

Assessment Regulations

Professional Doctorate Awards

Approved: UAB 26 April 2017

Minor Revisions: 11 July 2018, 10 July 2019, 2 June 2020, 8 July 2020

Document Title: Assessment Regulations – Professional Doctorate Awards			
Version No.	1.4	Author Role Title	Quality Manager (RFS)
Superseded version	June 2020		
Approval Date	8 July 2020	Approved by	Academic Board
Effective Date	28 September 2020	Review Date	Annual

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	4
1.1 Status and Scope	4
1.2 Characteristics of Professional Doctorate Awards	4
2. Application of the Regulations.....	5
2.1 Status and Scope	5
2.2 Variance from the Assessment Regulations	7
3. General Provisions.....	8
3.1 Framework for Academic Awards	8
3.2 Responsibilities	8
3.3 Definition of Attempt	10
3.4 Studying Additional Non-Contributory Modules	10
3.5 Recognition of Prior Learning	11
3.6 Ethical Compliance	11
3.7 Intellectual Property	11
3.8 Academic Misconduct.....	11
3.9 Conduct in Examinations.....	12
3.10 Extenuating Circumstances.....	12
3.11 Penalties for the Late Submission of Coursework.....	12
3.12 Penalties for the Late Submission of the Advanced Independent Work	13
3.13 Release of Unratified Marks for Taught Modules	13
3.14 Notification of Assessment Results.....	13
3.15 Language of Instruction and Assessment.....	15
3.16 Intermediate Awards	15
3.17 Maximum Period of Registration.....	16
3.18 Withdrawal from a Course	17
3.19 Posthumous Awards	17
3.20 Aegrotat Awards.....	17
3.21 Revocation of Awards	18
3.22 Right to Academic Appeal	18
3.23 Operation of Assessment Processes in Exceptional Circumstances.....	18
4. The Assessment of Students	19
4.1 The Purpose of Assessment.....	19

4.2 The Role of Academic Judgement	19
4.3 Assessment Boards	20
4.4 Module Assessment.....	21
4.5 Module Reassessment.....	22
4.6 Module Failure after Reassessment.....	24
5. Progression	25
6. Advanced Independent Work [AIW].....	25
6.1 General Provisions.....	25
6.2 Supervision.....	26
6.3 Requirements for the Advanced Independent Work [AIW].....	27
6.4 Examination of the Advanced Independent Work [AIW].....	29
6.5 Examiners	31
6.6 Examination Procedures: First Examination	33
6.7 Examination Procedures: Re-examination	36
7. Eligibility for Award.....	40
7.1 General Provisions.....	40
7.2 Eligibility for the Award of a Professional Doctorate Award (DClinPsy, EdD, DBA etc.).....	40
7.3 Eligibility for Masters Degrees, Postgraduate Diploma's, Postgraduate Certificates, University Certificate in Postgraduate Professional Development.....	41
7.4 Compensation of Failed Module(s)	41
7.5 Eligibility for Level 7 Awards	41
8. Grading of Awards	42
8.1 Grading of Professional Doctorate Awards	42

Assessment Regulations for Teesside University Professional Doctorate Awards

1. Introduction

1.1 Status and Scope

1.1.1 This edition of the Assessment Regulations for Professional Doctorate Awards supersedes previous versions. The sections of the Assessment Regulations relating to Modules will apply to all students registered and/or enrolled on Teesside University Modules from 28 September 2020¹.

The sections of the Assessment Regulations applying to Progression and Award will apply to all students registered and/or enrolled on courses from the commencement of their Academic Year. Where a student registers and/or enrolls outside of the published University's standard academic year (for example, a student with a January commencement date) the sections of the Regulations applying to Progression and Award in place at the start of their academic year will apply, unless notified otherwise.

1.1.2 The Regulations refer only to Professional Doctorate Awards that include taught elements as part of an approved course of study. Doctorates which consist entirely of research are managed via the [Framework and Regulations for the Award of Higher Degrees by Research](#).

1.1.3 The Regulations are supplemented by two other documents: the *Glossary*, which defines the key terms used in the Regulations; and the *Variance Register* which details all approved variances from the Regulations.

1.1.4 Both staff and students are expected to be familiar with the Regulations. Sources of support for students in understanding the Regulations are published in Student Handbooks. Students may also seek independent advice from the Students' Union. Staff can seek support by contacting the Academic Registry.

1.2 Characteristics of Professional Doctorate Awards

1.2.1 Professional Doctorate Awards are credit-rated and modular, with an emphasis on professionally relevant and practice orientated learning and research. The awards are rooted in an academic discipline as well as a profession and are made for the

¹ Students completing reassessment will be considered under the Regulations applying when they commenced on the Module(s) under consideration for reassessment.

creation and interpretation, construction and/or exposition of knowledge which extends the forefront of the discipline and/or professional practice, including by original research. They are located at level 8 on the FHEQ. The distinctive features of the award are described in the QAA [Doctoral Degree Characteristics Statement](#).

1.2.2 Professional Doctorate Awards consist of a series of taught modules and the development and submission of a piece of Advanced Independent Work [AIW]. The student must present and defend the Advanced Independent Work in an oral (*viva-voce*) examination, or an approved alternative, to the satisfaction of the examiners. The format of the AIW may differ according to the requirements of the area of professional practice in question and will be discussed and approved as part of Course Approval processes.

1.2.3 The AIW should be no less than 180 credits and no more than 300 credits of the total 540 credits required for a Professional Doctorate Award. The word length of the AIW should be commensurate with the number of credits allocated, with Level 8 outcomes and appropriate to the form of AIW presented. This should be agreed as part of the Course Approval process. Where a course team wishes to include more than one component for the AIW, this should be considered as part of the Course Approval process.

1.2.4 All modules contained within a Professional Doctorate course will be at either Level 7 (Masters) and/or Level 8 (Doctorate). A maximum of 120 credits may be at Level 7.

1.2.5 All Professional Doctorate courses must include an element of advanced research methods, defined as specific techniques required to conduct research in a particular discipline, minimally to the value of 60 credits or 600 hours of notional learning time. The Course Document for each Professional Doctorate award must clearly state how and where in the course this is achieved.

2. Application of the Regulations

2.1 Status and Scope

2.1.1 Standard Regulations: These Regulations are the standard regulations for all Teesside University's Professional Doctorate Awards regardless of location or mode of delivery. They will apply to all students undertaking those awards, unless variance has been approved by, or on behalf of, Academic Board (see Section 2.2).

2.1.2 Inclusion of Level 7 modules: Where Level 7 modules are included in Professional Doctorate courses, those modules will be assessed using the [Assessment Regulations for Taught Masters Level Awards](#) although progression and award will be governed by the [Assessment Regulations for Teesside University Professional Doctorate Level Awards](#). Details on Maximum Credit Allowances can be

found within the [Credit Accumulation and Modular Scheme \(CAMS\)](#). A maximum of 120 Level 7 credits may be included within a Professional Doctorate award.

2.1.3 Awards of the University Offered by Partner Institutions: Where other institutions deliver Teesside University awards under partnership arrangements, those institutions and awards are bound by these Regulations subject to any approved variance (see Section 2.2).

2.1.4 Discretion: In clearly specified circumstances, Assessment Boards have the power to exercise their discretion in the light of their academic judgement to ensure that students are treated equitably and fairly, that academic standards are maintained, and students are not disadvantaged by administrative or procedural irregularities beyond their control. In exercising discretion, Assessment Boards must take account of the views of the external examiner(s) and should ensure that decisions are taken in the spirit of these Regulations to the benefit of students. Decisions reached as a result of the exercise of discretion must be minuted together with the reasons for the decision.

2.1.5 Guidance on Implementation: Other than the guidelines and procedures relating to approved variance, where guidance is issued which supplements these Regulations, the Regulations take precedence in the event of conflict.

2.1.6 Chair's Action: An Assessment Board may delegate its responsibilities to the respective Chair in relation to recommendations concerning an individual student, subject to the approval of the relevant external examiner(s).

Delegated responsibility should only be exercised in exceptional cases, for example:

- a) To correct errors and/or omissions in the assessment marks and/or module results presented to an Assessment Board.
- b) To reconsider a decision of the Board in light of a recommendation made by an Academic Appeal Committee following consideration of the evidence relating to an Academic Appeal application.
- c) To instigate the Irregular Results procedure or otherwise ensure students are considered justly and consistently.
- d) To recommend conferment of an award in light of the above.
- e) To consider module results and/or the conferment of an award for a very small number of students where it is not practical to reconvene a Module and/or Progression and Award Board.

2.1.7 Authority: The regulations in force at any time shall be those published on the Student Regulations section of the University Website unless otherwise specified (see Section 2.1.8). Students who register for an award part-way through a year of study, or resume study after a period of interruption, will be governed by the regulations in force at the time of such registration or resumption.

