression and Award Boards (PABs) have discretion to offer a second and final resit/s for a failed module/s up to a maximum of 60 credits, for a capped mark, provided 60 credits have been achieved across the stage. This may only be considered where the award criteria for the stage have not been achieved, after any resit opportunities and other mechanisms to retrieve the credit have been considered (compensation and condoned credit) and provided there is good evidence of attendance and engagement such that the student is likely to succeed at the next resit assessment opportunity.

A second resit may not be given for the following:

- a dissertation weighted at more than 30 credits
- where the stage has already been repeated

The student will be offered a second resit of the failed module/s without attendance, i.e. without repeating the teaching and learning. The regulations under 'Resits' regarding resit modes, resit marks, capping and resit scheduling apply.

Discretionary repeat stage

A repeat stage means restarting the programme ab initio as published with attendance. That is a repeat of the teaching, learning and assessment. All previous marks and credit will be removed from the student record for award purposes and a new full assessment cycle undertaken.

The offer of a repeat stage will be made at the PAB where a choice of a repeat or resits may be given, to enable completion within the maximum period of registration. There is no automatic right to repeat a stage. Any such offer will be at the PAB's discretion.

A repeat stage may not be given where the stage has already been repeated, where second resits without attendance have already been granted, or where a repeat would take the student over their maximum period of registration

No student shall be permitted more than four academic years to achieve the credits for the final MSc award, even where they have transferred programme or taken a period of temporary or permanent withdrawal.

Individual modules may not be repeated.

A student offered a repeat stage will be required to abide by the conditions set out in a Roffey Park Repeat Year Learning Agreement. The Learning Agreement and accompanying Guidance is available at <http://www.sussex.ac.uk/adqe/standards/examsandassessment>. The Institute may commence withdrawal proceedings for any student in breach of their Learning Agreement.

22 - Students with a Declared Disability

A student is considered as disabled if they have a physical or mental impairment which has 'a long term and substantial adverse effect on their ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities'.

The Institute will seek to provide reasonable adjustments (RAs) to learning and assessment for students with a disability that meets the definition in the Equality Act 2010 if it is likely to impact on their learning and assessment. The purpose of a Reasonable Adjustment is to remove or minimise the barriers that a disabled student may face in order to provide them with a fair and equal opportunity to succeed.

Students claiming a disability are required to submit a declaration, based on medical/professional evidence, that their disability meets the definition in the Equality Act in order for Reasonable Adjustments to be considered to support a student with their learning and assessment. Students with an existing disability should let the Institute know about their disability as early as possible after their place is confirmed, and before the start of the first module [on an online distance learning programme]. This is to allow time for RAs to be considered and implemented for the whole of the academic year.

Roffey Park Institute will use academic judgement to decide whether some types of Reasonable Adjustment are appropriate or possible, while also maintaining academic standards in delivery and assessment of module learning outcomes. Adjustments will be made on a case-by-case basis, but may include extending deadlines, waiving penalties, changing the format of an assessment, etc.

An agreed RA to assessment should result in a fair and equal opportunity for a disabled student to succeed without conferring an advantage over other students, in order to comply with the principles of assessment.

The agreed RAs will be made available to the student and to members of Roffey Park staff, as necessary. The student is responsible for raising concerns if the agreed RAs to learning and assessment are not being delivered.

Reasonable Adjustments can be revised as appropriate should circumstances change (for example, a significant change in a student's condition or a change in teaching or assessment).

When there is a sudden and unforeseen exacerbation of the known condition, or where the condition is first diagnosed or declared shortly before a particular assessment it may not be possible to provide RAs to assessment that would otherwise be appropriate. An Exceptional Circumstances claim may be submitted for all such cases.

A student may also claim for exceptional circumstances that are unrelated to their long term condition via the on-line claims process. The evidence must relate to the original cohort deadline or the extended deadline, not to any late submission deadline.

23 - New Declaration of a Disability

In cases of a new declaration of either a physical disability, specific learning difference, a mental health condition or autistic spectrum condition, the PAB has the discretion to base the final classification outcome on the marks achieved during the stage or stages of study where the necessary support was offered which enabled the student to work to their full learning potential.

For postgraduate students the Progression and Award Board will be advised of cases where support has been offered after the start of the programme so that a sit may be considered.

