

## Quality Assurance and Assessment Regulations

---

- 1 Guiding Principles**
- 1.1 The Programme Committee has devolved responsibly from The College of Legal Practice's Board for overseeing and maintaining all academic standards and quality control matters.
  - 1.2 The Programme Committee is responsible for all matters concerning curriculum development and delivery, including policy-making on eligibility, enrolment, progress, assessment and completion of award courses.
  - 1.3 The Programme Committee devolves responsibility for overseeing the assessment of students to the Module Panel(s) and the making of final awards to the Progression and Awards Panel.
  - 1.4 All programmes are identified against the QAA's Framework for Higher Education Qualifications Level.

Academic Level	Description
6	Level 6 modules and awards represent exit level standard for a Bachelor's degree with honours in that subject.
7	Level 7 modules and short courses represent exit level standard for a Master's degree in that subject.

- 2 Registration**
- 2.1 In order to be able to register as a student of The College of Legal Practice, an applicant needs to complete an Application Form. On receipt of the application form, the Student Services team will consider whether to make the applicant an offer. If an offer is made, the applicant will need to accept this offer and meet any conditions of the offer before being eligible to register as a student of the College.
  - 2.2 The applicant is responsible for ensuring that they produce all relevant documentation required by the College for the purpose of registration. If an applicant does not register within relevant deadlines, their registration on the programme will be cancelled or terminated as appropriate.
  - 2.3 In order to complete registration, an applicant must:
    - 2.3.1 complete the administrative process of registration;

- 2.3.2 make payment of fee or make acceptable arrangements to pay the fee;
  - 2.3.3 agree to comply with the Student Contract; and
  - 2.3.4 register on the appropriate modules for their programme of study.
- 2.4 Registered students retain their registration status until they achieve the award, withdraw or have their registration terminated by the Progression and Awards Board. The College also reserves the right to terminate the registration of a student who has exceeded the maximum period of study of four years.
- 

### **3 Programmes of Study and Awards**

- 3.1 The College offers programmes of study leading to the following awards:
- 3.1.1 Postgraduate Graduate Foundation in Law at Level 6 of the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications leading to an award of postgraduate credit.
  - 3.1.2 Postgraduate awards at Level 7 of the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications:
    - 3.1.2.1 Postgraduate Certificate (PGCert)
    - 3.1.2.2 Postgraduate Diploma (PGDip)
    - 3.1.2.3 LLM
- 3.2 The Level 7 programmes of study are awarded following the accumulation of a certain amount of academic credits. Specifically:
- 3.2.1 A maximum of 20 credits at level 6 and a minimum of 40 credits at level 7 is required for a PGCert (60 credits).
  - 3.2.2 A maximum of 30 credits at level 6 and a minimum of 90 credits at level 7 is required for a PGDip (120 credits).
  - 3.2.3 A maximum of 30 credits at level 6 and a minimum of 150 credits at level 7 are required for an LLM (180 credits).
- 

### **4 Modules and Academic Credit**

- 4.1 All programmes of study are made up by academic credits. Credit is awarded to a learner in recognition of the verified achievement of designated learning outcomes at a specified level. The credit value assigned to the module represents an estimate of the amount of work, including teaching contact, practical work, independent study
-

and assessment, typically required in order to complete the module. Each credit represents a minimum of 10 hours' work.

- 4.2 The College offers modules at a standard size of 10 or 20 credits and, where appropriate, larger modules in multiples of 10 credits. A module is a self-contained area of study with defined intended learning outcomes, syllabus, and assessment(s), which measure knowledge and skill. When a group of these modules are taken together in an approved curriculum, they form a programme of study. The Programme Leader has overall responsibility for the management of that particular programme.
  - 4.3 The academic standard of each module, including the standard of its assessment, is defined by reference to the Level 6 or Level 7 Grading Criteria which are approved for this purpose by the College.
- 