2.1.8 Review and Approval of Regulations: The Regulations are reviewed periodically to reflect changing institutional agendas and for the purpose of editorial amendment. This review process is informed by feedback from staff, students, external examiners, and, where appropriate, other agents external to the University. The Regulations pertaining to each semester will be published in advance of its commencement.

2.1.9 Changes to the Regulations: While the University reserves the right to amend the Regulations, changes will not normally be implemented within a year of study. In exceptional cases (for example, following major review and modification) amendment to the Regulations may result in different cohorts of students registered for the same award being considered under different Regulations. Students will be notified in such cases and every effort will be made to ensure no cohort is unduly disadvantaged.

2.2 Variance from the Assessment Regulations

2.2.1 Approval: Variance to these Regulations will normally only be approved to meet specified requirements or expectations of Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs) or other such external bodies that accredit awards of the University. Such variance must always be approved by, or on behalf of, Academic Board and recorded in the Variance Register.

2.2.2 Definitions: Variance from the Assessment Regulations will be of two kinds: a) Module Variance; and b) Course Variance:

a) Module Variance is approved on behalf of Academic Board. It is sought from the relevant School Committee or course approval panels and only relates to module-specific regulations (for example, module-specific variance to the standard pass criteria). It is approved as part of the module approval process and must always be reported to the relevant University Committee for the purposes of oversight and accuracy of the Variance Register.

b) Course Variance is approved on behalf of Academic Board. It is sought from the relevant University Committee. It will normally relate to course-wide regulations (for example, standard progression profiles/criteria, and the grading of awards). Course variance is agreed in principle at course approval or by the relevant School Committee but must always be approved by the relevant University Committee for the purposes of oversight and accuracy of the Variance Register.

3. General Provisions

3.1 Framework for Academic Awards

3.1.1 Credit Framework

All Professional Doctorate Awards consist of modules. Each module has its own learning outcomes and is designed, delivered, and assessed at an academic level consistent with those outcomes. Credit is awarded for achievement of the specified learning outcomes of the module. Credit is accumulated sequentially, by level, until the credit requirements for the award are met. All awards offered by the University comply with the credit requirements of the national frameworks which identify and articulate typical characteristics of HE awards. These requirements, as well as more information about the operation of credit, can be found in the University's [Credit Accumulation and Modular Scheme \(CAMS\)](#). All Professional Doctorate Awards contain a large module of Advanced Independent Work. Within CAMS this is permitted to be between 180 and 300 credits.

3.1.2 Assessment and Feedback Policy

Assessment not only enables students to demonstrate they have achieved the learning outcomes; it also promotes high-level learning. Feedback is a fundamental part of the process which enables students to understand and improve their learning. The University's [Assessment and Feedback Policy](#) provides a framework for effective, appropriate and fair assessment practice that promotes future facing learning.

3.1.3 Other Relevant Documentation

The Regulations are paramount in decision-making relating to matters of student progression, achievement, and grading. However, in addition to these Regulations, the University operates a number of other institutional policies and procedures which variously inform, support, or structure student learning. Where these other policies and procedures bear on these Regulations reference is made to the full document.

3.2 Responsibilities

3.2.1 Responsibilities of the University

3.2.1.1 Assessment and Regulatory Literacy

Regulations and policies should be understood by staff and students and should not be a barrier to effective assessment practice and high-level student learning. In this respect, the University acknowledges that developing assessment and regulatory awareness is a paramount concern for both staff and students. Learning is most effective when students and staff share an understanding of academic and professional standards in an atmosphere of mutual trust. As such, the University will,

over time, actively engage students in a mutual dialogue about assessment processes in order to establish a shared understanding of the meaning of academic standards and professional judgement.

3.2.1.2 Information for Students

The University requires that students are made aware of, and have access to, the following information:

- i. The relevant assessment regulations governing their course of study;
- ii. The full details and requirements of their specific course of study;
- iii. The learning outcomes, assessment criteria, weightings and assessment strategy for each module;
- iv. The criteria relating to grading and marking schemes;
- v. The reassessment arrangements for their course of study;
- vi. The procedures for the submission of assignments, including the procedure and the penalties for late submission of summative assessments and the requirements and procedure for the submission of the Advanced Independent Work and the oral examination;
- vii. The grounds on which applications can be made for mitigating circumstances and/or extensions to deadlines for assessed work, and the procedures for doing so²);
- viii. The mechanism used to communicate results and the date this will occur;
- ix. The grounds on which applications for Academic Appeal can be made and the procedures for making such an appeal³;
- x. The [Regulations Relating to Academic Misconduct \(Taught Provision\)](#)
- xi. The [Regulations Relating to Research Misconduct in Advanced Independent Work](#)
- xii. The University's [Intellectual Property Policy](#).

3.2.2 Responsibilities of Students:

The University is committed to providing students with the resources, opportunities, and the support required to become successful high-level learners. However, effective learning requires active personal engagement with these resources and purposeful participation in the learning opportunities provided. As such, students are

² [Extenuating Circumstances Regulations](#)

³ [Academic Appeal Regulations](#)

expected to comply with the regulatory requirements of their course of study, engage with scheduled classes, and carry out the prescribed learning activities for the modules on which they are enrolled.

Students studying through online learning may be taught through synchronous and/or asynchronous modes of delivery. Whilst students should attend all scheduled online teaching activities, course engagement will also be monitored through other methods relating to activities on the VLE platform. Students will be advised of how their engagement will be monitored both during their induction and throughout their studies.

In addition, it is the responsibility of students to:

- i. Ensure they are aware of examination dates, coursework submission dates, the date of submission of the Advanced Independent Work, the date of the oral examination and make themselves available for the oral examination;
- ii. Attempt all examinations and/or summative assessments or approved alternative (see Section 3.3);
- iii. Inform the University if they are unable to attend classes or other course related activities in accordance with the University's [Attendance and Engagement Policy](#).
- iv. Notify the University through the proper procedures of any extenuating circumstances which may have affected their performance and which they wish to be taken into account (see Section 3.10).

3.3 Definition of Attempt

A module is deemed to have been attempted if a submission is made by the student for any component of summative assessment as defined in the Module Specification. No minimal mark needs to have been achieved in order for the submission to count as an attempt.

An assessment (including the AIW) is deemed to have been attempted if a submission is made by the student in accordance with the procedures defined for submitting the assignment.

An examination is deemed to have been attempted if the student accurately completes the formal attendance card and submits at least one answer script with a properly completed front cover.

3.4 Studying Additional Non-Contributory Modules

3.4.1 Students who have gained sufficient credits to be conferred the award for which they enrolled may not study additional modules as a means of improving marks or grades.

3.5 Recognition of Prior Learning

Students may be permitted to enrol onto courses with advanced standing through the University's [Recognition of Prior Learning Policy](#) or through an approved articulation or progression route. Such prior learning may be certificated or experiential or a combination of both. In such cases, students are awarded credit for experience gained elsewhere. The approved processes by which entry with advanced standing may be permitted are available on the University website.

RPL requirements for each Professional Doctorate Award must be clearly specified at course approval. Students will not be granted RPL against the AIW part of a Professional Doctorate Award.

3.6 Ethical Compliance

Students are expected to consider the ethical implications of everything they say, write or otherwise communicate in their assessment tasks. In addition, where applicable, students are required to comply with appropriate ethical release/approval processes. These are defined in the *Policy, Procedures & Guidelines for Research Ethics*.⁴ Students are also required to comply with the ethical processes of relevant Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Bodies (PSRB's). Specific reference to Professional Doctorate Awards is made in section 1.2.3 of the *Policy*.

Full ethical approval must have been obtained by the time a student's progression is considered as identified in course documentation.

Where, during the course of the AIW, the nature of the data collection changes substantially from that in the original proposal, via the Director of Studies, the student shall submit a further revised application for Ethical Approval.

3.7 Intellectual Property

The University of Teesside wishes to encourage the exploitation of Intellectual Property (IP). Students are expected to comply with the [Intellectual Property Policy](#).

3.8 Academic Misconduct

Students are expected to observe the University's regulations which define and proscribe cheating, plagiarism and other forms of academic misconduct^{5,6}

⁴ The *Policy, Procedures & Guidelines for Research Ethics* is available here: <http://www.tees.ac.uk/docs/DocRepo/Research/ethics.pdf>

⁵ [The Regulations Relating to Academic Misconduct \(Taught Provision\)](#).

Professional Doctorate Students are also expected to comply with the [Regulations Relating to Research Misconduct in Advanced Independent Work](#).

3.9 Conduct in Examinations

Students are expected to observe the University's instructions relating to conduct in undertaking examinations. Regulations relating to the conduct of examinations are specified in [The Regulations Relating to Academic Misconduct \(Taught Provision\)](#). Regulations relating to the conduct of the examination of the Advanced Independent Work are included in Section 6 [below] of these regulations.

