

## **SEN12D004**

**Title:** Learning and Teaching Committee  
**Date:** 26 October 2011  
**Circulation:** The Senate – 7 November 2012  
**Agenda:** SEN12A001  
**Version:** Final  
**Status:** Open

---

### **Issue**

A number of recommendations made to LTC on 29 June 2011 in relation to partnership activities which require retrospective approval from Senate using Chair's action.

### **Recommendation**

Senate is asked to approve the following recommendations set out in report to LTC reference LTC10D107:

- 1) UCS Otley be reapproved as a partner institution of the University of East Anglia and the University of Essex for a period of five years commencing September 2011, subject to the conditions in the institutional review report being met by agreed deadlines.
- 2) UCS Ipswich be approved for the delivery of postgraduate research degrees for a period of five years commencing September 2011, subject to any conditions contained within the approval report being met by agreed deadlines.  
The recipients can be asked to decide to note, receive, endorse, consider, advise or recommend or oppose. It should be clear from this paragraph precisely what the recipients are being asked to do.
- 3) Course validations, re-validations and course closures as set out in the report.

### **Resource Implications**

None

### **Risk Implications**

Low

### **Equality and Diversity**

Equality and Diversity issues have been carried out and taken into account appropriately.

### **Timing of decisions**

The decision to approve these recommendations is required by Senate on 7 November 2012 by retrospective Chair's action.

**Further Information**

Ms Hannah Coman, Partnerships Manager, e-mail: [h.coman@uea.ac.uk](mailto:h.coman@uea.ac.uk), tel: (01603) 591603

**Background**

As set out in the attached report.

**Discussion**

No discussion needed as issues set out in the report.

**Attachments**

Report to LTC reference LTC 10D107

**University of East Anglia and University of Essex**

**UNIVERSITY CAMPUS SUFFOLK JOINT ACADEMIC COMMITTEE**

**REPORT TO UNIVERSITY OF EAST ANGLIA LEARNING AND TEACHING  
COMMITTEE (JUNE 2011) AND UNIVERSITY OF ESSEX SENATE (JUNE 2011)**

**Report from the meeting of the University Campus Suffolk Joint Academic Committee  
held on 9 June 2011.**

**ITEMS FOR DECISION**

**1 PROPOSAL FOR THE INTRODUCTION OF POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH  
DEGREES AT UCS IPSWICH**

Reported An event was scheduled to take place on 23 June 2011 to consider the approval of UCS Ipswich to offer postgraduate research degree programmes with effect from September 2011.

**Recommended to the Senates of both Universities**

that, pending a successful outcome to the approval event (as set out in Appendix A to follow), UCS Ipswich be approved for the delivery of postgraduate research degrees for a period of five years commencing September 2011, subject to any conditions contained within the approval report being met by agreed deadlines.

**2 INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW OF UCS OTLEY**

**Recommended to the Senates of both Universities**

that UCS Otley be reapproved as a partner institution of the University of East Anglia and the University of Essex for a period of five years commencing September 2011, subject to the conditions in the institutional review report being met by agreed deadlines.

**3 VALIDATION OF NEW COURSES**

**Recommended to the Senates of both Universities**

that the following courses be approved for a period of five years commencing September 2011:

*UCS Bury St Edmunds*

- DipHE / BA / BA (Hons) English and Psychology
- DipHE / BA / BA (Hons) English and Sociology
- DipHE / BA / BA (Hons) History and Psychology
- DipHE / BA / BA (Hons) History and Sociology
- DipHE / BA / BA (Hons) Business Management and Psychology

*UCS Great Yarmouth*

- BA (Hons) Arts Practice (level 6 progression route)

*UCS Ipswich*

- CertHE / DipHE / BSc (Hons) Bioscience
- PGCert / PGDip / MA Childhood and Youth Studies
- BSc Applied Radiation Sciences in Healthcare
- PGCert / PGDip / MA Learning and Teaching
- PGCert Higher Education Practice
- PGCert / PGDip / MA Marketing
- PGCert / PGDip / MSc Regenerative Medicine
- PGCert / PGDip / MSc Science of Healthy Ageing

*UCS Lowestoft*

- BEng (Hons) Operations Engineering (level 6 progression route)

#### **4 REVALIDATION OF EXISTING COURSES**

##### **Recommended to the Senates of both Universities**

that the following courses be reapproved for a period of five years commencing September 2011:

*UCS Bury St Edmunds*

- DipHE / BA / BA (Hons) English and History
- CertHE / FdSc Electrical Engineering
- CertHE / FdSc Electronic Engineering
- CertHE / FdSc Mechanical Engineering
- FdA Hospitality and Event Management (formerly FdA Management of Hospitality and Events)
- DipHE / BSc / BSc (Hons) Psychology and Sociology

*UCS Great Yarmouth*

- CertHE / FdSc Electronic Engineering
- CertHE / FdSc Mechanical Engineering
- FdA Hospitality and Event Management (formerly CertHE / FdA Event Management (Hospitality); CertHE / FdA Event Management (Leisure); CertHE / FdA Event Management (Tourism))
- FdA Creative Music

*UCS Ipswich*

- DipHE / BA (Hons) Event Management
- DipHE / BA (Hons) Hospitality Management
- DipHE / BA (Hons) Leisure Management
- DipHE / BA (Hons) Tourism Management
- CertHE Event Management
- DipHE / BA (Hons) Event Management and Tourism Management
- DipHE / BA (Hons) Tourism Management and Hospitality Management
- DipHE / BA (Hons) Tourism Management and Leisure Management