24 - Aegrotat awards

An aegrotat degree is a degree that may be awarded where a student is unable to complete their studies in the foreseeable future. This may be because of serious illness or death.

An absurd outcome for an individual student

Where, in the view of the Progression and Award Board (PAB), the strict application of the regulations results in an absurd outcome for an individual student that cannot be remedied within the existing discretion of the PAB, the PAB may make a recommendation to the University's Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education and Students). Marks cannot be changed or set aside.

The Pro Vice-Chancellor has the authority to accept or reject the recommendation of the PAB. The final application of the accepted recommendation rests with the PAB.

In the case of a recommendation not being accepted, the PAB can either make an alternative recommendation or apply an outcome within the regulations. Where this is the case, normal appeals procedures may apply.

25 - Academic Misconduct

All instances of plagiarism, collusion, personation, fabrication of results, or misconduct in an exam are serious failures to respect the integrity and fairness of the assessment process. As such they must be seriously considered and appropriate penalties applied.

Types of academic misconduct:

Collusion – the preparation or production of work for assessment jointly with another person or persons unless explicitly permitted by the assessment.

Plagiarism – the use, without acknowledgement, of the intellectual work of other people, and the act of representing the ideas or discoveries of another as one's own in written work for assessment.

Personation -In written work – is where someone other than the student prepares the work, part of the work or provides substantial assistance with work submitted or assessment.

Fabrication of results – or observations in practical or project work.

General principles:

- All work submitted for assessment should be the student's own work undertaken in the language required by the assessment.
- Where a proof-reading service is used the student must ensure that no substantive changes are made to the content of the assessment.
- Students must be provided with discipline-specific referencing norms at the start of their studies.
- All sources of information used in preparing work must be fully acknowledged.
- Students must work alone on preparing their assessment (unless explicitly allowed) and must protect their work prior to submission.
- Where there is evidence that academic misconduct may have occurred, the case is referred to an Investigating Officer.
- The role of the Investigating Officer is to make a preliminary determination of major or minor misconduct based on the evidence.
- Minor misconduct is where a small proportion of assessed work is plagiarised or subject to minor collusion.
- Major misconduct cases usually include instances where a significant proportion of assessed work is found to be plagiarised, where there is substantial collusion or fabrication of results or abuse of any examination room protocols, or where there is evidence of repeated minor misconduct.
- Where a concern has been raised regarding misconduct, the Marker should identify all instances of the misconduct in the assessment exercise and highlight these for easy reference.
- In all cases, the Module Leader will be responsible for ensuring the Investigating Officer receives appropriate assistance in reviewing the submitted assessment.
- Once the Investigating Officer has made a preliminary determination of minor or major misconduct, the student should be notified that their work is under investigation for potential academic misconduct. The student will be informed of any such investigation within 10 working days after the end of the moderation process for the assessment(s) in question.

Procedure for a First Case of Collusion or Plagiarism

Where the Investigating Officer confirms that no previous case of academic misconduct has been logged on the student's record, the student will be given feedback.

For a First Case (minor or major) a mark will be given based only on the sections believed to be the student's own work in a case of plagiarism and only on work that is not the same as another student's work in the case of collusion.

The collusion or plagiarism incident will not be recorded against the student's assessment record as a misconduct case.

Procedure for minor and major misconduct

The student shall be informed in writing by the CPM Team of the date and purpose of the Misconduct Panel and the allegation made against them. The Panel will normally comprise the Programme Director, the Director of Operations, Roffey Park Institute, and one additional PhD qualified member of Faculty or Associate Faculty.

Students are entitled (but not required) to attend a Panel meeting and are encouraged to submit a written statement. The evidence file will be available to the student and their representative to review.

Procedure for cases of personation

A suspected case of personation may be investigated by the Programme Director or another member of Roffey Park Faculty appointed by them, based on a paper-based review of the student's other written assessments. If there is considered that there is a case to be answered, the Programme Director assembles a Panel comprising her/himself, the Director of Roffey Park Academy and one additional PhD qualified member of Faculty or Associate Faculty. The student is invited to attend the Panel (online) to discuss the case findings and to provide information on how the assessment was completed.

The outcomes of such Panel interviews are as follows:

Denial of misconduct – if the student denies that misconduct occurred the meeting will first be concerned with establishing whether misconduct has taken place. The Panel will question the student to establish their knowledge of the work, the methods used to produce the work, and knowledge of the sources informing the work. Once the Panel has heard all the relevant evidence, it will reach a conclusion on whether the student has been found guilty or not guilty.