3.10 Extenuating Circumstances

The University recognises that there may be times when, due to adverse circumstances beyond their control, a student may be unable to meet an assessment deadline, or cannot complete assessments to the best of their ability, or are unable to attend an examination. In such circumstances the University operates [Extenuating Circumstances Regulations \(Taught Provision\)](#) to enable students to request that such circumstances are taken into consideration.

There are three types of remedy that may be offered to a student who is experiencing difficulties outside their control in relation to the taught elements of the course:

- An Extension of the assessment deadline to a later date;
- A formal application for Mitigating Circumstances;
- Interruption of Studies until an agreed date.

Details of these processes are set out in the University's [Extenuating Circumstances Regulations \(Taught Provision\)](#). Guidance for students is available on the University's website.

NOTE: Where the student experiences an issue in relation to the AIW/Oral examination, reference should be made to Section 6 of these regulations.

3.11 Penalties for the Late Submission of Coursework

Where coursework is submitted later than the original deadline without the prior approval of an extension or mitigation, or where coursework is submitted beyond an agreed extension, then the following tariffs apply:

- a) 1-7 calendar days late: work is capped at 50%.
- b) Beyond 7 calendar days late: work will receive a mark of 0%.

Where submission is in relation to the reassessment of previously failed coursework, any work submitted beyond the submission date without authorisation will receive a mark of 0%. In addition, an extension will only be given at reassessment in exceptional circumstances.

3.12 Penalties for the Late Submission of the Advanced Independent Work

Where the Advanced Independent Work is submitted later than the original deadline without the prior approval of an extension or mitigation, or where the Advanced Independent Work is submitted beyond an agreed extension, then the Advanced Independent Work will not be submitted for the Oral Examination and the student will be required to re-present the work for reassessment.

Where submission is in relation to the reassessment of the Advanced Independent Work, any work submitted beyond the submission date without authorisation will not be assessed and the student will fail the reassessment.

If the AIW is not submitted within the Maximum Registration Period (see Section 3.17) then the student will fail the assessment/reassessment.

3.13 Release of Unratified Marks for Taught Modules

A provisional mark for summative assessments will be communicated individually to the student as and when the mark has been internally moderated as part of the feedback process. This will be communicated at the earliest opportunity and not normally later than 20 working days after the date of submission. Definitive marks can only be agreed by Module Assessment Boards after external moderation has taken place. Definitive marks will be released to the student as part of the Notification of Assessment Results process (see Section 3.14).

3.14 Notification of Assessment Results

3.14.1 Results

3.14.1.1 The Student Information System (SITS) is the official repository of all student results.

3.14.1.2 On completion of a meeting of an Assessment Board, or following a decision made by Chair's Action, the Chair is responsible for ensuring that details of all ratified marks/grades and all decisions taken by the Board are entered into the Student Information System.

3.14.1.3 The Department of Finance and Commercial Development is responsible for ensuring that accurate results lists are available for use by Assessment Boards.

3.14.2 Communication of Results to Students

3.14.2.1 Students studying for University awards will be informed on an annual basis of the date by which, and the manner in which, they will be notified of their ratified results/grades and the decision taken by the Assessment Board.

3.14.2.2 The mechanism of communicating results to students established by the process defined in Section 3.14.2.1 shall be considered to be the formal notification of those results and the date on which they are issued shall count as the date of publication.

3.14.2.3 The University will retain an auditable record of the formal communication to students of ratified results/grades and Assessment Board decisions, including any instructions to students regarding reassessment. The record will include both the content of the communication and its time/date.

3.14.2.4 The University will ensure students are informed that it is the responsibility of each student to ascertain their results by the means communicated to them.

3.14.2.5 The University shall, subject to 3.14.3, communicate information to students on ratified results concerning:

- i. Module marks or grades;
- ii. Progression to the next level of a course (if appropriate);
- iii. The award of a qualification;
- iv. Any compensation that has been awarded (compensation can only be applied to Level 7 modules);
- v. The opportunity to undertake reassessment or deferred assessment, including details of relevant modules and assignments;
- vi. The offer to restudy individual modules or levels of a course;
- vii. Specific requirements in relation to the Advanced Independent Work
- viii. Any other decisions taken by the Assessment Board;

3.14.2.6 Where a student has been awarded a qualification or withdrawn from their course of study, a transcript shall be issued by the University showing the marks or grades for all modules undertaken and any qualification that has been awarded.

Otherwise, a record of progress shall be issued annually by the University showing the marks or grades for all modules undertaken.

3.14.2.7 The transcript shall be the official record of a student's academic achievement and may take the form of a Diploma Supplement, or a Higher Education Achievement Record.

3.14.3 Withholding of Results

3.14.3.1 The decisions of Assessment Boards in relation to non-excluded students owing the University payment for tuition fees or academic charges may not be conveyed to students until confirmation is received from the Finance Office that the debt has been paid.

3.14.3.2 When an Assessment Board requires a non-excluded student debtor to re-sit an examination or otherwise undertake reassessment, the student will be informed in the normal way, but the outcome of such opportunities may not be conveyed to the student by the Assessment Board.

3.14.3.3 The University may withhold final results, certificates and transcripts, from students with debts relating to the academic experience even if they have made arrangements to pay their outstanding debt. Such students may not be invited to attend any Academic Awards Ceremony and their name may not appear in the Academic Awards Brochure.

3.14.3.4 The University may not grant to a student an award, a certificate of an award, or allow them to attend an Academic Awards Ceremony whilst a matter of alleged Misconduct is in the process of being considered under the University's [Student Disciplinary Regulations](#).

3.15 Language of Instruction and Assessment

The primary language of instruction will be English. Unless otherwise approved by variance, all modules which contribute to an award of the University must be taught and assessed in English.

3.16 Intermediate Awards

If a student fails to satisfy the requirements for a primary target award, an intermediate award may be conferred if the credit requirements and associated learning outcomes for that award have been met. These requirements will be specified either at course approval or in the University's [Credit Accumulation and Modular Scheme \(CAMS\)](#) framework. At the discretion of the Progression and Award Board, higher-level credit can substitute for lower-level credit to meet the

requirements for an intermediate award. Lower-level credit cannot be substituted for higher-level credit. Intermediate awards are not eligible for overall grading.

Intermediate Awards should be agreed as part of the Approval process and a course specification produced. Such awards must be contained within the University Schedule of Awards.

3.17 Maximum Period of Registration⁷

The maximum period of registration on a course of study is the normal full-time registration period plus three years. This includes all periods of interruption and/or intercalation when the student's registration is formally suspended. Some courses accredited by professional, statutory and regulatory bodies (PSRB) may specify a shorter timescale.

The standard maximum registration period for Professional Doctorate Awards is as follows:

Award	Normal Period of Registration		Maximum Period of Registration	
	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time
Professional Doctorate Award	3	6	6	9

The normal period of registration and maximum period of registration for professional doctorate awards studied by online learning will be considered and approved during the approval/review process.

3.17.1 Registration of Part-Time/online learning Students

Assessment Boards can withdraw part-time/online learning students if they have not formally interrupted their studies and have not fulfilled either of the following requirements:

- i. Enrolled or re-enrolled as required in the current academic year.
- ii. Studied the minimum number of credits, normally 30, required to continue on the course.

In such cases, the Assessment Board will confer an intermediate award on the basis of any credits and associated learning outcomes achieved at the University.

⁷ The Maximum Period of Registration will be reset if a student transfers to another course.

3.18 Withdrawal from a Course

A student can withdraw from their course of study, or, where it is clear that they are no longer attending or engaging with their studies, arrangements will be made for their withdrawal from the award and their enrolment with the University terminated.

A student must advise the University in writing if they wish to withdraw from their course of study. Students who withdraw from their course of study, or whose enrolment is terminated by the University, will be considered for an intermediate award at the next meeting of the course's Progression and Award Board.

3.19 Posthumous Awards

Any award of the University, as detailed in the Schedule of Awards described in the CAMS framework, may be conferred posthumously. The normal conditions of the award must be satisfied.

3.20 Aegrotat Awards

In instances where a student is unable to complete their course of study and they have not met the requirements for the intended award, an Aegrotat award may be conferred. The following conditions apply:

- i. Unforeseen exceptional medical or other sufficient circumstances prevent the candidate completing the award for which they are registered.
- ii. The Assessment Board is nevertheless satisfied that the candidate would have qualified for the award had it not been for such valid cause.
- iii. The candidate, or a person authorised to act on their behalf, has indicated that they are willing to accept the award prior to its recommendation to an Assessment Board.
- iv. The candidate, or a person authorised to act on their behalf, has agreed in writing that, in accepting the award they are waiving the right to be reassessed.
- v. If conferred, an Aegrotat is an exit award and, as such, is the conclusion of the student's course of study.
- vi. An Aegrotat award cannot be conferred to students on courses accredited by a professional body which does not sanction this form of award.