## **5 Module Assessment**

- 5.1 The preparation of each element of assessment is the responsibility of the named Module Leader. Once drafted, all assessments and the relevant Marking Scheme will be internally scrutinised and then sent to the External Examiner for approval. The purpose of these reviews is to ensure that learning outcomes are sufficiently addressed, that the total assessment load is satisfactory and that there are no factual or typographical errors within the assessment. An assessment must normally have the agreement of both the internal reviewer and the external examiner before being released to students.
  - 5.2 Students are normally expected to submit all work for assessment at the first scheduled opportunity after registering for a given module. All work must be submitted in English and all work submitted for assessment in whatever form will remain the property of the College.
  - 5.3 Where an element of assessment is by examination, students must adhere to the rules for examinations. Examinations scripts will not be returned to students.
  - 5.4 Wherever possible, work submitted by a student in furtherance of their programme of study will be marked anonymously. There are some situations where it is not feasible to mark work anonymously (such as oral presentation) and the College will advise students where this is the case. Work will be marked against the standard Grading Criteria and the specific Marking Scheme relevant to that element of assessment.
  - 5.5 In order to provide assurance of the quality of marking and feedback, internal moderation of the assessed work will take place once the first marking is completed. The size of the sample will vary according to
-

the number of students. A guide is that the sample should include 10% of assessments or 10 pieces of assessed work (whichever is lower) across the whole range of marks on a module..

- 5.6 Where delivery of the module involves more than one member of staff, the function of the moderation process incorporates the need to ensure that marking is consistent and fair across all markers. To achieve this, a sample from each marker will be taken, and moderated to ensure such fairness and consistency. Internal moderation will also ensure adherence to the marking guidelines and their fitness to be used as an element of feedback for students.
  - 5.7 The process of internal moderation involves checking that the marks have been awarded fairly and consistently and in accordance with the grading criteria/marketing scheme. The process also provides the opportunity to reflect on and refine assessment and feedback practices. Moderation must take account of the marks awarded to the full set of assessed work for the task, module or programme, in the context of the academic standards for the award. It is not the purpose of moderation to 'second' or 'third' mark student scripts, and therefore no individual student will have their mark changed as a result of moderation.
  - 5.8 The outcome of the moderation process will be one (or more) of the following:
    - 5.8.1 That all the marking is fair and consistent and requires no change to either the marks or the feedback provided to students;
    - 5.8.2 That the marking is consistent but too harsh or too generous, requiring all relevant marks to be adjusted up or down following consultation with the relevant marker(s);
    - 5.8.3 That there are significant inconsistencies in marking necessitating a re-mark of all work by the original marker, following consultation with relevant markers;
    - 5.8.4 That the quality or consistency of feedback provided requires enhancement.
  - 5.9 The Module Leader is responsible for ensuring that internal moderation has taken place. Once moderation is concluded the Module Leader should advise the External Examiner that work is ready for their review and should be provided to them. Students are able to be provided with the provisional mark achieved for an individual assessment following completion of the internal moderation process.
-

The mark is provisional based on the agreement of the External Examiner and ratification by the relevant Assessment Panel.

- 5.10 Students will normally receive their provisional mark within four calendar weeks following the date of submission.
- 5.11 An External Examiner will normally review the same sample of scripts used for the internal moderation. That said, an External Examiner has the right to review all relevant assessments. Following review of the marked and internally moderated work, the External Examiner will be asked to confirm if they are satisfied with the standard of marking of student work and that the standards are comparable to that which is required in comparable providers of the same or similar courses. If they are not satisfied, the procedures laid out in para. 8.6 of these Regulations will apply.
- 5.12 It is the responsibility of the Module Panel to ratify the overall outcome and percentage mark for each student studying on a module. This mark will be recorded for each module as follows:
  - 5.12.1 For each Graduate Foundation in Law subject area:
    - 5.12.1.1 a pass, where the student has achieved a mark of 40% or above; or
    - 5.12.1.2 a fail, where the student has achieved a mark of less than 40%; or
    - 5.12.1.3 a fail, where the student has not attempted the summative assessment(s) and where Exceptional Circumstances to defer assessment have not been approved;
    - 5.12.1.4 Introduction to Law is marked on a pass/fail basis and therefore no percentage mark will be recorded.
  - 5.12.2 For all other modules at Level 6 and Level 7:
    - 5.12.2.1 a pass, where the student has achieved an overall mark of 50% or above; or
    - 5.12.2.2 a fail, where the student has achieved an overall mark of less than 50%; or
    - 5.12.2.3 a fail, where the student has not attempted the summative assessment(s) and where Exceptional Circumstances to defer assessment have not been approved;
  - 5.12.3 Where a student's assessment profile for a module includes both first and second sits, the Assessment Panel shall

disregard the second sit marks for the purpose of determining a module grade, if:

