



Summary of Changes to Academic Regulations & Policies for 2016/17

Contents

1. Taught Degree Regulations (approved by AB on 8 June 2016).....	2
1.i Naming of Exit Awards (2.3).....	2
1.ii Revocation of Exit Awards (2.3).....	2
1.iii UG Degree Requirements (5).....	2
1.iv Intercollegiate Modules (7.7).....	2
1.v Condoned Fails for UG Modules (11.16).....	2
1.vi PGT Classification (Appendix C).....	2
2. General & Admissions Regulations (approved by AB on 8 June 2016)	2
2.i. Revocation of Awards (4).....	2
3. Academic Misconduct Policy (5.1)	2
4. Marking Policy.....	3
5. Duties of Visiting Examiners.....	3
5.1 Clarification that Visiting Examiners cannot change individual marks as they normally only see a sample of the assignments.....	3
5.2 Heavier emphasis on the fact that Visiting Examiners should not be asked to serve as third markers, unless attempts to resolve a marking conflict have failed.....	3
5.3 The proportion of assignments to be seen by a Visiting Examiner has been adjusted to:	3
6. Online Submission.....	4

- 1. Taught Degree Regulations (approved by AB on 8 June 2016)**
 - 1.i Naming of Exit Awards (2.3)**
 - 1.i.a Clarification on the naming of exit awards has been provided, based on the conventions used for full awards.
 - 1.i.b Provision has also been included for students who do not meet the minimum requirements for a *named* award, but do have sufficient credit for an exit award.
 - 1.ii Revocation of Exit Awards (2.3)**
 - 1.ii.a Once students have been awarded a degree, they cannot then 'recycle' any of the credits that led to that award to 'top up' to another, higher, degree.
 - 1.ii.b Students who have obtained an exit award from SOAS but then want to return to their studies at SOAS at a later stage would therefore need to have their exit award rescinded in order to be able to get accreditation for certified prior learning.
 - 1.iii UG Degree Requirements (5)**
 - 1.iii.a SOAS is currently not compliant with QAA guidelines, which state that an UG Honours degree (BA/BSc) should normally be awarded for 360 credits (or more).
 - 1.iii.b SOAS should require 360 credits for an UG Honours degree (BA/BSc); it will then no longer be possible for students to drop a module and graduate with 330 credits as is currently the case.
 - 1.iii.c Additionally, the scope for accreditation of prior certified learning has been made explicit.
 - 1.iv Intercollegiate Modules (7.7)**
 - 1.iv.a Clarification on the role of intercollegiate modules in classification has been provided.
 - 1.v Condoned Fails for UG Modules (11.16)**
 - 1.v.a It is now standard practice across the HE sector to make use of condoned fails, in order to mitigate the requirement that 360 credits be completed (see above). This allows students who have narrowly failed a module to carry the credit for the module regardless and therefore graduate.
 - 1.vi PGT Classification (Appendix C)**
 - 1.vi.a The wording has been amended throughout to make the criteria for Pass, Merit and Distinction clearer.
 - 1.vi.b Additionally, information on the classification of two-year MAs has been expanded to show whether marks obtained abroad count for the classification or not.
- 2. General & Admissions Regulations (approved by AB on 8 June 2016)**
 - 2.i. Revocation of Awards (4)**
 - 2.i.a This section has been updated to align with new regulations concerning the revocation of exit awards (see above).
 - 2.i.b A further paragraph on rescission of awards due to unlawful or unfair conduct of a graduate has been added.
- 3. Academic Misconduct Policy (5.1)**
 - 3.1 Where a penalty applied in accordance with the current tariffs for academic misconduct results in the award of a 'fail' mark, that fail will be condonable in accordance with Regulation 11.16 unless the AMP specifically advises to the contrary.