When conferring an Aegrotat award, the decision of the Board must be based on the student's overall profile and evidence of some completed work at the level of the award being recommended.

Aegrotat awards are unclassified/not graded. They will be listed as:

- i. Aegrotat Professional Doctorate.

Aegrotat awards can be awarded posthumously. In such cases, the requirement to secure agreement that, in accepting the award, the right to reassessment is waived in line with Section 3.20 iv. does not apply.

A student who does not wish to accept an Aegrotat award may choose to be reassessed under the provisions of section 4.5. A candidate who subsequently fails such a reassessment is not then eligible to claim the Aegrotat award.

3.21 Revocation of Awards

The University reserves the right to revoke an award, and all privileges and rights associated with that award, where it is established that a student has obtained an award by fraud or deception or where other circumstances come to light after the award is made which, if known at the time, would have meant the award would not have been made. The student concerned may appeal this decision through the procedures set out in the University's [Academic Appeal Regulations](#).

3.22 Right to Academic Appeal

Under certain conditions, a student has a right of appeal against assessment and/or examination decisions in accordance with the University's [Academic Appeal Regulations](#).

3.23 Operation of Assessment Processes in Exceptional Circumstances

Exceptional circumstances are defined as those caused by external factors beyond the University's control that may impact adversely upon institutional-wide assessment processes. Whilst the University remains functional, exceptional and/or emergency circumstances could result in substantial disruption to learning and teaching, the submission of assessments, marking and moderation processes and the progression of students along with the determination of awards. The University does not hold a definitive list of exceptional circumstances, but examples would include disruptive natural disasters such as flooding, epidemics of infectious diseases and industrial action resulting in assessment boycott.

As part of the approval of Assessment Regulations, the Academic Board makes provision to determine awards and the progression of continuing students where the University is, because of exceptional circumstances beyond its reasonable control, unable to apply the standard Assessment Regulations, Assessment and Feedback Policy and External Examiner processes as approved for that academic year. In discharging its responsibilities, Academic Board may determine the following action:

- i) Allow modifications to be made to previously approved arrangements for the marking and moderation of assessments as detailed within the [Assessment and Feedback Policy](#).
- ii) Make alternative arrangements for [External Examiner processes](#).

- iii) Allow recommendations to be made to make reasonable adjustments to the progression of students between levels/years and the award of qualifications.

The Vice-Chancellor (or nominee) will approve the introduction of the application of the Academic Regulations for the Exceptional Management of Taught Awards and the anticipated duration of their application, if known. A further statement will be provided announcing when the regulation will be rescinded and will be supported by a transition plan, where appropriate.

The University will undertake preparations for an effective response to exceptional circumstances, ensuring that the academic standards of its modules and courses and the integrity of its awards are maintained, its reputation safeguarded and students treated fairly and equitably. As such, the University will undertake reasonable action to expedite the conferment of final awards and progression of continuing students. It is expected that the application of the Academic Regulations for the Exceptional Management of Taught Awards will be rare and reserved for extreme occasions.

The regulatory framework outlining the University's approach to learning and teaching practice, assessment and feedback (including moderation), External Examiner processes, progression of its students and the award of qualifications is set out under the Academic Regulations for the Exceptional Management of Taught Awards.

4. The Assessment of Students

4.1 The Purpose of Assessment

A key function of assessment is to promote high-level learning. Assessment is also the primary mechanism that enables students to demonstrate they have achieved the learning outcomes of the course on which they are registered and fulfilled the standards required of the award. Given its dual purpose, assessment is not merely the evidence that learning outcomes have been achieved but a crucial aspect of a high-quality student learning experience.

4.2 The Role of Academic Judgement

The outcomes of high-level learning are assessed by professional examiners who use their academic judgement to determine the level of achievement demonstrated in student assessment. These judgements are based on associated criteria and standards. The academic judgement of examiners cannot, in itself, be questioned or overturned. As such, a common understanding of the meaning of those criteria and standards – both academic and professional – is based on mutual trust and meaningful dialogue between staff and students.

Indeed, the assessment of student work is usually a matter of judgement, not merely of simple computation. Marks, grades and percentages are thus the means by which examiners communicate their judgement of a student's work and the different aspects of learning it demonstrates. Their purpose is to provide information for Assessment Boards who will make the final decision on a student's progress, achievement of learning outcomes, and the fulfilment and grading of the award.

These regulations provide a framework within which professional academic judgement can be exercised in such a way that students are treated with equity, parity, and consistency across the University's Professional Doctorate courses.

4.3 Assessment Boards

4.3.1 Impartiality of Assessment Boards

An effective staff-student relationship requires a culture of trust, respect, and professionalism. As part of this, the assessment of students will take place with due regard to the principles of transparency, independence, equity, and impartiality. Assessment Boards will ensure there is no conflict of interest during the assessment process that might compromise this culture and these principles.

Where a potential conflict of interest arises, the academic staff member(s) concerned will not have sole responsibility for assessing the work of any relevant student. In addition, a declaration of interest must be made to the relevant Assessment Board (or in advance to the Chair of the Board). Unless prior dispensation has been given by the Chair, the member of academic staff will leave the meeting of the Board when the individual case is being considered. This process will be recorded in the minutes.

If a member of staff (either at the University or approved partner) is a student on a module/course being considered by the Board, they will not be involved in the Board in any capacity.

In instances where Assessment Boards are asked to consider outcomes from other regulatory processes (e.g. academic misconduct, fitness to practise, and academic appeal), due regard will be given to the impartiality of the Chair and Members of the Board. If the Chair of the Board has had any previous formal involvement in a case to be considered, they will declare an interest and hand the Chair over to an impartial senior colleague during the discussion of the case. Similarly, if any Member of the Board has had formal involvement in a case to be considered, they will declare an interest and must not take part in the discussion and decision-making process. Such declarations and actions must be recorded in the minutes.

4.3.2 System of Assessment Boards

The University employs a two-tier system of Assessment Boards to determine the outcome of student assessment. This system is conducted sequentially through Module Assessment Boards and Progression and Award Boards. Each Assessment

Board will make judgements on student performance within its own approved terms of reference. It will minute the basis on which decisions are made and record these in the Student Information System (SITS) using the approved codes. The Terms of Reference for University Assessment Boards are published on the University website.

4.4 Module Assessment

4.4.1 Module Pass

The overall pass mark for each taught module is 50%. The AIW will be assessed on a Pass/Fail basis only.

4.4.2 Module Pass with Multiple Components

Where the assessment strategy of a module is comprised of two or more components of assessment, a pass will be awarded where a student achieves at least 50% in the overall module mark. The student does not need to achieve a mark of 50% in each component.

4.4.3 Additional Pass Criteria

Additionally, a minimum level of achievement in any or all of the components of assessment for the module may be necessary to meet PSRB requirements, the expectations of accrediting bodies, or other course-specific regulations. Such requirements must be approved through the variance procedures described in Section 2.2, published in the relevant course and module specification, and be explained in the relevant Module and Student Handbooks.

4.4.4 Pass/Fail Modules

The minimum criteria to pass a module approved to use only pass/fail grades is the achievement of an overall pass grade. If a combination of pass/fail and percentage grades is used, then both minimum requirements must be met (i.e. a pass mark and a minimum aggregated mark of 50% in the other component(s)). Pass/fail module credits will contribute towards the award.

Advanced Independent Work modules use pass/fail grades only. No marks are awarded for the Advanced Independent Work.

4.4.5 Passed Modules and Reassessment

A student who has passed a module at the first attempt either outright or by compensation may not be reassessed in the module in order to achieve a higher mark unless the student has been given dispensation to restudy the module under the provisions described in Section 4.6.

4.5 Module Reassessment

4.5.1 Limit to Reassessment

Students who fail any taught module at the first point of consideration will be provided with an opportunity to undertake reassessment. In such cases, the student will be offered reassessment in the failed component(s) of the module. There is no limit to the number of taught modules eligible for reassessment. Students are normally only entitled to one reassessment attempt per module (see Section 4.5.5).

4.5.2 The Timing of Reassessment

Reassessment opportunities for the taught modules will normally take place on an inter-sessional basis after the taught modules have been undertaken in full. However, Assessment Boards may be scheduled to determine and offer in-session reassessment where, for course specific circumstances, it is deemed beneficial to student completion and achievement (see Section 4.3.2).

4.5.2.1 Timing of Reassessment for Part-time/online learning Students

The appropriate Assessment Board will consider the profile of each part-time/online learning student registered on a Teesside University Award on an annual basis. In instances where a part-time/online learning student has failed a module(s), in advance of achieving the criteria to be eligible for the intended award as described in Section 7.2, the Assessment Board will offer reassessment opportunities subject to 4.5.1. Such reassessment opportunities can, as appropriate, take place in-session or be offered on an inter-sessional basis.