5.12.3.1 The student has approved exceptional circumstances for the module to defer an element of module assessment, and;

5.12.3.2 On completion of the deferred sits, the student's profile indicates a pass based on the first sit marks.

5.13 See Appendix 1 for the interpretation which is given to individual module performance, considered by the Assessment Panels.

5.14 Unless an exceptional circumstance has been approved (see section 6), there will be a penalty on coursework which is submitted after the deadline, or after the revised deadline in the case of a student who has been granted an extension:

5.14.1 Where the student submits work up to seven calendar days after the deadline the percentage mark for the component of assessment will be capped at 40% for the Graduate Foundation in Law subject area.

5.14.2 For any other module at Level 6 or 7, where the student submits work up to seven calendar days after the deadline the percentage mark for the component of assessment will be capped at 50%.

5.14.3 For all modules at Level 6 and 7, including the Graduate Foundation in Law, where the student submits work more than seven calendar days after the deadline, the percentage mark for the component of assessment will be set to zero.

5.15 A student who has failed a module or subject area will be permitted one further opportunity, at the next scheduled assessment point as specified by the Academic Team, to attempt the failed component(s) of the module or subject area assessment ('Resit Component').

5.16 A student who has failed a module or subject area at the resit opportunity shall be deemed to have irrevocably failed the module or subject area. Students are not permitted to repeat a module or subject area in its entirety and there will be no further opportunities to resit except where Exceptional Circumstances have been approved.

5.17 The percentage mark for a Resit Component will be recorded as follows:

---

- 5.17.1 capped at 40% for a Resit Component in the Graduate Foundation in Law;
  - 5.17.2 capped at 50% for Resit Components in all other modules (except for the Solicitors Legal Skills module); and
  - 5.17.3 without a cap for Resit Components in the Solicitors Legal Skills module.
- 5.18 For the purposes of recording a final mark, the mark for the Resit Component shall supersede the first attempt, even when this results in a lower overall mark for the module or subject area. Where a student does not submit or sit the Resit Component, the original mark shall stand and the student shall be deemed to have been offered all resit opportunities available under these regulations.
- 5.19 The individual percentage mark for a Resit Component of the Solicitors Legal Skills module will not be capped but the overall module mark will be capped at 50%.
- 5.20 Once a student has passed a module /subject area or resit component, there is no provision to undertake additional study and assessment towards that module/ subject area or resit component with a view to improving overall performance in that module / subject area or resit component.
- 5.21 It is the responsibility of the Progression and Awards Panel to recommend the conferment of credit for the Graduate Foundation in Law and the conferment of awards for award-bearing programmes; to make decisions on the continuation; and, where relevant, progression of a student based on the grades received from the Module Panel. For award-bearing programmes, the Progression and Awards Panel has the authority and discretion to condone failed modules and/or short courses, in light of the student's overall profile at the point at which an award is considered. Credits in condoned modules count towards the requirements for academic progression and awards in the same way as credits which are achieved in modules that have been passed and will be recorded in the classification algorithm as 50%.
- 5.22 When considering students for any award (except those awards requiring 60 credits or less) the Progression and Awards Panel may condone fail grades at Level 7 but is limited to a total of 30 credit points that have been failed.
-

---

## 6 Exceptional Circumstances

- 6.1 The College operates a “fit to sit” policy. As such, if you sit or submit an assessment you deem yourself to be sufficiently able to take the assessment. This means that you cannot later claim to have exceptional circumstances.
- 6.2 However, the College understands that sometimes circumstances may affect your studies, which in turn might prevent you from submitting your work on time or attending a summative assessment. Where a student wishes to apply for Exceptional Circumstances, applications should be made under the [Exceptional Circumstances Policy](#).