- DipHE / BA (Hons) Event Management with Business Management
- DipHE / BA (Hons) Hospitality Management with Business Management
- DipHE / BA (Hons) Leisure Management with Business Management
- DipHE / BA (Hons) Tourism Management with Business Management
- DipHE / BSc / BSc (Hons) Criminology and Sociology
- DipHE / BSc / BSc (Hons) Psychology and Early Childhood Studies
- DipHE / BA / BA (Hons) Early Childhood Studies and Youth Studies
- DipHE / BSc / BSc (Hons) Psychology and Sociology
- DipHE / BSc / BSc (Hons) Criminology
- DipHE / BSc / BSc (Hons) Psychology and Criminology
- DipHE / BSc / BSc (Hons) Psychology and Youth Studies
- DipHE / BSc / BSc (Hons) Criminology and Youth Studies
- DipHE / BA / BA (Hons) Sociology and Youth Studies
- PGCert / PGDip / MA Clinical Effectiveness (formerly Clinical Practice)
- PGCert / PGDip / MA Leadership and Service Innovation (formerly Leadership and Innovation in Health and Social Care)
- BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography
- BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy and Oncology
- PGDip Human Resource Management (formerly Personnel Management)
- MA Human Resource Strategy
- DipHE / BA / BA (Hons) Photography

*UCS Lowestoft*

- CertHE / DipHE / BA / BA (Hons) Design (formerly Design (Design Crafts) and Design (Graphic and Typographic Design))

## 5 COURSE DISCONTINUATION

### Recommended to the Senates of both Universities

- i. that the following courses be discontinued with immediate effect:

*UCS Bury St Edmunds*

- FdSc Architectural Technology
- FdA Fine Art Practice

*UCS Great Yarmouth*

- CertHE / FdSc Electrical Engineering

- ii. that the following courses be discontinued with effect from September 2011:

*UCS Ipswich*

- CertHE Psychology and Sociology
- CertHE Criminology
- CertHE Psychology and Criminology

- CertHE Psychology and Youth Studies
- CertHE Criminology and Youth Studies
- CertHE Sociology and Youth Studies

iii. that the following course be discontinued with effect from September 2013:

*UCS Ipswich*

- DipHE / BA / BA (Hons) Graphic Design (Motion Graphics)

## **ITEMS FOR INFORMATION**

### **1 QAA INTEGRATED QUALITY AND ENHANCEMENT REVIEW**

- |          |   |
|----------|---|
| Reported | A summary of the outcomes of the IQER developmental engagement process, focussed on the theme of assessment, from each UCS Learning Network Centre. All centres concluded that the process had been positive and had helped to highlight much good practice as well as areas where the management of HE provision across the network could be improved. |
| Noted    | The summative review stage of the IQER process would continue to be centre-specific, with no consolidated report published for UCS as a whole.  |

Dr Kay Thompson  
 Secretary to the UCS Joint Academic Committee  
 June 2011

•

**REPORT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL APPROVAL OF UCS IPSWICH  
FOR THE DELIVERY OF POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH DEGREE  
PROGRAMMES**

**23 June 2011**

**1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND**

- 1.1** A central element of the UCS Strategic Plan (2010-2015), approved by the UCS Board, is to promote national and international research that informs teaching activity. In order to achieve this and other strategic objectives, University Campus Suffolk has formally proposed to the validating universities, via the UCS Joint Academic Committee, that it wishes to seek approval for the delivery of research degree programmes at UCS Ipswich from the start of the 2011/12 academic year. This will enable a small but growing number of experienced and research-active senior academic staff at UCS to act as primary supervisors for research degree programmes, to complement the facility that currently exists for less experienced staff to join supervisory teams at the two validating universities.
- 1.2** The approval event has been conducted in accordance with the approval process jointly developed by the validating universities, taking into consideration the guidance within the QAA Code of Practice and existing arrangements for the management of research degree programmes at both universities. Although the approval process is being conducted jointly by the University of East Anglia (UEA) and University of Essex (Essex) to reflect the unique nature of UCS, it is the intention that research degree students at UCS will be registered as students of either UEA or Essex, depending on subject expertise, with primary supervision taking place in Ipswich and a second supervisor appointed at the relevant validating university. Unlike other students at UCS who receive a joint award of UEA and Essex, research degree students will receive a single award of the relevant validating university.
- 1.3** UCS has identified the following seven areas where they feel they have the capacity to undertake primary supervision of research degree students. It is envisaged that other areas will be added as UCS develops appropriate expertise.
- Regenerative Medicine
  - Biomedical Science
  - Health Services Research
  - Social Science
  - Management
  - Business
  - Leadership and Enterprise
- 1.4** The panel met with representatives from the UCS Graduate School, related administrative support services and a range of staff nominated as first and second supervisors, as listed in the appendix below. A tour of facilities and resources was also provided, including the library, the Learning Development Centre, open access IT facilities, the Graduate School and teaching, research and clinical laboratories.
- 1.5** The panel focused on the academic and quality assurance aspects of the proposal, while recognising that there were broader issues relating to the strategic, financial and

legal aspects which were in the process of being finalised outside the Senate-led institutional approval process.

## 2 SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS

### UCS strategic objectives

- 2.1 The panel recognised that the development of research-led teaching was a key strategic objective for UCS. This was reflected in the growth in the number of staff appointed with established research backgrounds, including the UCS Provost who had experience of building up the research profile of another higher education institution in his previous role. UCS staff reported that they were keen to draw upon the research expertise of the two validating universities and to work collaboratively with UEA and Essex in terms of funding bids and contributions to the Research Excellence Framework.
- 2.2 Establishing research degree provision within UCS was regarded as a mechanism to inspire undergraduate and taught postgraduate students, as well as stimulating staff interest in research and scholarly activity. The potential to involve PhD students directly in teaching and learning at UCS was recognised, although the panel noted this was not covered in the documentation (for example in terms of the training of graduate teaching assistants). The panel also recognised that it was important for staff recruitment purposes to be able to attract high calibre academics to UCS, who would expect to be able to supervise students at this level. The ambition and focus of UCS in terms of driving forward the research agenda was commended by the panel.