4.5.3 Module Mark for Reassessed Modules

When a student is reassessed in a module under 4.5.1, the marks obtained in the component(s) of assessment passed at the first point of consideration shall stand whereas the maximum mark that may be awarded for the reassessed component(s) is 50%. The mark for the module will be recalculated on the basis of the original marks for the component(s) passed at the first attempt and the marks gained in the reassessed components.

Where, exceptionally, capping at the component level results in a failed mark for the module overall, and where capping at module level would have resulted in a pass, the module shall be recorded as passed with a capped mark of 50%.

If the pass mark for the module has not been attained following reassessment, the mark that will stand is the higher of either the original module mark or the recalculated mark following the reassessment.

The maximum outcome of the reassessment of the Advanced Independent Work is pass.

4.5.4 In-module Retake:

On a module basis, and only if approved as a specific reassessment strategy at the time of approval⁸, course teams may make arrangements for students to retake specific assessment tasks in-module before the result has been formally ratified by a Module Assessment Board. In-module Retakes are permitted only where:

- i. The assessment is not an examination;
- ii. The module is designated as non-compensatable;
- iii. The assessment has been subjected to full internal moderation processes;⁹
- iv. Either the module pass mark has not been attained outright; or the module pass mark has been attained but the minimum required mark in specified assessment component(s) has not been achieved.
- v. The module/component(s) has been attempted.

When a student retakes an assessment under 4.5.4, the marks obtained in the component(s) of assessment passed at the first attempt shall stand whereas the maximum mark that may be awarded for the retaken component(s) is 50%. The mark for the module will be recalculated on the basis of the original marks for the component(s) passed at the first attempt and the marks gained in the retaken components.

If the pass mark for the module has not been attained following the In-module Retake, the mark that will stand is the higher of either the original module mark or the recalculated mark following the retake.

Students who fail to attain the module pass mark following an In-module Retake will be eligible for reassessment as detailed in 4.5 if permitted within the course regulations and the constraints of the award.

In-module Retake is not available for the Advanced Independent Work.

4.5.5 Exceptional Third Attempt

On a module basis, and only if approved as a specific reassessment strategy at the time of approval¹⁰, course teams may make arrangements for students to undertake

⁸ In-module retakes shall normally only be approved to meet defined requirements, or other such expectations, of PSRBs and/or where the module assesses specific aspects of competency that must be demonstrated (i.e. passed) before the student can study the work-based practice aspects of a professional course.

⁹ The University's marking and moderation processes are defined in the [Assessment and Feedback Policy](#).

¹⁰ Exceptional Third Attempts should normally only be approved to meet defined requirements, or other such expectations, of PSRBs and/or where the module assesses specific aspects of competency that must be

a second reassessment opportunity (i.e. a third attempt). Exceptional Third Attempts should normally only be used where:

- i. The module is designated as non-compensatable;
- ii. Either the module pass mark has not been attained outright; or the module pass mark has been attained but specified assessment component(s) must meet a minimum level of achievement;
- iii. An In-module Retake, as described in Section 4.5.4., is not available as an approved reassessment strategy on the module;
- iv. There are no Fitness to Practise concerns (if applicable);
- v. The module has been attempted at the first and/or second attempt.

Exceptional Third Attempts are only available for modules at Level 7 and are not available for the Advanced Independent Work.

When a student is reassessed for a second time in a module under 4.5.5, the marks obtained in the component(s) of assessment passed at the first attempt shall stand whereas the maximum mark that may be awarded for the reassessed component(s) is 50%. The mark for the module will be recalculated on the basis of the original marks for the component(s) passed at the first attempt and the marks gained in the reassessed components.

Where, exceptionally, capping at the component level results in a failed mark for the module overall, and where capping at module level would have resulted in a pass, the module shall be recorded as passed with a capped mark of 50%.

If the pass mark for the module has not been attained following reassessment, the mark that will stand is the higher of either the original module mark or the recalculated mark following the reassessment.

4.6 Module Failure after Reassessment

All outstanding reassessment opportunities must be completed prior to a student undertaking any restudy.

4.6.1 Restudying Failed Modules

Following module reassessment as described in Section 4.5, at the discretion of the Progression and Award Board, a student may be offered one further attempt by restudying the failed taught module(s) and repeating them as though for the first time. This will normally take place at the next available opportunity. The mark gained

demonstrated (i.e. passed) before the student can study the work-based/work-related practice aspects of a professional course

following restudy will be awarded in full and, if necessary, reassessment opportunities made available as detailed in section 4.5. Restudy of a module is only permitted on one occasion and a maximum of 80 credits may be restudied over the duration of the Course.

Restudy is not permitted in the Advanced Independent Work.

5. Progression

Each course should develop a proposal for managing progression, as appropriate to the course structure, which should be agreed as part of the course approval process. As a minimum, one progression point should be included at which a Progression and Award Board determines whether a student has made sufficient progress to move to the Advanced Independent Work part of the course. Any exit points and intermediate awards should be made clear in course documentation.

Students offered reassessments may, at the discretion of the relevant Progression Board, be allowed to proceed pending results of their reassessments. If they are unsuccessful they will normally be required to suspend their progression until the module deficiencies are redeemed or to withdraw and leave with the appropriate intermediate award (see section 3.16).

Once a student has commenced the Advanced Independent Work, Progression and Award Boards should, at least once per year and as agreed at approval, to establish whether a student is still actively engaged on the AIW and is maintaining regular contact with the supervisors. The lead supervisor should provide a report on the student progress to this Board. The Progression and Award Board should consider this report and take appropriate action which may include withdrawal from the course. Cognisance should be taken of the maximum length of the course (see *Section 3.17*).

6. Advanced Independent Work [AIW]

6.1 General Provisions

Professional Doctorates are awarded for the creation and interpretation, construction and/or exposition of knowledge which extends the forefront of the discipline and/or professional practice, including by original research.

The AIW part of the Professional Doctorate Award forms a separate assessment part of the award. A mark is not allocated for the AIW but the student is required to successfully complete the AIW and associated credits in order to be eligible for the Professional Doctorate Award.

The AIW part of Professional Doctorate Awards is intended to reflect the principles underpinning the assessment of Higher Degrees by Research (e.g. PhD).

6.2 Supervision

6.2.1 Supervisory Team

The Supervisory Team will consist of a Director of Studies, Second Supervisor(s) and any appropriate advisors. Where appropriate the Team will comprise at least one academic supervisor and one non-academic supervisor to contribute professional practice in relevant fields, in order that the Supervisory Team has appropriate expertise to support the student. The Practice Supervisory may be from the student's employing or sponsoring company. The Supervisory Team will not normally include more than three members.

A record of the Supervisory Team, including any changes to the Team, will be noted at the relevant Assessment Board for information.

The Director of Studies will normally come from within the University and usually from within the School in which the student is enrolled. The Director of Studies must be suitably qualified for the proposed research and have personal expertise in the student's field of study and/or theoretical approaches to be applied. The Second Supervisor(s) may be from within the University or outside, depending on the expertise available. In the temporary absence of a Director of Studies (e.g. illness, sabbatical leave), an Acting Director of Studies will be appointed, normally from within the existing Supervisory Team.

6.2.2 Supervisory Experience

A Supervisory Team shall normally have a combined experience of supervising not fewer than two candidates to successful completion of a UK Professional Doctorate or Research Degree. At least one supervisor shall have had experience of supervising at least two candidates to successful completion of a UK Professional Doctorate or Research Degree, **or** at least one supervisor shall have had experience of supervising one candidate to successful completion of a UK Professional Doctorate or Research Degree and have successfully completed the Research Supervisors' Training Module, or an external equivalent approved by the University Research & Innovation Committee.

One supervisor must be able to contribute some specialised knowledge and/or professional practice in the field of study.

6.2.3 Research Supervisor Training

Academic staff who wish to become Research Supervisors must normally successfully complete an approved supervisory training course (or approved external equivalent), before they undertake any supervisory role. Only in exceptional

circumstances will a member of staff be allowed to undertake supervision without such training and in that event, the training course must be completed within 12 months of the uptake of such a duty and other members of the Team must be appropriately qualified.

6.2.4 Director of Studies

One supervisor shall be the Director of Studies (first supervisor) with responsibility to supervise the student on a regular basis. The Director of Studies must hold a Doctoral level qualification (or equivalent professional qualification) and must normally be a member of University staff. Schools will monitor individual supervisor workloads so that normally, a Director of Studies is not acting as a Director of Studies for more than six students at any one time.

A student undertaking a professional doctorate or research degree shall be ineligible to act as Director of Studies for another Professional Doctorate student but may act as second supervisor or adviser.