---

## 7 Accreditation of Prior Learning

- 7.1 The College recognises accreditation of both prior experiential learning and certificated learning towards the requirements of a programme of study at the College. For the avoidance of doubt, accreditation of prior learning does not apply to the Graduate Foundation in Law.
  - 7.2 A student who has previously studied at a university, or a similar institution, may apply to the College for recognition of their prior learning as academic credit to be used towards the requirements of a programme of study at the College. In order to qualify for consideration, this credit must:
    - 7.2.1 correspond to the subject and level studied to the programme the student is looking to study.
    - 7.2.2 be appropriately certified by the originating institution.
    - 7.2.3 not exceed 20 credits for a PGDip or 60 credits for an LLM.
  - 7.3 A student who achieved learning through experiences outside the formal education and training systems (normally associated with a working environment) may apply for Accreditation of Prior Experiential Learning.
  - 7.4 Accreditation of Prior Experiential Learning is different from formal learning as it is often unstructured and can be more personal and individualised. Where a student wishes to rely on Accreditation of Prior Experiential Learning, they will need to identify the learning which they are claiming to have achieved and prepare a portfolio of evidence of support. It is usual for this to involve some sort of reflective writing and supporting evidence.
  - 7.5 Where Accreditation of Experiential Learning is requested the decision about whether to accept this will be made by a subject specialist acting on delegated authority from the Programme
-



Committee. There may be a charge levied to the applicant for this and the amount will depend on the number of credits being claimed.

- 7.6 Where Accreditation of Prior Learning is accepted by the College the following principles will apply:
- 7.6.1 A student may not carry marks or grades awarded by another institution. Indeed, a student may only carry marks achieved under the College's own academic regulations.
  - 7.6.2 Accreditation of Prior Learning may not be used to gain an award in its entirety.
  - 7.6.3 Accreditation of Prior Learning must be shown on the student's final transcript including the level and credit points transferred.
  - 7.6.4 Credits transferred to the College will not be used in the calculation for honours or other differential level of award.
  - 7.6.5 Accreditation of Prior Learning will not be accepted for the awards of PGCert.
  - 7.6.6 Accreditation of Prior Learning will normally have been undertaken no more than five years before the proposed date of initial registration at the College.
  - 7.6.7 All Accreditation of Prior Learning must be noted by the Progression and Awards Panel.
- 

## **8 External Examiners**

- 8.1 External Examiners are appointed by the College to have oversight of the programme-specific assessment and ensure that it has been undertaken in a manner which is just to the individual student and that the standard of the College's awards is maintained. The Programme Committee is responsible for agreeing to the appointment of an External Examiner.
- 8.2 The role of the external examiner(s) is to provide an independent evaluation of the College's arrangements for assessing student work, to verify that academic and professional standards are set and maintained at appropriate levels, and to report systematically and objectively to the College's Programme Committee on their findings and experience (see 8.5).
- 8.3 External examiners will be:
- 8.3.1 of sufficient authority and expertise in the area(s) to be examined;
-

- 8.3.2 familiar with current standards and procedures of programmes at the same level in the UK and will have relevant experience of examining student work in accordance with the expectations of the QAA Quality Code; and
  - 8.3.3 free from any type of involvement with current staff, students or activities of the College within the previous five years that could reasonably lead to an allegation of bias, the appearance of bias or an allegation that they could have a personal interest in the outcomes of the assessment process.
- 8.4 Membership and attendance of External Examiners at Module Panels and Progression and Awards Panels is expected.
- 8.5 An External Examiner is to take a full part in the deliberation of the relevant Assessment Panel's discussion. An External Examiner is required to provide an annual report detailing how standards are assured and any areas for enhancement. The External Examiner will receive a written response to their report from a senior member of College staff.
- 8.6 The Programme Committee has devolved responsibility for academic standards. As such, where disagreements involving External Examiners arise and which mean an Assessment Panel is unable to agree a recommendation, it is for the Programme Committee to ensure that the matter is resolved.
- 8.7 Where disputes with or between External Examiners arise which cannot be resolved, the Programme Committee shall:
- 8.7.1 convene an ad hoc meeting of the Assessment Panel Disputes Committee. This committee shall be made up of one representative of the Programme Committee (who will chair the committee), one senior academic member of staff (who should have external examining experience) and the Chief Operations Director (who shall be responsible for clerking the meeting);
  - 8.7.2 advise all students affected that the decision of the Assessment Panel has been deferred and that an outcome will be received by a specified later date.
- 8.8 The Assessment Panel Disputes Committee has full power to investigate and take decisions on disputes. The outcome of this investigation will be given to the relevant Assessment Panel to action as appropriate to determine the matter. If the dispute cannot be
-

---

resolved, it will go back to the Assessment Panel Disputes Committee and then to the Programme Committee for a decision.