4. Marking Policy

- 4.1 The chief aim of the policy is to allow departments to decrease the amount of double marking; this is in response to concerns raised by Visiting Examiners and to reflect sector-wide developments.
- 4.2 The differentiation between full and half modules and between written exams and other assessments has been abandoned.
- 4.3 The policy clarifies the processes for single marking, moderation by retrospective sampling, check marking, and double marking.
- 4.4 Check marking is being introduced as a new method to create an alternative to moderation by retrospective sampling and time-intensive full double marking. It might be particularly helpful on smaller modules that cannot generate a sample for moderation, or in departments that wish to retain a closer monitoring of the first marker than moderation would allow.
- 4.5 In line with practice across the sector, double marking will be retained for all modules that are assessed 100% by a single piece of coursework/project/exam – typically ISPs and dissertations.
- 4.6 Double marking should also take place for modules assessed by a single assessment worth 90%, with the remaining 10% of the mark coming from attendance/participation.
- 4.7 For the 10-89% bracket, flexibility has been introduced. Departments can adopt full check-marking **or** full moderation by retrospective sampling, **or** mix the two approaches should they be wary of a more comprehensive move to moderation, but consider check marking too time-intensive.
- 4.8 Departments must adopt **one** of the marking methods for **all** their modules (UG and PGT) and maintain this approach for the entire academic year. The method of choice should be confirmed at the last LTQC meeting of an academic year, for the following academic year.
- 4.9 Departments should inform students which marking method they will be using to assess submissions.

5. Duties of Visiting Examiners

- 5.1 Clarification that Visiting Examiners cannot change individual marks as they normally only see a sample of the assignments.
- 5.2 Heavier emphasis on the fact that Visiting Examiners should not be asked to serve as third markers, unless attempts to resolve a marking conflict have failed.
- 5.3 The proportion of assignments to be seen by a Visiting Examiner has been adjusted to:

(a)	First Class/Distinction	25% of submissions in this class/at least 5 submissions (if there are fewer than 5 submissions in this class, then all of them should be seen)
(b)	Fails	25% of submissions in this class/at least 5 submissions (if there are fewer than 5 submissions in this class, then all of them should be seen)
(c)	Borderlines (to be identified <u>before</u> penalties are applied)	25% of submissions in this class/at least 5 submissions (if there are fewer than 5 submissions in this class, then all of them should be seen)
(d)	A selection of scripts in addition to those in (a), (b) and (c)	25% of submissions in this class/at least 5 submissions (if there are fewer than 5 submissions in this class, then all of them should be seen)

6. Online Submission

- 6.1 All written work for summative assessment, including dissertations, must be submitted online, that is via TurnItIn on the BLE. No hardcopy submissions of written work, including dissertations, will be required of students. The practice of asking students to both upload a copy of their work online and submit one or more hardcopies (normally to a different deadline) will be discontinued.
- 6.2 If staff wish to mark hardcopy papers, they must arrange for printing themselves (for example through the print room) and bear the resulting costs. It is not appropriate to ask professional support staff to carry out printing. Regardless of how staff choose to mark, comments, feedback and a mark must be made available via TurnItIn on the BLE.
- 6.3 For non-written submissions, clear submission guidelines for students must be provided. Relevant professional support staff must be kept informed of the arrangements to ensure that they can facilitate the process if necessary and coordinate access for Visiting Examiners.
- 6.4 If online submission via TurnItIn on BLE is not appropriate for a particular written assignment (for example because it will exceed the maximum file size of 20MB, or because the assignment has a particular format, e.g. if you require the production of a website), clear submission guidelines for students must be provided. Relevant professional support staff must be kept informed of the arrangements to ensure that they can facilitate the process if necessary and coordinate access for Visiting Examiners.
- 6.5 For non-assessed, formative written assignments it may be possible to use other submission modes, including hardcopy, bearing in mind that this can disadvantage some students. Asking students to submit all written assignments online allows them to become more confident with this method of submission.
- 6.6 It is the responsibility of the relevant Programme Board Chair to ensure that all members of teaching staff follow this policy, both for the submission of written work and the return of feedback. Any deviations from this should be reported to the Faculty ADLT.

Eva Peters
ep30@soas.ac.uk
Curriculum & Regulations Officer
September 2016