6.2.5 Additional Advisers

In addition to the supervisors, an adviser or advisers may be proposed to contribute some specialist knowledge or provide a link with a relevant external organisation. The adviser(s) may be from the student's employing or sponsoring organisation.

6.2.6 Change of Supervisory Arrangements

A change of supervisory arrangements may be instigated either by the student or a member of the Supervisory Team, in consultation with the relevant Course Leader and all parties concerned. This should be noted at the relevant Assessment Board.

6.2.7 Responsibilities of the Supervisory Team and Responsibilities of the Student

Course Teams are required to develop a list of responsibilities of the Supervisory Team and of the student what can be discussed at approval/review. This should be clearly communicated to students, normally though the course handbook.

6.3 Requirements for the Advanced Independent Work [AIW]

6.3.1 Language of the AIW and oral examination

Except with the specific permission of the Assessment Board, the AIW shall be presented and defended in the English Language.

6.3.2 Abstracts

There shall be an abstract of approximately 300 words bound into the AIW which shall provide a synopsis of the AIW. Three loose copies of the abstract shall be

submitted with the AIW which should have the name of the author, the title of the course on which the student is studying and the title of the AIW as a heading.

6.3.3 Acknowledgement of sources

The AIW shall acknowledge published or other sources of material consulted, including an appropriate bibliography, and any assistance received.

6.3.4 Assistance and Proof Reading

The AIW must be the student's own work.

It is the student's responsibility to check the accuracy, grammar, spelling and referencing in the AIW before final submission. This requirement does not preclude the student from obtaining limited assistance with proof-reading and with the routine collection and/or processing of data under guidelines and instructions clearly devised by the candidate. When such help is obtained, it should be with the prior approval of the Director of Studies who must be satisfied that the spirit of the 'own work' requirement is not breached.

If the student has a disability/specific learning difficulty such as dyslexia, the student should be encouraged to register with Disability Services at the earliest opportunity to enable consideration of their support needs to be undertaken¹¹.

6.3.5 Collaborative Work

Where a student's research programme is part of a collaborative group project, the AIW shall indicate clearly the candidate's individual contribution and the extent of the collaboration.

6.3.6 Pre-Publication of work

The student shall be free to publish material in advance of the submission of the AIW but reference should be made in the AIW to any such work. Copies of published material should be included in an Appendix.

6.3.7 Copies of AIW for Assessment

The student shall submit for examination two soft bound copies of the AIW, unless otherwise notified by the Course Leader, and one PDF version which is an exact copy of the soft bound copy.

¹¹ https://www.tees.ac.uk/sections/studentsupport/student_disabilities.cfm

The copies of the AIW submitted for assessment shall remain the property of the University but the copyright in the AIW shall be vested in the student.

6.3.8 Length of the AIW

The length of the AIW should conform to the word limit and other requirements as agreed at course approval, depending upon the type of AIW format required for the assessment. Examiners may decline to examine any AIW that exceeds the maximum word length by 10%. However, this will count as an attempt at the assessment.

Specific details of the Format of the AIW will be included in the Research Handbook for each course.

6.4 Examination of the Advanced Independent Work [AIW]

6.4.1 Stages of Examination

The examination for all Professional Doctorate awards have two stages: firstly the submission and preliminary assessment of the AIW; and secondly its defence by oral (or approved alternative) examination.

Where the examiners are of the opinion that the AIW is so unsatisfactory that no useful purpose would be served by conducting an oral (or alternative) examination they may recommend to the Assessment Board that the oral examination is not held and refer the AIW for further work (*reassessment prior to oral examination*). In such cases, the examiners shall provide the assessment board with written guidance for the student concerning the deficiencies of the AIW. The examiners may not recommend that the candidate fail the AIW without conducting the oral (or alternative) examination.

6.4.2 Exemption from Oral or Arrangement of Alternative Examination

A student will normally be assessed by oral examination on the AIW unless, as a result of sickness, disability or other comparable valid cause, a reasonable adjustment is made in collaboration with the Department of Student and Library Services. Such approval shall not be given on the grounds that the candidate's knowledge of the English language is inadequate.

6.4.3 Location and Language of Oral

An oral examination shall normally be held in the UK. In exceptional cases the Assessment Board may give approval for the oral examination to take place outside of the UK. Except with the specific permission of the Assessment Board, the oral shall be conducted in the English Language.

6.4.4 Appointment of Independent non-examining Chairs at Oral Examinations

An Independent non-examining Chair (IneC) will normally be appointed to ensure that the oral examination of a candidate takes place to the appropriate standard. In addition to the practical functions associated with the oral examination, the principal duty is to ensure that the examiners have agreed what questions will be required to be answered by a candidate under examination and to ensure that this is undertaken fairly during the oral examination. The IneC plays no part in the assessment of a candidate but may be called upon to advise the examiners in the interpretation of regulations when reaching an assessment decision. If required, the IneC may request further advice for the examiners from the Chair of the Assessment Board.

6.4.5 Academic Misconduct and the AIW

Where there is evidence of academic misconduct in the preparation of the AIW or other irregularities in the conduct of the examination come to light during, or subsequent to, the recommendation of the examiners, the examination team should take action in accordance with the [Regulations Relating to Research Misconduct in Advanced Independent Work](#).

6.4.6 Conduct of Oral Examinations

The relevant Assessment Board should ensure that all AIW examinations are conducted and the recommendations of the examiners are presented wholly in accordance with the Assessment Regulations for Professional Doctorate Awards. In any instance where the Assessment Board is made aware of a failure to comply with all procedures of the examination process, it may declare the examination null and void and appoint new examiners.

6.4.7 Nomination of the Examination Team

Nominations for Award and Module External Examiners for Professional Doctorate Awards will be forwarded to the University External Examiner Sub-Committee and formally appointed via this Sub-Committee on behalf of the Student Learning & Experience Committee. Nominations for Advanced Independent Work External Examiners [AIWEE], either as part of the pool of external examiners or for individual students should also be forwarded to the University External Examiner Sub-Committee for approval.

Arrangements for the nomination of the Examination Team for individual students shall be determined at course approval.

6.4.8 Notification of Date of Oral Examination

The Course Leader shall make known to the student the procedure to be followed for the submission of the AIW and any conditions to be satisfied before the student may be considered eligible for oral examination.

Course Leaders should make appropriate arrangements to notify the student, all supervisors and the examiners of the date of the oral examination. Preliminary indication should include the general time period (e.g. September) and will normally be given when work on the AIW commences.

6.4.9 Circulation of the Advanced Independent Work to Examiners

6.4.9.1 The relevant Course Leader must ensure that a copy of the AIW is sent to each examiner, together with the Examiner's Preliminary Report form and a link to the relevant assessment regulations and should ensure that the examiners are properly briefed as to their duties.

6.4.9.2 The relevant Course Leader should ensure that all the examiners have completed and returned the Preliminary Reports to the University before the oral examination takes place.

6.4.9.3 Where a student does not submit the AIW by the due date, and without approved extenuating circumstances, the student shall be deemed to have failed the AIW and the oral examination will not go ahead.

6.5 Examiners

6.5.1 Composition of the Examination Team

A student shall be examined by at least two, and, normally, not more than three examiners [*except where 6.6.6, Appointment of an Additional External Examiner, applies*], of which at least one of whom shall be External Examiner, and at least one of whom shall have up-to-date professional expertise. The Course Leader will oversee the selection of the Examination Team following the mechanisms agreed at course approval. The student will have no input into the selection of the Examination Team.

6.5.2 Definition of an Internal Examiner

An Internal Examiner shall be defined as an Examiner who is:

- a) a member of staff of the University; or
- b) a member of staff of the student's Collaborating Establishment.

Internal Examiners must be independent of the Supervisory Team and have taken no part in advising the student on the AIW. There should be no conflicts of interest when appointing to the role of Internal Examiner. Conflicts of interest include personal interest, involvement or relationship with the student under consideration.

6.5.3 Examination of Staff Candidates

Where the student and the Internal Examiner are both on the permanent staff of the same establishment, a second External Examiner shall be appointed. A student who

is on a fixed short-term employment contract (e.g. a research assistant) shall be exempt from the requirements of this Regulation.

6.5.4 Definition of an External Examiner

An External Examiner shall be independent of both Teesside University and any collaborating establishment; shall have taken no part in advising the student on the AIW; shall not have acted previously as the student's supervisor or adviser; or normally research collaborator. An External Examiner shall not normally be either a supervisor of another student or an External Examiner on any *other* taught course in the same School at the University.

Any prior connection with the student, whether of the above nature, or other connection (e.g. relative), must be declared at the point of nomination as an Examiner.

Former members of staff or former students of the University shall normally not be approved as External Examiners until five years after the termination of their employment, or completion of their studies with the University.