*Commendation: The ambition and focus of UCS in terms of driving forward the research agenda.*

### Research environment and management of the student experience

- 2.3 The panel noted the intention for steady growth in postgraduate research student numbers, with five to ten students expected to enrol initially, building to approximately thirty students by 2013/14. Ensuring a critical mass of research degree students in order to provide a stimulating intellectual environment and a high quality student experience was a key concern of the panel. With such small student numbers, ensuring that students were not left feeling isolated would be crucial.
- 2.4 The panel were informed of a variety of mechanisms that would be adopted by UCS to embed research degree students into the UCS school structure and the life of the Graduate School. The research culture within UCS had been growing over recent years, stimulated by new staff appointments. Events were regularly held to promote research and scholarly activity, including an annual research colloquium, a postgraduate student colloquium and active school seminar programmes. UCS was increasingly being approached by outside agencies to work on research projects, which was helping to embed the research culture within the wider community.
- 2.5 Within the School of Science, Technology and Health, staff were aligned to research interest groups and research links had been established with local clinicians. Members of staff within the School formed part of the East Anglian Musculoskeletal Collaboration in conjunction with UEA and the University of Cambridge, and links were being established with the Essex Biomedical Sciences Institute. The School was beginning to attract international conferences, including a world summit on regenerative medicine in December 2011 and a conference on professions and

enterprise in November 2012. An international collaboration between Geron Corporation and the School's Biotechnology Unit had resulted in a £2 million project which currently employed eight full-time research scientists, including several at post-doctoral level. The panel noted that the majority of the six primary supervisors identified by UCS were undertaking research in the health, biomedical science and regenerative medicine area. The panel agreed that the School provided an appropriate environment for students wishing to undertake research in this area.

- 2.6** Within Business, Leadership and Enterprise, the Head of School reported that there were the beginnings of a research culture, with visiting speakers delivering monthly seminars alongside internal speakers. A number of visiting professorial appointments had recently been made, some of whom were already working with UCS on special projects and could potentially act as second supervisors and mentors for UCS supervisors. Where visiting professors were intended to be used in a supervisory capacity, the panel agreed that it would be important to ensure that appropriate contractual arrangements were in place. The panel noted that the Head of School, although very experienced in PhD supervision, was the only member of staff within the School identified as a primary supervisor. The panel felt that further reassurance was needed that an appropriate research environment would be provided for students and that contingency plans would be in place in the event of any unforeseen staff changes. There were similar concerns regarding other schools within UCS where the supervisory base was similarly confined to a small number of staff.

*Condition: UCS to provide further evidence to support the development of research degree programmes in other proposed subject areas (social science, management, business and leadership and enterprise), outlining strategies for creating an appropriate research culture and a depth of supervisory expertise in order to provide a stimulating and stable intellectual environment for students.*

- 2.7** The panel noted the intention for research degree students to be supported by a second supervisor at either UEA or Essex, in cases where there was relevant subject expertise within the validating universities. UCS staff noted that they would expect students to actively participate in research activities and seminars at the relevant validating university. The panel agreed that it would be important for students to be clear about what they could expect from UEA or Essex. Further discussions were required both within the validating universities and with UCS to ensure a shared understanding of the facilities, resources and support that would be available to UCS students, and associated mechanisms for cementing links between relevant academic and support departments.

*Condition: UEA and Essex to reflect further on the facilities, resources and support to be made available to UCS research degree students, in liaison with UCS Ipswich, in order to ensure that there is a shared understanding of what students can expect from each validating university.*

### **Part-time students**

- 2.8** Discussions with UCS staff highlighted that part-time students would form a significant part of the research student body. Although it was recognised that UCS had a strong track record in dealing with mature part-time students, the panel noted that within the wider HE sector supporting and encouraging the retention and timely completion of part-time doctoral students was very challenging. This could influence the performance of institutions in terms of reputation and position in relevant league tables. The issue of ensuring a critical mass of research degree students would also be more pronounced if a significant proportion of the student body was part-time and on

campus on a more irregular basis. The panel agreed that the documentation needed to be explicit about the anticipated profile of the student body, with the inclusion of a detailed plan for supporting part-time students in order to maximise levels of retention and completion, recognising and addressing the commonly observed pattern of low levels of completion in part-time research degree students. The plan should also cover contractual arrangements for part-time employer-funded students. Until this plan was approved, it was agreed that recruitment should be confined to full-time students.

*Condition: UCS to outline a strategy for managing and supporting part-time students to encourage satisfactory levels of retention and completion. This strategy should also cover contractual arrangements for part-time employer-funded students.*

### **Research skills training**

- 2.9** Mechanisms for providing research skills training and professional and career development were discussed. Careful consideration had been given to the development of a programme of training which would be offered internally within UCS, alongside provision on offer at UEA and Essex. It was noted that the programme had been mapped against the Researcher Development Framework. UCS was also actively involved in the regional Vitae group and was participating in discussions regarding the establishment of a regional GRADSchool. Dr Will Thomas, course leader for the UCS Graduate School Programme, would be tutoring on the GradSchool at Essex, reflecting the reciprocal nature of arrangements for supporting research students.
- 2.10** It was noted that at UEA and Essex, skills training was becoming more discipline-specific in response to student feedback. While this was not possible within UCS due to the anticipated size of the student body, it was recognised that in small groups it was possible to tailor sessions to meet different discipline needs. Training sessions were also open to taught postgraduate students and staff, which would help to ensure a critical mass.