Not guilty – the work will be sent back to the Marker to be marked and the mark used for progression and classification purposes.

Guilty – the Panel will agree an appropriate penalty

Admission of misconduct - if the student admits that misconduct occurred the meeting will be concerned with assessing the gravity of the actions and considering the circumstances. The student will be informed of any outcome of this admission within 14 working days of the meeting.

Penalties where the student has not previously been considered by a Panel:

No penalty may be exceptionally agreed.

Reduce the mark for the assessment by 10 percentage points (not 10% of the mark). This is normally used for minor cases.

Confirm the mark of 0 for the assessment component. This is normally used for major cases.

Penalties where the student has previously been considered by a Panel:

No penalty may be exceptionally agreed.

Reduce the mark for the module to 0.

Reduction of the Grand Mean for the programme by up to 10 percentage points

Reduce the classification by one or more class.

Disqualify from Roffey Park Institute for a period of at least 3 years.

Appeals against misconduct

An appeal against an Academic Misconduct Panel decision can only be considered where there:

- is evidence of procedural irregularity (including administrative error) in the consideration of the student's case of such a nature as to cause doubt as to whether the result might have been different had there not been such an irregularity

- existed circumstances affecting the student's case of which those who determined the penalty were not aware when they made their decision, and which could not reasonably have been presented to them
- exists evidence of prejudice or of bias on the part of those making the decision.

The academic basis of the panel's decision (including whether plagiarism or collusion is judged to have occurred) is not itself subject to appeal since this is a matter of academic judgment.

26 - Student Complaints

Roffey Park Institute believes that it is in everyone's interests to resolve complaints as quickly as possible, as close to the source of the problem as possible, and by informal means in preference to formal ones. The complaints procedures described below have been drawn up with these aims in mind.

If you have cause for complaint about any aspect of your degree programme or your time at Roffey Park, including:

- The way in which a course or programme is taught or assessed;
- The learning support available;
- Misleading information in prospectuses or in advertising or promotional material; any deficiencies in Roffey Park's service or performance;
- Complaints arising from a disability

You should take the matter up at once with the person responsible.

If you are uncertain who is responsible for the matter about which you are complaining, or if you remain dissatisfied after having discussed it with them, you should take the matter up with one of the following in order:

- The Programme Director
- The Director of Operations Roffey Park Institute

The individual whom you approach will discuss your complaint with you, assess the situation, take advice from other staff members where necessary, and take one of the following courses of action:

- Resolve the problem by talking it through with you;
- Resolve the problem by speaking directly to the person responsible or to the service provider.

If the person approached as above cannot resolve the problem to your satisfaction, it will be referred, at your request, to the CEO of Roffey Park Institute. It will be treated at this point as a formal complaint, and you will be asked to complete a complaints form.

The Institute will take one of the following courses of action:

- Resolve the dispute with the appropriate staff member;
- Dismiss the complaint if he or she feels it is frivolous or vexatious, or otherwise lacking in merit;
- Refer the case to a Complaints Panel.
- A written record will be kept of the complaint and its outcome will be monitored. You will be told the outcome of your complaint in writing.

General Points

Individuals have the right to be heard in person at each stage of the complaints procedure and may be accompanied by a friend or fellow student, who may, if necessary, speak on their behalf.

If you wish to be heard in person, but are unable to be present, you may nominate someone to speak on your behalf. In these circumstances, you will lose the right to be heard personally and this will not be a ground for subsequent appeal against a decision on your complaint.

The Panel referred above will consist of the following:

- The Director of Operations, Roffey Park Institute
- The MSc Programme Director
- A suitably qualified (PhD) member of faculty

If the panel finds in favour of the student who has brought the complaint, Roffey Park will reimburse any necessary incidental expenses incurred by the student in connection with the hearing. This will not, however, include any legal expenses.

In dealing with a complaint, privacy and confidentiality will be respected. Disclosure about the complaint will only be made insofar as this is necessary for dealing with the complaint.