6.5.5 Experience of Examiners

- a) Examiners shall be experienced in research in the general area of the candidate's AIW and, where practicable, have experience as a specialist in the topic(s) to be examined.
- b) Within the limits of a maximum of three examiners, every effort should be made to appoint examiners to cover the academic content of interdisciplinary AIW.
- c) At least one External Examiner shall have substantial experience (that is normally two or more previous examinations) of examining Advanced Independent Work for Professional Doctorate Students or equivalent Research Degree theses.

6.5.6 Ineligibility of Professional Doctorate or Research Degree Students to act as Examiners

No student registered for a Professional Doctorate Award, or Research Degree, either at Teesside University or another institution, shall act as an Examiner.

6.5.7 External Examiners' Fees and Expenses

The University shall determine and pay the fees and expenses of the examiners.

6.6 Examination Procedures: First Examination

The purpose of the oral examination is to explore and examine the student's understanding of the research topic and their ability to defend the written AIW submission.

Professional Doctorate students are expected to demonstrate, within the oral examination, a systematic understanding and analysis of a substantial body of knowledge at the forefront of an area of policy or practice, the extension of the area's frontier by the creation of new knowledge and a detailed and critical understanding of advanced research techniques/problems within a discipline. Further information is provided within the QAA [Doctoral Degree Characteristics Statement](#).

Course Teams are expected to contextualise the main points relating to the purpose of the oral examination for their students and to ensure effective communication of these to students, normally via the relevant handbook.

6.6.1 Examiners' Confidential Independent Preliminary Reports

Each Examiner shall read and examine the AIW and submit an independent preliminary report on it, normally to the Course Leader and normally at least three working days before any oral examination (or alternative form of examination) is held, for exchange between the examiners. In completing the Preliminary Report, each examiner shall, where possible, make an appropriate provisional recommendation subject to the outcome of any oral examination. Except where otherwise authorised by the examiners, the contents of the reports will be held in confidence between the examiners and (following the oral examination) by the relevant Assessment Board.

6.6.2 Examiners' Final Reports on First Examination

Following the oral examination the examiners shall, where they are in agreement, submit on the appropriate form, a joint report and recommendations relating to the AIW and oral examination to the relevant Assessment Board. The preliminary reports and joint recommendations of the examiners shall, together, provide sufficiently detailed comments on the scope and quality of the work to enable the Assessment Board to satisfy itself that the recommendation chosen in *Section 6.6.3* below is appropriate.

Where examiners are not in agreement, separate reports and recommendations shall be submitted. The recommendations shall be made on the appropriate form.

6.6.3 Examiners' Recommendations

Examiners' Recommendations on the AIW must normally be considered under the oversight of the relevant Assessment Board. Following completion of the examination, the examiners will make one of the following recommendations:

- a) the student be awarded a pass for the AIW;
- b) the student be awarded a pass for the AIW subject to amendments being made to the AIW (see further clarification in Section 6.6.4);
- c) the student be permitted to re-submit the AIW and be re-examined, with or without an oral examination (see further clarification in Section 6.7.1);
- d) the student fail the AIW and not be permitted to re-submit and be re-examined.

6.6.4 Amendments

Where the examiners are satisfied that the student has, in general, reached the standard required for a pass in the AIW but considers that the students' AIW requires some amendments and corrections not so substantial as to call for the submission of a revised AIW, a provisional pass may be recommended. A pass will be awarded subject to the student amending the AIW to the satisfaction of the Internal and/or the External Examiner(s), who shall indicate to the student, in writing, what amendments and corrections are required.

The student shall submit the amended AIW within the time limit specified by the examiners. This time limit commences on the date of the formal notification of the outcome of the AIW at which the list of amendments and corrections required is notified to the student. This date is normally the date of notification of the outcome of the relevant assessment board.

Amendments can constitute: spelling, grammatical, and/or typing errors; or they may take the form of re-ordering of material, or minor textual additions for further clarification of the research but which does not require further research to be undertaken. In such cases the amendments should be made within a period to be determined by the examiners up to a maximum of six months from the date of notification of the outcome of the relevant assessment board.

The student shall submit the amended AIW within the time limit specified by the examiners. Non submission within the time limit specified shall result in the student failing the AIW.

Following submission of the amended work, the Internal Examiner, in consultation with the External Examiner if requested, will confirm that the amendments have been completed to their satisfaction and the Chair of the Progression & Award Board will complete a Chair's Action if an Assessment Board is not appropriately scheduled.

Where the student submits the amendments but the examiners determine that the amendments have not been made to their satisfaction, at the discretion of the assessment board, the student will be given a further four weeks from the date of

confirmation of this outcome to complete revised amendments. If the requirements are not met within that timeframe then the students will fail the AIW.

If, due to adverse circumstances beyond their control, a student is unable to submit the amended AIW within the time limit specified by the external examiners, the student can request that these circumstances are taken into consideration by the University. In such cases, an application should be made using the [Extenuating Circumstances Regulations \(Taught Provision\)](#).

6.6.5 Non-unanimous Recommendations

Where the examiners' recommendations are not unanimous, the Assessment Board may:

- a) accept a majority recommendation (provided that the majority recommendation includes at least one External Examiner);
- b) accept the recommendation of at least one of the External Examiners; or
- c) require the appointment of an additional External Examiner.

In these circumstances, the feedback to the student may take longer than 14 days.

6.6.6 Appointment of Additional External Examiner

Where an additional External Examiner is appointed under *Section 6.6.5c) above*, s/he shall prepare an independent preliminary report on the basis of the AIW and, if considered necessary, may conduct a further oral examination. The examiner should not normally be informed of the specific recommendations of the other examiners. On receipt of the report from the additional examiner, the Assessment Board shall consider the outcome for the student.

6.6.7 Examinations additional to the Oral

A further examination, in addition to the oral examination, may be requested by the examiners. In such cases the approval of the Chair of the Assessment Board should be sought prior to any examination taking place. Where such an examination is arranged following an oral examination, it shall normally be held within two calendar months of the oral examination unless the Assessment Board permits otherwise. Any such examination shall be deemed to be part of the candidates first examination.

6.6.8 Reassessment prior to Oral Examination

Where the examiners are of the opinion that the AIW is so unsatisfactory that no useful purpose would be served by conducting an oral examination or alternative examination, they may recommend that the Assessment Board dispense with the oral examination or alternative examination and refer the AIW for reassessment. In such cases the examiners shall provide the Assessment Board with written guidance

for the candidate covering the deficiencies of the AIW. The examiners shall not recommend that a candidate fail the AIW without providing an opportunity to hold an oral examination or other alternative examination.

6.6.9 Notification of Deficiencies of the AIW

Where the Assessment Board agrees that the AIW has not been satisfactorily completed and that no re-examination of that specific AIW be permitted the examiners shall prepare an agreed statement of the deficiencies of the AIW and the reason for their recommendation which shall be forwarded to the student by the Chair of the Assessment Board.

6.6.10 Responsibilities of examiners following recommendation of amendments

If a recommendation of amendments is made by the examiners following oral examination, the responsibility for how such amendments will be approved should be clearly indicated on the appropriate form at the oral examination. Either one or both of the examiners may request final approval of required amendments, whether external or internal examiner. If it is specified that both examiners will require final approval, but in the intervening period between recommendations being made and the amendments being submitted for final approval, either of the examiners becomes unavailable, it shall be acceptable for the other examiner to make a final approval, as long as the examiner making final approval is an external examiner. If an external examiner is unavailable, a decision about how final approval of amendments will be done will be taken by the relevant Assessment Board.

6.6.11 Candidate non-submission of required revisions or amendments

Where, following examination, the examiners have recommended that the student be required to make amendments to the AIW, or that revision and resubmission is required for re-examination, a student who does not submit the required amendments, or submit a revised AIW, will be deemed to have failed the AIW. Where the examiners have referred a submitted AIW for revision prior to oral examination (RPO), a candidate who does not submit a revised AIW will be deemed to have failed the AIW.

6.7 Examination Procedures: Re-examination

6.7.1 Criteria and Deadlines

One re-examination of the AIW may be permitted by the Assessment Board, subject to the following requirements:

- a) a student who fails to satisfy the examiners at the first examination including, where appropriate the oral or approved alternative examination or any further examination required (see 6.6.3) may, on the recommendation of the

examiners and with the approval of the Assessment Board, be permitted to revise the AIW and be re-examined;

and

b) the examiners shall provide the candidate, through the Assessment Board, with written guidance on the deficiencies of the first submission;

and

c) subject to the deadline for resubmission of the revised AIW. The student shall submit for re-examination normally within the period of one calendar year from the date of the notification of Assessment Outcomes. The Assessment Board may use its discretion to approve an extension to this period and this should be recorded in the minutes of the Assessment Board.

The Assessment Board may fail any student (with or without oral examination) who fails to resubmit the AIW by the expiry of the deadline for resubmission.