### **Workload allocation and training for supervisors**

- 2.11** The panel discussed the time that would be allocated to primary and secondary supervisors at UCS in order to enable them to undertake their own research and support research degree students. Where staff were employed in senior management positions within UCS, the panel also questioned whether they would have sufficient time to provide appropriate levels of support to research degree students. This was not perceived to be a problem by UCS, for although there was not a single workload allocation model in operation, the UCS Provost was keen to ensure that appropriate allowances were made to enable relevant staff to fulfil supervisory roles and actively engage in research activity in order to meet UCS strategic objectives.
- 2.12** It was confirmed that relevant UCS staff would regularly attend training sessions for supervisors organised by both UEA and Essex, in order to keep up-to-date with the requirements of the validating universities.

### **Facilities and resources**

- 2.13** The panel were pleased to note the level of UCS investment in the initiative in terms of the creation of the relevant infrastructure, the establishment of a Graduate School with a physical presence in the James Hehir Building, the provision of scholarships and the creation of dedicated library space for research students. It was noted that in

addition to the library resources available within UCS, research degree students would have access to electronic resources at the relevant validating university in light of their dual-registration at UCS and UEA or Essex. In terms of library budgets, the Head of Learning Resources reported that funding was set aside for new projects (£30,000 during the current academic year) in order to ensure that appropriate resources were in place.

*Commendation: The significant investment in resources and infrastructure made by UCS to support the proposal to introduce postgraduate research degree programmes, and the quality of the documentation provided to the panel.*

### **Management of research degree provision**

**2.14** It was envisaged that the UCS Research Committee would play a key role in managing research degree provision at UCS, reporting via Academic Board to the UCS Joint Academic Committee and with representation at a senior level from both validating universities. The panel noted that the proposed committee had a broad remit at both strategic and operational level, and recognised that as student numbers expanded it would be prudent to revisit this model. The membership of the committee would also benefit from further reflection to ensure that it was pitched at an appropriate level in terms of the involvement of the validating universities.

**2.15** The panel agreed that it would be beneficial to identify opportunities for cross-membership of committees at UEA and Essex, to ensure that relevant staff at UCS were active participants in discussions affecting research degree students and were up-to-date with any regulatory changes.

*Condition: Further discussions to take place between UCS and the validating universities to ensure that:*

- a) reporting lines are clear, and membership and terms of reference of relevant committees are updated as necessary to reflect the introduction of research degree programmes*
- b) there is cross-representation of UCS staff on relevant UEA and Essex committees, to ensure that UCS staff are active participants in discussions affecting research degree students and up-to-date with any regulatory changes.*

### **Administration of research degrees**

**2.16** The panel noted that students would be operating under different structures and regulations, depending on whether they were registered as UEA or Essex students. It would be important to ensure that students were clear about these structures, with care taken to avoid any inequity of student experience. It was confirmed that UCS would be producing two student handbooks, one for Essex-registered students and one for UEA-registered students, in order to address this concern. The panel agreed that these should be approved by the relevant validating university prior to publication. It was recognised that induction and ongoing student support via the UCS Graduate School would also be key in ensuring that students were clear about arrangements for managing research degree programmes.

*Condition: UCS Ipswich to produce separate student handbooks for UEA and Essex registered students, in liaison with, and for approval by, the relevant validating university.*

- 2.17 The relationship between the UCS Graduate School and equivalent units at UEA and Essex was discussed, and it was agreed that regular and open communication was key to successfully managing operational arrangements. Further work was required to finalise arrangements for dealing with day-to-day operational issues in conjunction with each validating university. For example, further thought was required regarding procedures for dealing with complaints relating to supervisory arrangements or skills training provision, which would need to be dealt with at the validating university in order to align more closely with existing practice at UEA and Essex.

*Condition: Further discussions to take place between UCS and the validating universities to ensure that arrangements for the administration of research degrees are appropriate and comply with the relevant regulatory frameworks in operation at each university.*

*Condition: Further discussions to take place between UCS and the validating universities to ensure that clear and effective lines of communication are in place between the Graduate Schools (or equivalent) at each institution.*

### **3 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 3.1 The panel concluded that UCS Ipswich was of an appropriate standard to be approved at institutional level for the delivery of postgraduate research degree programmes for a period of five years commencing September 2011, subject to satisfactorily meeting the conditions noted below by 1 August 2011.
- 3.2 The panel were pleased to initially support the development of full-time research degree programmes in the areas of regenerative medicine, biomedical science and health services research.

#### **Conditions**

- 3.3 UCS to provide further evidence to support the development of research degree programmes in other proposed subject areas (social science, management, business and leadership and enterprise), outlining strategies for creating an appropriate research culture and a depth of supervisory expertise in order to provide a stimulating and stable intellectual environment for students.
- 3.4 In order to recruit part-time research degree students, UCS should outline a strategy for managing and supporting part-time students to encourage satisfactory levels of retention and completion. This strategy should also cover contractual arrangements for part-time employer-funded students.
- 3.5 UEA and Essex to reflect further on the facilities, resources and support to be made available to UCS research degree students, in liaison with UCS Ipswich, in order to ensure that there is a shared understanding of what students can expect from each validating university.
- 3.6 UCS Ipswich to produce separate student handbooks for UEA and Essex registered students, in liaison with, and for approval by, the relevant validating university.
- 3.7 Further discussions to take place between UCS and the validating universities to ensure that arrangements for the administration of research degrees are appropriate and comply with the relevant regulatory frameworks in operation at each university.
- 3.8 Further discussions to take place between UCS and the validating universities to ensure that:

- a) clear and effective lines of communication are in place between the Graduate Schools (or equivalent) at each institution
- b) reporting lines are clear, and membership and terms of reference of relevant committees are updated as necessary to reflect the introduction of research degree programmes
- c) there is cross-representation of UCS staff on relevant UEA and Essex committees, to ensure that UCS staff are active participants in discussions affecting research degree students and up-to-date with any regulatory changes.