- 8.9 Where an External Examiner has a serious concern relating to systemic failings with the academic standards of a programme, they are free to write to the Chief Executive Officer. If this does not resolve the matter, the External Examiner may invoke QAA's concerns scheme: <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/reviewing-higher-education/how-to-make-a-complaint>

---

## 9 Academic Misconduct

- 9.1 Academic misconduct includes any action by a student which gives them (or has the potential to give them) an unfair advantage in an examination or assessment, or might assist someone else to gain an unfair advantage, or any activity likely to undermine the integrity of the assessment. An offence may occur in relation to any form or component of assessment.
- 9.2 Academic misconduct may include, but is not limited to:
- 9.2.1 Plagiarism - presenting someone else's work or ideas as the student's own without adequately identifying it and citing its source;
  - 9.2.2 Self-plagiarism - submitting the same work that the student has already submitted for another assessment when this is not permitted;
  - 9.2.3 Taking a copy of another student's work without their permission;
  - 9.2.4 Collusion - assisting another student, or being assisted by another person, in gaining an unfair advantage in an academic assessment;
  - 9.2.5 Contract cheating - contracting with another individual or body to receive or provide work in exchange for compensation of any kind, including payment (including use of essay mills or buying work online);
  - 9.2.6 Arranging for someone else to impersonate a student by sitting their examination;
  - 9.2.7 Cheating in examinations (or other formal assessment), including possession of unauthorised material or technology during an examination, and attempting to access unseen assessment materials in advance of an examination;
-

- 9.2.8 Submitting fraudulent mitigating circumstances claims or falsifying evidence in support of mitigating circumstances claims (this may also be considered a non-academic disciplinary matter);
- 9.3 Academic misconduct may be distinguished from poor academic practice, which is the result of inexperience or a lack of knowledge. The College considers this distinction to be one of academic judgement and a Module Leader may discuss the matter with a senior member of the College academic team. Students who are found to have demonstrated poor academic practice will generally be provided with appropriate support, advice and guidance.
- 9.4 Where it is deemed that there is sufficient evidence of academic misconduct the College will follow the process for Academic Misconduct.
- 9.5 Where the Module Leader is of the view that the allegation of academic misconduct is more serious than poor academic practice, they shall write to the relevant Programme Leader outlining the allegation and providing appropriate documentary evidence to support the allegation. On receipt of the notification from the Module Leader, the Programme Leader shall:
- 9.5.1 advise the student that an allegation of academic misconduct has been made against them and the underlying facts that have been provided to support the allegation;
  - 9.5.2 carry out a preliminary investigation which may include reviewing the evidence provided by the Module Leader and meeting with the student concerned.
- 9.6 On conclusion of the review, the Programme Leader shall present to the appropriate Assessment Panel a recommendation as to the course of action the Assessment Panel should take in relation to the assessment(s) concerned. The recommendations available to the Programme Leader include:
- 9.6.1 awarding a grade for an assessment based purely upon academic merit, taking into account the extent to which the work submitted represents evidence of the student having met the relevant learning outcomes, where the Panel is, in its academic judgment, able accurately to determine this; or
  - 9.6.2 reducing the grade awarded for an assessment, to reflect the extent to which the academic misconduct has, in their academic judgement, created doubt about the evidence
-

represented by the submitted work for the student having met the relevant learning outcomes; or