Once they have exhausted Roffey Park Institute's internal procedures and in the event that they feel the complaint has not been satisfactorily resolved, students can invoke the University of Sussex's complaints procedure. The University can only review your complaint if your concern relates to:

1. The quality of your learning opportunities;
2. The academic standards of the award

In such cases, students should enter the University's procedure at Level 3 by writing to the Academic Registrar of the University. The University's Complaints Procedure is published in full at:

<https://student.sussex.ac.uk/complaints/university/procedure#partners>

27 - Appeals

Appeals can be lodged against an individual assessment results, whole module results, or overall programme outcomes. There is no right of appeal against the academic judgement of the marker.

Students have the right to appeal on the following grounds:

- a. That there existed circumstances affecting the student's performance of which the marker was not aware when their decision was taken, and which could not reasonably have been presented to the examiner;
- b. That there was a procedural irregularity (including administrative error) or other inadequacy in the conduct of the assessment, or processing of marks or grades;
- c. That there exists evidence of prejudice or of bias on the part of a marker.

Students should make sure that they are aware of their programme requirements and modes of assessment, as appeals cannot be based on ignorance of assessment requirements or submission deadlines. Students should also make sure that any evidence of medical or other problems which might affect an assessment is submitted via the approved mechanism well in advance of the

assessment.

Students wishing to appeal should write to the Director of the Roffey Park Academy within 21 days of the publication of the results against which the appeal is being made, stating clearly their grounds for appeal. Appeal deadlines and timelines will be published for each module on the programme Moodle site.

Appeals will be considered by an Appeals Panel comprising the Programme Director and two members of academic full-time staff, at least one of whom is not associated with delivery of the Programme. All meetings of the Appeals Panel will be formally recorded. Decisions of the Appeals Panel shall be reached by a simple majority vote.

The Appeals Panel shall determine whether appeals are admissible, in terms of being:

- a. Received in time (or, if received out of time, whether exceptional circumstances exist which justify waiving the normal time-limit); and
- b. That the grounds of the appeal meet the criteria given above.

Where an appeal is determined to be admissible, it shall be considered by the Appeals Panel, in one of these ways:

- a. Where the appeal appears to be readily decidable in favour of the appellant on the basis of the evidence available, the Appeals Panel may reach a decision without the need for a hearing;
- b. Otherwise, the appeal will be examined at a hearing, at which the appellant shall have the right (though not the obligation) to attend, and the Appeals Panel shall be entitled to ask (but not require) them to attend, to provide further information.

An appellant who attends an Appeals Panel hearing shall be entitled to be accompanied by a person of his or her choice, who may represent him or her. If the appellant wishes to be so accompanied or represented, he or she shall inform the Programme Director at least one working day in advance of the time of the hearing and shall at that time also supply the name of that person.

After the Appeals Panel hearing has been presented with the evidence in the case, the appellant (and the person accompanying him or her) shall withdraw while the Panel considers its decision in private. The Appeals Panel will normally invite the appellant (and the person accompanying him or her) to return to hear its decision. However, the Appeals Panel reserves the right to defer immediate decision and instead to provide a later written decision. In such cases, the normal time-limit (for reaching a decision, formulating it in writing and dispatching it to the appellant) shall be seven working days unless otherwise specified by the Appeals Panel at the time of the hearing, in which case a specific reason for needing the additional time will be given to the appellant.

The Appeals Panel, whose decision shall be final, shall either:

- a. Arrange for the appellant and the relevant examination board to be informed that the appeal is not upheld, and that the decision of the board should not be altered; or
- b. Uphold the appeal and determine a remedy appropriate in the circumstances and inform the appellant and the exam board accordingly.

Students can appeal to the University of Sussex once they have exhausted Roffey Park's internal procedures, in the event that they feel the matter has not been satisfactorily resolved. Students should complete the [appeals form for decisions of a partner institution](#), available on the University

of Sussex website (<https://student.sussex.ac.uk/complaints/appeals/types-of-appeal#partner>), and submit this to the Appeals Officer of the University, within 21 days of the formal notification of the outcome of the appeal at Roffey Park, giving full details of the appeal and the action taken. The University will review whether the procedures in the partner institution have been correctly and fairly applied.