### **Commendations**

- 3.9** The significant investment in resources and infrastructure made by UCS to support the proposal to introduce postgraduate research degree programmes, and the quality of the documentation provided to the panel.
- 3.10** The ambition and focus of UCS in terms of driving forward the research agenda.

## **APPENDIX**

### **Membership of the approval panel**

Dr Aulay Mackenzie, Dean of Academic Partnerships, University of Essex (*Chair*)

Wendy Clifton-Sprigg, Deputy Academic Registrar, University of Essex

Dr Pam Cox, Dean of the Graduate School, University of Essex

Christine Dobson, Director of the Office of Academic Development, University Campus Suffolk

Professor Richard Gray, Director of Postgraduate Research Programmes, University of East Anglia

Melanie Steele, Assistant Registrar, University of East Anglia

Erica Towner, Director of Partnerships, University of East Anglia

Professor Denis Wright, Dean of Students and Learning and Teaching, Imperial College London

Dr Kay Thompson, Academic Partnerships Manager, University of Essex (*Secretary*)

### **Members of UCS Ipswich staff involved in discussions with the panel**

Dr Emma Bond, Senior Lecturer, School of Applied Social Sciences

Dr Penny Cavenagh, Director of Research and Enterprise and Head of the Graduate School

Chrissie Harrington, Head of School of Arts and Humanities

Dr Erica Joslyn, Head of Division, School of Applied Social Sciences

Dr Mark Lyne, Head of Quality Enhancement

Jen Mackness, Academic Registrar and Director of Student Services

Dr Valerie Mann, Lecturer, School of Science, Technology and Health

Professor Brendon Noble, Head of School of Science, Technology and Health

Steve Phillips, Head of Learning Resources

Dr Olivia Sagan, Research Associate, Office of Research and Enterprise

Professor Mike Saks, Provost

Dr Susan Smith, Research Administrator

Dr Catherine Theodosius, Lecturer, School of Science, Technology and Health

Dr Will Thomas, Course Leader, The Graduate School Programme

Professor David Weir, Head of School of Business, Leadership and Enterprise

## SEN12D004

**Title:** Learning and Teaching Committee  
**Date:** 30 October 2012  
**Circulation:** The Senate – 7 November 2012  
**Agenda:** SEN12A001  
**Version:** Final  
**Status:** Open

---

### Issue

Learning and Teaching Committee approved a new Academic Appeals and Complaints procedure at its meeting on 27 June 2012 for introduction in the academic year 2012/13. This procedure requires retrospective approval from Senate using Chair's action.

### Recommendation

LTC recommends that this policy is approved by Chair's action at the meeting of Senate on 7 November 2012.

### Resource Implications

None

### Risk Implications

Low

### Equality and Diversity

Equality and Diversity issues have been taken into account when the new policy was devised. There will be continued monitoring of Equality and Diversity issues when Stage one and Stage two appeals and complaints are received with a view to take follow up action if necessary.

### Further Information

Mr Jon Sharp, Acting Director of Teaching and Learning, ext: 7374, e-mail: [Jon.Sharp@uea.ac.uk](mailto:Jon.Sharp@uea.ac.uk).

### Background

The Academic Appeals and Complaints procedure was reviewed in 2011/12 by a Review Group comprising academic and administrative staff in line with best practice across the HE sector in the UK. The new procedure introduces the consideration of Academic Appeals and Complaints at Stage One by a Faculty Panel and moves away from the consideration of Stage One appeals and complaints by a single person, the Head of School. It is hoped that the establishment of panels will ensure both the consistency of decisions and that the principle of consistency can be embedded within our procedures. Stage Two appeals will continue to be considered by the Director of University Services and the Academic Director of Taught Programmes/Research Programmes as appropriate.

### Attachments

The final Academic Appeals and Complaints Procedure is attached.

# Academic Appeals & Complaints Procedure

(to apply to all Academic Appeals & Complaints relating to academic year 2012-13 onwards)

## 1. Purpose

- 1.1 The Academic Appeals Procedure is intended to allow the formal raising of concerns by UEA Students\* undertaking taught or research programmes regarding their academic results or circumstances relating to them. The Academic Complaints Procedure is intended to allow the formal raising of concerns by UEA students undertaking taught or research courses regarding academic matters not relating to academic results. We take students' concerns seriously at UEA and the Procedure is designed to enable their effective consideration and the enacting of timely remedies as appropriate. If a more appropriate route exists to consider the substantive concern, the student will be advised to engage with the relevant alternative procedure.
- 1.2 The Academic Appeals and Complaints Procedure is informed by the following core principles: Natural Justice, Ease of Use, Realistic Time Frames, Transparency, Consistency, The Treatment of Students as Adults, Recognition of Professional Body Requirements
- 1.3 The Academic Appeals and Complaints Procedure comprises three parts: an informal stage; a formal Stage One, in which the Faculty Appeals & Complaints Panel (FACP) considers the appeal, and a formal Stage Two, which a Student may follow if dissatisfied with the outcome of the Stage One appeal and if the submission meets the required conditions for consideration.
- 1.4 A Guidance document for staff and students detailing the processes associated with these regulations is available from Learning & Teaching Services

\* *Students studying at UEA, or registered with UEA and based at the John Innes Centre, Sainsbury Laboratory or Institute of Food Research. For students based at the John Innes Centre, Sainsbury Centre, Sainsbury Laboratory or Institute of Food Research, Stage One appeals and complaints are considered by the FACP applicable to the School of registration. Students on validated or accredited programmes at partner institutions wishing to submit an appeal or complaint should use the relevant procedures at their place of study.*

## 2. Commitments

- 2.1 Students who submit a case under this procedure will not be unfavourably treated for having done so. Any Student who believes that s/he has been less favourably treated as a result of submitting a case should immediately contact the relevant Director of University Services.
- 2.2 The University expects that Students will not engage in frivolous or malicious appeals or complaints. It should be noted that if an appeal or complaint is found to have been brought with mischievous or malicious intent this may provide grounds for disciplinary action against the student.
- 2.3 The University will operate in accordance with its Equal Opportunities Policy when applying the Appeals & Complaints Procedure.
- 2.4 Students should be aware that any information they supply will be treated with due discretion and on a 'need to know' basis
- 2.5 All personal information will be processed by the University in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998.
- 2.6 Training will be provided for all University staff involved in the processing of appeals and complaints.

