

# **Academic Regulations Framework update for 2023/24**

**Drew Li  
Assistant Academic Registrar**

## Faculty Recognition Groups to University Recognition Group

- An attempt to streamline the processes involved in approving credit transfer / RPL claims
- This is already in operation and is being chaired by Clare Milsom (Registrar) or Alison Cotgrave (Academic Registrar)
- There is a commitment to schedule the meetings as often as necessary to ensure that claims are treated in a timely fashion to ensure offers can be made and students credits are entered onto the Student Information System in a more consistent way
- So, claims now need to go to the URG Secretary whose email address is [URGSecretary@ljmu.ac.uk](mailto:URGSecretary@ljmu.ac.uk)

## The treatment of late assessment submissions

- Coursework assessments can be submitted up to 5 working days late but will be capped at the pass mark for the module. This applies to the first attempt at the module only
- Extensions are not impacted by this change. An approved extension is still awarded the full mark.
- However, unauthorised late submissions are flagged as late by the module leader in the SIS gradebook spreadsheet. The work is marked and the full mark entered but the “late flag” will mean that the system caps the component at the pass mark (40% for UG and 50% for PGT).
- This applies at the first attempt only recognising that further attempts are often subject to tighter marking deadlines and the students are capped anyway (and therefore there is no incentive to submit the work on time)
- We are hoping that this will reduce the number of referrals where students would be capped anyway so why not just capped them in the first attempt

## The use of AI in assessments has been recognised in the Regulations

- Cheating to include the submission of material that has been created using artificial intelligence (AI) software, without the prior knowledge and consent of the Module Leader
- In terms of students suspected of cheating without knowledge / consent of the Module Leader we do have the potential to viva a student in the first instance and then potentially proceed to an AMP or if you think there is enough evidence without a viva (e.g References which don't exist etc) then we can consider proceeding directly to AMP
- Module Leaders in their coursework specifications could be making it clear whether AI can be used and to what extent

## Third Attempts

- All students have the right to two referral opportunities in any failed module(s). No further attempts are permitted.
- ESRs and FMAs (or FRAs) will still exist but there will no longer be a Board of Examiner decision whether to award FRAs for students with less than 60 credits.
- ESRs will be given if 100 credits are achieved; Final Referrals (FRAs) will be given if less than 100 credits.
- The benefits of this is that it will be easier for part-time programmes as we can award third attempts rather than having to wait until the student attempts all 120 credits at a level.
- Confirmation that an Exceptional Second Referral and Final Referral Attempt (3rd attempt) is normally scheduled in the following academic year. However, this does give some flexibility.

## Compensation

- Compensation is being re-introduced into the Academic Framework for 2023/24
- Compensation up to 20 credits can be awarded on programmes where students are attempting levels of at least 120 credits. They must achieve a mark of at least 30% (at L3 – L6) or 40% (at L7) in the failed module and have 100 credits at the level.
- Compensation is only applied once the student has been given the opportunity for a referral attempt at the module. It can then be applied to any attempt at the module.
- Confirmation (on compensation) that for PGT programmes, eligibility for compensation is consideration once the 120 credit “taught” element of the programme has been attempted
- Compensation credit, once awarded, cannot be revoked
- **NOTE: If your programme cannot allow compensation due to Professional Body requirements then you need to apply for a variance. The default assumption will be that it is allowed.**

## PGT Borderline Consideration

- PGT Students will now be considered as “borderline” if their award mark is within 1% of the higher award. They will be awarded the higher award if the majority of the credits are in the higher award boundary

	Student A	Student B
Module 1	67%	70%
Module 2	68%	67%
Module 3	56%	71%
Module 4	78%	70%
Module 5	85%	65%
Module 6	70%	68%
Dissertation	67%	70%
Mark	69.44% (Merit)	69.00% (Distinction)

## Whilst we are talking about calculating awards!!

- All classification calculations are calculated to 2 decimal places but this isn't always transparent to students or indeed staff as the transcripts have always displayed the level mean as integers
- Why is this an issue?
  - We have received appeals where students calculate their marks using the integer values appearing on their transcript and then think they are entitled to a higher mark
- We are going to display the mark to 2dp on their transcripts (and it is explained as such in the academic framework)

## A calculation example

L5			L6
5301LAWPL	54	6302LAWSQ	58
5301LAWCL	60	6302LAWAS	63
5301LAWSQ	85	6306LAWBL	50
5304LAWCL	60	6306LAWCL	46
5113LAWPL	68	6315LAWFL	65
5300LAWCL	57	6315LAWFL	65
Average	64	Average	58
Award Mark	59.5		

L5			L6
5301LAWPL	54	6302LAWSQ	58
5301LAWCL	60	6302LAWAS	63
5301LAWSQ	85	6306LAWBL	50
5304LAWCL	60	6306LAWCL	46
5113LAWPL	68	6315LAWFL	65
5300LAWCL	57	6315LAWFL	65
Average	64.00	Average	57.83
Award Mark	59.38		

This is how the student had calculated it using integer values

$$0.25 * 64 + 0.75 * 58 = 59.5$$

They then queried why they were not being rounded up to a 2.1 as per the AF Regulations

Whereas the system actually calculates it to 2dp meaning an average of 59.38 which doesn't round up.

Note: If the student had had more than 60 credits in the higher classification then borderline rules would have upped their classification

# Questions / Clarifications?