- 9.6.3 awarding a grade of 0 for an assessment, where the extent of the academic misconduct is, in their academic judgement, such as to make it unsafe to award any academic credit for the work.
  - 9.7 In addition to the sanctions above, the Programme Leader is also able to provide an informal warning to the student as to their future conduct and / or require a student to attend a mandatory training session to support them in better academic practice.
  - 9.8 This review and notification of the recommendation should be concluded and notified to the student within 15 working days.
  - 9.9 The student has a right to appeal against the decision of the relevant assessment panel in this regard through the Academic Appeals Procedure.
  - 9.10 Where the Programme Leader is of the view that the allegation of academic misconduct is particularly serious, a Programme Leader can refer the matter to a formal disciplinary hearing. In reaching this view, the Programme Leader may take into account any previous academic misconduct offences committed by the student or where the circumstances surrounding a single offence are considered to be so serious as to justify a student disciplinary panel hearing.
- 

## **10 Progression, Awards and Classification of Awards**

- 10.1 The Progression and Awards Panel has responsibility for determining progression on programmes and for determining the final award and classification on an award-bearing programme and the final classification and conferment of credit for the Graduate Foundation in Law. In order to qualify for an award of the College a student must satisfactorily complete the programme of study and any requirements that are set out in the individual regulations for the programme. For the purposes of these regulations, achievement of credit includes the accreditation of prior learning credits from outside the College and credits in modules with a condoned fail grade.
  - 10.2 Credit achieved through accreditation of prior learning cannot be included in classifying an award.
  - 10.3 All awards under these regulations will be conferred by the Awards and Progression Panel under authority delegated to it by the Programme Committee. The date of the award will be the date on
-

which it is conferred by the Progression and Awards Panel. This includes the award of credit for the Graduate Foundation in Law.

10.4 The credits a student must achieve for each award along with an explanation of the classification algorithm is detailed as follows:

10.4.1 A maximum of 20 credits at level 6 and a minimum of 40 credits at level 7 is required for a PGCert.

10.4.1.1 This award is not conferred with a classification.

10.4.2 A maximum of 30 credits at level 6 and a minimum of 90 credits at level 7 is required for a PGDip.

10.4.2.1 Subject to 10.2, Postgraduate Diplomas are classified on the basis of on the basis of 80 credits, using the marks achieved in the highest scoring modules, in proportion to the weight of credits that such modules bear to the overall award rounded to the nearest whole number.

10.4.2.2 If the 80-credit limit means that a higher scoring module would be excluded, then the credit limit can be exceeded to permit that higher scoring module to count towards the PGDip classification.

10.4.2.3 Postgraduate Diplomas are classified on the following scale from the average mark which has been reached using the relevant calculation set out above:

10.4.2.3.1 Distinction 70–100%

10.4.2.3.2 Commendation 60–69%

10.4.2.3.3 Pass 50–59%

10.4.2.4 Save as set out in 10.4.2.5, where a student achieves an overall percentage which is 1% below the boundary for the next classification, a student shall be awarded the higher classification if at least 60 credits are in the higher classification.

10.4.2.5 Where a student's classification is based on more than 80 credits, as set out in 10.4.2.2, the classification which is awarded to the student will be determined so as to give the best outcome for the student.

---

10.4.2.6 If a student receives a condoned fail then this shall be recorded as 50% for the purpose of this classification.

10.4.3 A maximum of 30 credits at level 6 and a minimum of 150 credits at level 7 for an LLM

10.4.3.1 Subject to 10.2, Master's Degrees are classified on the basis of 120 credits, using the marks achieved in the highest scoring modules, in proportion to the weight of credits that such modules bear to the overall award. rounded to the nearest whole number.

10.4.3.2 If the 120-credit limit means that a higher scoring module would be excluded, then the credit limit can be exceeded to permit that higher scoring module to count towards the Degree classification.

10.4.3.3 Master's Degrees are classified on the following scale from the average mark which has been reached using the relevant calculation:

10.4.3.3.1 Distinction 70–100%

10.4.3.3.2 Commendation 60–69%

10.4.3.3.3 Pass 50–59%

10.4.3.4 Save as set out in 10.4.3.5, where a student achieves an overall percentage which is 1% below the boundary for the next classification, a student shall be awarded the higher classification if at least 80 credits are in the higher classification.

10.4.3.5 Where a student's classification is based on more than 120 credits, as set out in 10.4.3.2, the classification which is awarded to the student will be determined so as to give the best outcome for the student.