### **3. First Steps to Try to Resolve Concerns**

*(Note: In this and the following sections, references to 'Board of Examiners' in relation to postgraduate research students normally means the internal and external examiner of the thesis appointed by the University. For other students, and for the taught elements of the professional doctorates (ClinPsyD, DSW and EdD) and the PhD with Integrated Studies, references to 'Board of Examiners' normally means those internal and external examiners appointed by the University in respect of taught provision.)*

- 3.1 Students are encouraged to seek an informal resolution of the matter about which they are concerned before beginning the formal Procedure. Informal explorations of possible ways in which a matter may be resolved will not prejudice the consideration of a later formal submission.
- 3.2 Marks allocated to work which has not been double-marked can be challenged by students either informally (via re-marking) or as part of an appeal. Work which has been double-marked cannot be challenged or the subject of an Appeal. Details of the procedure are available from the relevant University Service Offices. Under the Submission of Work for Assessment Policy the outcome should normally be available within a further 10 working days.
- 3.3 Students should make every attempt to submit their case concerning a provisional academic result (whether singly or double marked) before the Board of Examiners meets. This is in Students' best interests as an early

decision can then be made. Where the interval between the notification of an academic result and a meeting of the Board of Examiners is less than 10 working days, consideration of an appeal shall be postponed until after the relevant Board of Examiners has met. At this point, the formal academic appeals procedure shall be followed.

- 3.4 Should these steps not resolve the matter to the Student's satisfaction, the Student may submit an academic appeal or complaint under Stage One of the Procedure.

#### **4. The Nature of the Appeal/ Complaint**

- 4.1 Students may appeal any of the following:

- i) A degree result
- ii) Confirmed marks (i.e. following internal moderation)
- iii) Failure to be transferred to a PhD from an MPhil or to an EdD from an MEd
- iv) Required withdrawal from a course
- v) A verdict of plagiarism and/or collusion
- vi) A penalty applied in respect of plagiarism and/or collusion
- vii) A refusal to permit the late submission of work for assessment or to approve a delayed first sit

- 4.2 Only those decisions/ judgements/ outcomes detailed at 4.1 above can be cited as the object of an academic appeal and any appeal based on grounds not covered by 4.1 above shall be rejected without consideration by the FACP.

- 4.3 Academic complaints may address any aspect of a student's academic experience about which s/he is dissatisfied with the exception of those grounds detailed at 4.1 above

#### **5. Submitting a Stage One Academic Appeal or Complaint**

- 5.1 Students must submit a completed Stage One Academic Appeal Form or a completed Stage One Academic Complaint Form to their Hub. Forms can be downloaded at (<https://www.uea.ac.uk/learningandteaching/appeals>). Students should be guided by Section 4 (above) in selecting the appropriate form. Students should submit all relevant evidence with their form.

- 5.2 The relevant University Service may suspend the Stage One Academic Appeal or Complaint where appropriate, pending clarification by a Student that s/he has tried to resolve the matter s/he is concerned about informally before beginning the formal Procedure.

- 5.3 A Student who has been found guilty of plagiarism or collusion and wishes to appeal against the level and/ or subsequent penalty, may submit a Stage One academic appeal. A Stage Two academic appeal should be submitted if a Student wishes to appeal against the decision that s/he has plagiarised and/or colluded.

- 5.4 A Student may decide to withdraw an appeal or complaint at any time prior to its consideration by the FACP
- 5.5 The Head of School shall be notified of the substance of the Appeal or Complaint and may choose, within the limits of his/ her authority, to reverse the action or decision giving rise to the Appeal or Complaint in advance of the FACP meeting to consider the case. Where this occurs it shall be regarded as an informal resolution of the Appeal or Complaint subsequent to a confirmation by the student that they are now content that the Appeal or Complaint has been satisfactorily addressed.
- 5.6 Until such time as the Appeal or Complaint has been resolved the student should continue in accordance with such requirements as are placed upon them with regard to their situation as it stands at the point of submission. For example students appealing against a failing mark should continue to engage with any reassessment opportunities they are required to undertake.

## **6. Consideration of the Stage One Appeal or Complaint**

- 6.1 Stage One Appeals and Complaints that meet the grounds for consideration (see 4.i-4.iii above) shall be considered by a Faculty Appeals & Complaints Panel (FACP), which shall meet with a frequency that ensures that the time between submission and consideration by a panel does not exceed 20 working days for any case (normally this will require monthly meetings).
- 6.2 There shall be two panels in each Faculty, one being responsible for UG and PGT cases and the other being responsible for PGR cases. Each panel shall be chaired by a senior, well-trained member of academic staff in the Faculty concerned. The Panel shall comprise 3 members of academic staff from the Faculty in question, one member of staff from a Panel in another Faculty, plus the Chair and an experienced LTS/ PPE secretary/advisor. The Head of LTS/PPE will advise on procedural matters in relation to particularly complex cases.
- 6.3 The relevant University Service Office will provide the FACP with the documentation submitted by the Student under Stage One, a summary of the case and an indication as to whether the submission appears to meet one of the necessary objects in order for it to be considered.
- 6.4 The relevant University Service Office will, within 5 working days of receipt of the Appeal or Complaint, write to the student acknowledging receipt and informing the student of the date of the next meeting of the FACP at which their case will be considered. This letter will also inform the student of the date by which they should normally expect to be advised of the Panel's decision.