Appendix 1 – Grade Criteria

Class	Shorter Written Assessments (Essays, Reports, Literature Review) (up to 5000 words)	Dissertation	Grade
Distinction	An outstanding answer, well written, logical and critical. Shows originality, flair and a full understanding of the subject. Where appropriate there is strong evidence of the use of a very wide range of sources, going beyond information provided e.g. in reading lists	Outstanding dissertation, showing initiative, originality, independence and thoughtfulness in analysis and interpretation of results. Outstanding design and execution of original research. Clearly and coherently expressed. There is evidence of a very wide range of appropriate sources.	100 92 88 82
	An excellent, full account, showing appreciation of all the main points, well written, critical and logical. Where appropriate there is strong evidence of the use of a wide range of sources, going beyond information provided (e.g., in reading lists)	Excellent dissertation, showing evidence of initiative, originality, independence and thoughtfulness as feasible in the design, execution, and reporting of the work. Precisely designed and executed research. Where appropriate there is evidence of the use of a wide range of sources.	78 75 72
Merit	Comprehensive answer, clear, logical and accurate. Well structured, showing a sound grasp of the subject, and ability to think about it effectively	Well-executed dissertation written up with clarity. Evidence of care and application in design, execution and reporting. Research well designed and executed though with limitations in terms of data-collection, methodology or interpretation.	68 65 62
Pass	Satisfactory answer, with few substantive errors and omissions, but limited in scope and argument. Adequately structured. May be a good answer to a closely related but simpler question.	Adequately organised and competent dissertation, but only a basic understanding of the point of the study. The dissertation may indicate a lack of attention to detail and other problems. Research design competent, but basic in terms of execution and/or results.	58 55 52
Marginal Fail	An answer with some basic merit, but with many errors and omissions, or sparse and irrelevant information. Poorly structured, with little detail. May be an acceptable answer to a related question.	Dissertation conforms to basic format but is poorly presented and/or expressed. Little attention to detail or design issues. Data inappropriate and/or poorly analysed. Research unoriginal and/or flawed in execution.	48 45 42
Fail	May contain some material relevant to parts of the question but with substantial errors, omissions and irrelevancies. Little or no detail. Lacking clarity of expression. Incoherent argument.	The dissertation contains some data but it is otherwise brief and perfunctory. There are some basic elements of research design, but key aspects are incomplete or badly executed. Poor use of literature. Based on assumptions or opinions rather than evidence	38 35 32
	Inadequate or completely wrong answer. No more information than you would expect from a lay person, or full of misconceptions, errors and irrelevancies	No dissertation, no evidence of data collection or seriously flawed in conception, execution and presentation. Little or no evidence of being able to apply relevant knowledge of research methodology.	20 10 0

Class	Presentations (Individual and Group)	Grade
Distinction	Outstanding presentation that shows originality in exposition as well as clarity, accuracy and thoroughness. There will be significant evidence of critical insight. Substantial effort will have been made to stimulate discussion. Sophisticated analysis will have been applied to the arguments and empirical evidence presented. Materials will be clear, stimulating and well-organised. The presentation will be well structured, skillfully delivered.	100 92 88 82
	Excellent presentation that shows originality in exposition as well as clarity, accuracy and thoroughness. Effort will have been made to stimulate discussion. There will have been appropriate analysis of the arguments and empirical evidence presented. The presentation itself will be clear, organised, and delivered effectively.	78 75 72
Merit	Presentation has appropriate content and a logical structure. There is a clear and focused exposition of the chosen material, with no major errors or omissions. Presentation is delivered clearly. Analysis of key conceptual and empirical issues will be evident; evidence will be used to support or illustrate theoretical points and interpretations. Some attempt will be made at promoting discussion (for example by making use of pre-prepared discussion points).	68 65 62
Pass	Presentation provides an adequate, if perhaps unsophisticated, answer; it is likely to be limited in scope and argument. It may suffer from omission of key material and/or sub-optimal structure. Source material may be appropriate, but it is unlikely to be organized conceptually. Presentation lacks attempts at original analysis. Exposition is likely to lack clarity and focus and may reflect lack of understanding of complex arguments or evidence. Irrelevant material may be included.	58 55 52
Marginal Fail	Presentation is basic in terms of topic coverage, sources used, and understanding demonstrated. It is likely to be under-researched and inadequately prepared. Misunderstandings, omissions or errors combine with poor structure and lack of clarity. Delivery poor, reflecting lack of preparation or confusion, either due to lack of understanding or failure in communication.	48 45 42
Fail	Presentation lacks a clear definition of the topic area and demonstrate little understanding. It is poorly structured and delivered, with substantial omissions, errors, and irrelevancies. Materials, if present, will lack clarity.	38 35 32
	Presentation is very weak in all areas and demonstrates little or no understanding of the topic.	20 10 0