6.7.2 Appointment of Additional Examiner for re-examination

The Assessment Board may require that an additional External Examiner be appointed for the re-examination.

6.7.3 Forms of Re-examination

There are five forms of re-examination:

- a) where the student's performance in the first oral examination or approved alternative examination was unsatisfactory and the Advanced Independent Work was also unsatisfactory, any re-examination shall include a re-examination of the AIW and an oral examination or approved alternative examination (AIW with oral);
- b) where the student's performance in the first oral examination or approved alternative examination was satisfactory but the AIW was unsatisfactory, the AIW is resubmitted and if the examiners, on re-examination, certify that the AIW as revised is satisfactory, then the student may not require an oral examination or approved alternative (AIW only);
- c) where on the first examination the student's AIW was satisfactory but the performance in the oral and/or other examination(s) was not satisfactory, the student shall be re-examined in the oral and/or other examination(s) subject to the time limits prescribed in *Section 6.7.1c) above*, without being requested to revise and submit the AIW (oral examination only);
- d) where on the first examination the candidate's AIW was so unsatisfactory that the Assessment Board dispensed with the oral examination, any re-examination shall include a re-examination of the AIW and an oral or approved alternative examination (refer prior to oral (see 6.6.8));
- e) where on the first examination the AIW was satisfactory but the candidate's performance in relation to the other requirements for the award of the degree was not satisfactory, the examiners may propose a different form of re-

examination to test the candidate's abilities; such examination may take place only with the approval of the relevant assessment board

6.7.4 Examiners' Confidential Independent Preliminary Reports on Re-Examination

In the case of re-examination, each examiner shall read and examine the AIW and submit, on the appropriate form an independent preliminary report before any oral or alternative form of examination is held. In completing the preliminary report, each examiner shall consider whether the AIW provisionally satisfies the requirements of the award and where possible make an appropriate provisional recommendation subject to the outcome of any oral examination, or without the need for further oral being held.

Except where otherwise authorised by the Examiners, the content of the reports will be held in confidence between the Examiners and (following the oral examination) the Assessment Board.

6.7.5 Examiners' Final Report on Re-Examination

Following the re-examination of the AIW, or following an oral or other examination, the examiners shall, where they are in agreement, submit, on the appropriate form, a joint report and recommendation relating to the award of the degree to the Chair of the Assessment Board. The preliminary reports and joint recommendation of the examiners shall together provide sufficiently detailed comments on the scope and quality of the work to enable the Assessment Board to satisfy itself that the recommendation chosen is correct.

Where the examiners are not in agreement, separate reports and recommendations shall be submitted. The recommendations shall be made on the appropriate form.

6.7.6 Examiners' Recommendations following Re-Examination

Following the completion of the re-examination the examiners will recommend that:

- a) the student be awarded a pass in the AIW;
or
- b) the student be awarded a pass in the AIW subject to amendments being made to the AIW [See section 6.6.4] with or without the requirement for a further oral examination
or
- c) the student not pass the AIW and not be permitted to be re-examined.

Examiners may indicate their recommendation on the results of the examination to the student but they shall make clear that the final decision rests with the relevant Assessment Board.

The Re-examination of the Advanced Independent Work is the final attempt available. Where the Assessment Board confirms the decision that a student has not passed the Re-Examination, no further opportunities for reassessment are available.

6.7.7 Amendments following Re-examination

Regulations for amendments following re-examination will mirror those for amendments following first examination [see *Section 6.6.4*].

6.7.8 Non-unanimous Recommendations following Re-examination

Regulations for non-unanimous recommendations following re-examination will mirror those for non-unanimous recommendations following first examination [see *Section 6.6.5*].

6.7.9 Appointment of Additional External Examiner following Re-examination

Regulations for the appointment of an additional External Examiner following re-examination will mirror those for the appointment of an additional External Examiner following first examination [see *Section 6.6.6*].

6.7.10 Recommendation for Failure without oral Re-examination

In the case of a recommendation of re-examination of AIW with oral examination, where the examiners are of the opinion that the resubmitted AIW is so unsatisfactory that no useful purpose would be served by conducting an oral examination, they may recommend that the Assessment Board dispense with the oral examination and fail the AIW. This should not be applied where the first examination outcome was referral prior to oral examination (RPO).

6.7.11 Notification of Deficiencies of the Advanced Independent Work following Re-examination

Where the Assessment Board decides that the AIW fail and the degree not be awarded, the examiners shall prepare an agreed statement of the deficiencies of the AIW and the reason for their recommendation which shall be forwarded to the candidate by the Chair of the Assessment Board.

6.7.12 Responsibilities of examiners following recommendation of Amendments

If a recommendation of amendments is made by the examiners following oral re-examination, the responsibility for how such amendments will be approved shall be clearly indicated on the appropriate form at the oral re-examination. Either one or both of the examiners may request final approval of required amendments, whether external or internal examiner. If it is specified that both examiners will require final approval, but in the intervening period between recommendations being made and the amendments being submitted for final approval, either of the examiners becomes

unavailable, it shall be acceptable for the other examiner to make a final approval, as long as the examiner making final approval is an external examiner. If an external examiner is unavailable, a decision about how final approval of amendments will be completed will be taken by the relevant assessment board.

6.7.13 Student non-submission of required revisions or amendments

Where, following re-examination, the examiners have recommended that the student be required to make amendments to the AIW, a student who does not submit the required amendments, or submit a revised AIW, within the specified time period will be deemed to have failed the AIW. Where the examiners have referred a submitted AIW for revision prior to oral examination (RPO), a candidate who does not submit a revised AIW within the specified time period will be deemed to have failed the AIW.

7. Eligibility for Award

7.1 General Provisions

7.1.1 Profile for Award Eligibility

The regulations for Teesside University awards, their qualification level, standard credit requirements, progression, and available intermediate awards are set out in the 'Schedule of Awards' published in the [Credit Accumulation and Modular Scheme \(CAMS\)](#). Students are considered for a Teesside University award if they have satisfied the general credit requirements for the award defined in CAMS and have satisfied the specific outcomes of the course set out in the *Programme Specification*.

An award is conferred following the meeting of the relevant Assessment Board and the endorsement of the outcomes of that Board. Once an award has been made, students will not be allowed to restudy any part of that award.

7.2 Eligibility for the Award of a Professional Doctorate Award (DClinPsy, EdD, DBA etc.)

In order to be deemed to be eligible for a Professional Doctorate Award, a student must have attained or exceeded the following:

- i. 540 credits of which at least 420 must be at Level 8, inclusive of least 180, and no more than 300 credits of Advanced Independent Work in the form of a thesis or equivalent.
- ii. 30 credits of compensation is permitted at Level 7 in accordance with Section 7.4.

Where this profile is achieved, a student may be eligible for the award of a Professional Doctorate Award. If necessary, and if permitted by course regulations, this will involve confirming the compensation of 30 credits at Level 7 in accordance with Section 7.4.

7.3 Eligibility for Masters Degrees, Postgraduate Diploma's, Postgraduate Certificates, University Certificate in Postgraduate Professional Development

Details of eligibility for these awards can be obtained in the [Taught Masters Level Award Regulations](#) sections 5.2-5.6.

7.4 Compensation of Failed Module(s)

Compensation refers to the process of deliberately balancing a limited amount of underachievement in one aspect of a student's overall performance in the course against an otherwise positive level of performance across the course as a whole. Where a student is eligible for compensation, the Assessment Board will confirm that the failure has been compensated and that credit has been awarded for the module(s).

7.4.1 Application of Compensation

Compensation will automatically be awarded to any module(s) up to a maximum of 30 credits at Level 7 subject to the following conditions:

- i. Compensation can only be applied at the point when the profile for award eligibility has been attained as defined in 7.2 and 7.3;
- ii. Compensation can only be awarded if an overall award average of at least 50% has been achieved across all taught qualifying modules;
- iii. Compensation is only permitted if the failed module(s) has been attempted at the first and/or second attempt;
- iv. Modules determined as non-compensatable at approval or ineligible for compensation may not be compensated;
- v. Modules failed due to academic misconduct are not eligible for compensation;
- vi. Modules failed due to a breach in the [Regulations Relating to Fitness to Practise](#) are not eligible for compensation;
- vii. Compensation is not permitted for Level 8 modules.

7.4.2 Marks for Compensated Modules

Where a module is compensated, the original mark shall be displayed on all communications notifying or documenting the student's achievement (e.g. record of progress, transcript, diploma supplement, etc.).

7.5 Eligibility for Level 7 Awards

Where a student on a Professional Doctorate Award fails to meet the requirements of their primary target award, they may be considered for a Level 7 award as detailed in the Taught Masters Regulations sections 5.3 – 5.7.

8. Grading of Awards

8.1 Grading of Professional Doctorate Awards

Professional Doctorate Awards are made without grade.