## **7. Timescales for Stage One**

7.1 The Student's submission including any supporting documentation must be received in the relevant Hub no later than 10 working days after:

- i) Appeals - the date on which the student was formally notified of the outcome against which they are appealing or, where informal resolution has been sought, the date of the last communication to the student regarding the outcome of the informal stage (This may include, inter alia, meetings, emails, and letters)
- ii) Complaints – the date on which the attempt to resolve matters informally was concluded. This date shall be the date of the last communication to the student regarding the outcome of the informal stage (This may include, inter alia, meetings, emails, and letters)

7.2 Appeals or complaints submitted after the deadline (see 7.1 above) with good reason for the delay may still be considered. The Student should contact the relevant University Service Office if s/he is unable to meet this deadline.

7.3 The decision by the relevant Director of University Services as to whether a late submission should be accepted shall be final and not subject to appeal.

7.4 Cases shall be considered by the next scheduled FACP, where a case is received by the relevant Service Hub not later than 5 working days prior to the FACP meeting. Cases received after that date will be deferred to the following FACP meeting to allow sufficient time for supporting documentation to be collated.

7.5 In normal circumstances the student shall be advised of the outcome of his/her Stage One Appeal or Complaint within 10 working days of the date of the FACP meeting. Where the complexity of the case prevents this the student shall be notified of the delay.

## **8. Actions and outcomes at Stage One**

8.1 A FACP will uphold appeals where any of the following are found:

- i) Correct procedure was not followed which undermined the validity of the academic result.
- ii) Prejudice and/or bias affected the academic result.
- iii) The Student's performance was adversely affected by extenuating circumstances not previously submitted (ONLY where late submission of extenuating circumstances has been approved by the ADTP).
- iv) Significant changes were made to a course without being properly communicated and/or were not properly taken into account.
- v) The teaching, supervision or research training provided was insufficient.

- vi) Extenuating circumstances were not fully and properly considered.
- vii) Natural Justice dictates that the appeal be upheld.
- viii) The learning support provided was unsatisfactory or inappropriate.

8.2 A FACP will uphold complaints where any of the following are found:

- i) Correct procedures were not followed.
- ii) The student experienced prejudice and/or bias.
- iii) Significant changes were made to a course without being properly communicated and/or were not properly taken into account.
- iv) The teaching, supervision or research training provided was insufficient.
- v) Natural Justice dictates that the complaint be upheld.
- vi) The learning support provided was unsatisfactory or inappropriate.

8.3 The possible remedies to an upheld complaint will, by the nature of complaints, be too individual to summarise here. They shall be determined by the FACP, will not involve any adjustment to academic outcomes (since academic outcomes must be addressed through the Appeals route) and where a concession would be needed to allow the proposed remedy to apply the Chair of the relevant FACP should seek advice from ADTP or ADRP as appropriate.

8.4 FACPs shall be able to agree compensatory payments to be made to students in relation to upheld complaints up to a limit of £500. If it is felt that such compensation would provide an insufficient remedy the Chair of the relevant FACP should seek advice from the ADTP or ADRP as appropriate who will exercise the powers they hold in relation to Stage Two cases in this regard.

8.5 The FACP shall have the power to institute the following actions in respect of upheld Appeals. The precise remedy determined by the FACP shall depend on the details of the case:

- i) Reconvene a Board of Examiners to reconsider the academic decision/outcome
- ii) Recommend to Senate that it instructs the original Examination Board to award a specified classification.
- iii) Instruct a new set of examiners to examine a thesis.
- iv) Permit the student to submit a revised thesis within a time period specified by the FACP.
- v) Permit the student a further upgrade attempt with a new transfer panel.
- vi) Require the correction of procedural irregularity.
- vii) Set aside a verdict and/ or penalty applied in relation to work alleged to have been plagiarised or in respect of which there is alleged collusion.
- viii) Require a Plagiarism Officer, not previously involved in the case, to investigate the case and determine the presence and level of any plagiarism and/ or collusion.
- ix) Grant retrospective approval of extension for late submitted work.

- x) Permit a student a further period of supervised study and to submit a revised thesis within a time period set by the FACP.
- xi) Retrospective granting of a delayed first sit.
- xii) Recommend a concessional remedy to be approved by ADTP or ADRP.

8.6 Where the outcome of an appeal requires the establishment of a reconvened Exam Board, the reconvened Board should have different internal members from the original Board. The Board should reconvene as soon as practical and the Secretary to the reconvened Board shall advise both the student and the Secretary of the FACP of the outcome.

8.7 In all cases the Secretary to the FACP shall write to advise the student of the outcome of the consideration of their case in accordance with 7.5 above.

8.8 The letter shall advise the student that a Stage Two Appeal or Complaint can only be submitted if the student believes that correct procedures were not followed at Stage One. The letter shall advise the student that, if they do not intend to pursue a Stage Two Appeal or Complaint on those grounds, the student may treat the Stage One outcome letter as a completion of procedures notification and, if they wish, exercise their entitlement to contact the Office of the Independent Adjudicator.

## **9. Submitting a Stage Two Academic Appeal or Complaint**

9.1 A Stage Two Appeal or Complaint can only be considered where the student claims that there was a procedural irregularity at Stage One or where the student is appealing against the decision to find them guilty of plagiarism and/ or collusion. The decision as to whether to consider a Stage Two Academic Appeal or Complaint will be made in the context of the principles set out at 1.2 above, with particular reference to the institution's commitment to apply Natural Justice.

9.2 A Student must submit a completed Stage Two Academic Appeal or Complaint Form (<https://www.uea.ac.uk/learningandteaching/appeals> ) along with any supporting documentation to the relevant Head of University Service..