10.4.3.6 If a student receives a condoned fail then this shall be recorded as 50% for the purpose of this classification.

10.5 For the Graduate Foundation in Law:

10.5.1 a student must achieve a pass in each subject area, by obtaining a mark of 40% or more for graded subject areas and a Pass in Introduction to Law.

---

- 10.5.2 classification is based on the average of the marks from each subject area (excluding the Introduction to Law), weighted according to the credit value of each subject area and rounded to the nearest whole number.
- 10.5.3 Where a student achieves an overall percentage which is 1% below the boundary for the next classification, a student shall be awarded the higher classification if the marks achieved for at least 4 subject areas are in the higher classification.
- 10.5.4 There are no step-off awards for the Graduate Foundation in Law and no opportunities for a student to be awarded less than 90 academic credits.
- 10.6 Where a student taking an individual module outside of an approved programme of study (i.e. LLM or GFL) achieves a percentage mark which is 1% below the boundary for the next classification (as set out in Appendix 1), a student shall be awarded the higher classification. If the student uses this credit towards an approved programme of study, the classification calculations in 10.4 and 10.5 shall apply.
- 10.7 There is no provision for a student, having qualified for an award, to undertake additional study and assessment towards that award.
- 10.8 In rare and exceptional circumstances, the Chair of the Progression and Awards Panel may recommend to the Programme Committee the revocation of any award which has been conferred by the College if it is discovered and proved to the satisfaction of the College that there was an administrative error in conferring the award or that information which was unavailable at the time the award was conferred which determines that the award should be revoked or that any details of the award should be altered. Following a recommendation by the Chair of the Progression and Awards Panel, the decision to revoke an award shall be taken by a full meeting of the Programme Committee. A student retains the right to appeal against this decision through the Academic Appeals Policy.
- 10.9 The Progression and Awards Panel has the ability to award a posthumous or an Aegrotat. An Aegrotat may be awarded if it is established that a student's absence, failure to submit work or poor performance in all or part of an award was due to illness or other cause found valid on production of acceptable evidence. In these circumstances, a Progression and Awards Panel may assess in whatever means it considers appropriate to determine a final award. This award will normally be at the highest academic level at which the student achieved credit but will not normally be awarded with a classification. Should a student wish to decline an Aegrotat award, it
-



---

shall be for the Programme Committee to determine whether the student has provided sufficient evidence to determine that they can be reassessed in the normal manner.

---

## **11 Variations to the Assessment Regulations**

- 11.1 Variations to the Academic Regulations will be agreed by the Programme Committee. Where a module or programme has started, the Academic Regulations at the start of the course will prevail, unless the changes are to the benefit of students generally or provided that the changes do not prejudice the students generally.
  - 11.2 Variations to these regulations will be made where in the opinion of the College they will assist in the proper delivery of education. Changes are usually made to update the rules and regulations to ensure that they are fit for purpose; to reflect changes in the external environment (such as legal, governmental or regulatory changes), to incorporate best practice from the sector, to incorporate feedback from students or to enhance the consistency of the approach taken.
  - 11.3 Assessment Regulations will be republished annually to reflect any variations made by the Programme Committee.
-

## Appendix 1 – Module Performance

See the table below for the interpretation, which is given to individual module performance, considered by the Module and Assessment Panels.

### Graduate Foundation in Law (overall)

<b>Numeric Grade</b>	<b>Grade Descriptor</b>	<b>(Indicative) Classification Descriptor</b>
70+	Excellent	First
60-69	Very Good	Upper Second
50-59	Good	Lower Second
40-49	Satisfactory	Third
30-39	Fail	Fail
0-29	Little or nothing of relevance	Fail

### All other Level 6 and 7 Modules

<b>Numeric Grade</b>	<b>Grade Descriptor</b>	<b>(Indicative) Classification Descriptor</b>
80+	Outstanding	Distinction
70-79	Excellent	
60-69	Good to Very Good	Commendation
50-59	Satisfactory to Good	Pass
40-49	Marginal Fail	Fail
30-39	Clear Fail	Fail
0-29	Little or nothing of relevance	Fail