9.3 A Student may decide to withdraw an appeal or complaint at any time prior to its consideration by the relevant DUS and ADTP/ADRP

9.4 Until such time as the Stage Two Appeal or Complaint has been resolved the student should continue in accordance with such requirements as are placed upon them with regard to their situation as it stands at the point of submission. For example students appealing against a failing mark should continue to engage with reassessment opportunities. In instances where a student has been withdrawn, s/he will retain this status until such time as the outcome of an Appeal or Complaint results in his/ her reinstatement

9.5 The relevant University Service Office will, within 5 working days of receipt of the Appeal or Complaint write to the student acknowledging receipt.

## **10. Consideration of the Stage Two Appeal or Complaint**

10.1 The relevant Director of University Services or their nominee will check that the appeal or complaint rests on a claim of procedural irregularity, or that it has been submitted in relation to a judgement of guilt in relation to plagiarism and/ or collusion. Where this is not the case the Stage Two submission will not be accepted for further detailed consideration and the student will be advised in writing that the submission does not meet the conditions necessary for consideration as a Stage Two Appeal or Complaint.

10.2 Where the Stage Two submission makes a claim of procedural irregularity at Stage One this will be investigated by the relevant Director of University Services or their nominee.

10.3 Where the Director of University Services is satisfied that there is evidence of procedural irregularity at Stage One the Student will be advised that his/her Stage Two Appeal or Complaint has been upheld.

10.4 Where the Director of University Services is not satisfied that there is evidence of procedural irregularity at Stage One, the case shall also be considered by either the ADTP/ADRP as appropriate.

## **11. Timescales for Stage Two**

11.1 The Student's submission including any supporting documentation must be received in the relevant Hub no later than 15 working days after the date on which the student was formally advised of the Stage One outcome.

11.2 Appeals and complaints submitted after this deadline with good reason for the delay may still be considered. The Student should contact the relevant University Service Office if s/he is unable to meet this deadline.

11.3 The decision by the relevant Director of University Services as to whether a later submission should be accepted shall be final and not subject to appeal.

11.4 In normal circumstances the student shall be advised of the outcome of their Stage Two Appeal or Complaint within 20 working days of the date of receipt by the relevant Service Office. Where the complexity of the case prevents this the student shall be notified of the delay.

## **12. Actions and Outcomes at Stage Two**

12.1 A Stage Two Appeal or Complaint shall be upheld where there is evidence that correct procedure was not followed at Stage One

12.2 Where a Stage Two Appeal or Complaint is upheld the case shall be referred to the next FACP for consideration in accordance with correct procedures and the case shall be treated in all regulatory respects as though it were at Stage One.

12.3 Where there is no evidence that correct procedure has not been followed the appeal or complaint shall be rejected and there shall be no further right of appeal or complaint within the University.

12.4 Where 12.3 applies a completion of procedures letter shall be sent to the student by the relevant Service Office advising the student of their entitlement to contact the Office of the Independent Adjudicator

## **APPENDIX A**

For the purposes of the *Academic Appeals Procedure* the following definitions shall apply:

**Academic Result:**

The result of the exercise by one or more duly authorised Teachers or Examiners of academic and/or professional expertise in determining the quality of a student's performance in any part of the assessment process for a degree or qualification of the University

**Formal notification:**

Communication by the University, its representatives and/ or staff through any of the following: delivery of a paper form notification in person or to designated mail collection points within the University or student address as held on SITS; electronically either via email or through 'E'Vision or any software package currently in use by the University for the purposes of communication with students.

**Grounds for Consideration:**

Where an appeal or complaint has been accepted as meeting the criteria that allow it to be considered by an FACP it is referred to as meeting the grounds for consideration

**Upheld:**

Where an appeal or complaint is described as having been upheld this means that the FACP (or the relevant DUS for Stage Two cases) has determined sufficient evidence exists that the necessary grounds have been met (eg That there is evidence of a bias or prejudice). It is important to note that upholding an appeal does not necessarily imply a particular final outcome for the student. For example, student may appeal a classification decision on the grounds of bias or prejudice. The FACP may find evidence of bias and prejudice and so uphold the appeal. The action prescribed by the FACP may be for the Board of Examiners to reconvene and the reconvened Board may still determine that, notwithstanding the outcome of the appeal, the degree classification itself remains appropriate.

**Procedural Irregularity:**

This term refers to circumstances where agreed processes have not been correctly applied, regulations not followed, or where other errors have been made by the University either in the actions that led up to the appeal or complaint, or in the consideration of the appeal or complaint. This might include cases where not all the available evidence has been weighed in the consideration of an appeal or complaint or where factual data has been misinterpreted.

**SEN12D004**

**Title:** Approval of new award title for UCS  
**Author:** Sally Walker, Head of Partnerships, Partnerships Office  
**Date:** 30 October 2012  
**Circulation:** The Senate – 7 November 2012  
**Agenda:** SEN12A001  
**Version:** Final  
**Status:** Open

---

**Issue**

At its meeting of 26 June 2001, Senate approved the recommendation of the award of Foundation Degree in Arts (FDA) and Foundation Degree in Science (FDSc). UCS have now requested that the award of a Foundation Degree in Engineering (FDEng) be approved by UEA (Essex already approve the award). Learning and Teaching Committee on 25 July 2012 recommended that this new award title of the Foundation Degree in Engineering be approved by Senate.

**Recommendation**

Senate is invited to approve the recommendation of the Learning and Teaching Committee of the new award title of Foundation Degree in Engineering.

**Resource Implications**

None identified.

**Equality and Diversity**

Not applicable.

**Further Information**

Sally Walker  
Head of Partnerships  
sally.walker@uea.ac.uk  
01603 592205