

ROBERT GORDON UNIVERSITY

**ACADEMIC REGULATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE**

Minute of the meeting held on 3 February 2021.

**Present:** V Strachan (Convener), I Bogdan, H Castle, Dr S Christie, J Creasey, Dr N Gibson, J Guest, Dr N Johnson, T Knight, Professor A Lamb, Dr D Lonie, F McLean Whyte, Dr S Officer, Dr E Pirie, Dr B Sutherland, D Sutherland and Dr Y Zhao.

**Apologies:** D Wilson and D Wynne.

**In Attendance:** A Davidson, F Hall (for item 3.), Liv Jonassen (for item 2.) and L Jack (Secretary).

	Action
<p>1. <b>MINUTE</b></p>	
<p>1.1 The Minute of the Meeting held on 7 October 2020 was approved and the extracts from the Minutes of the Meetings of the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee held on 2 December 2020 and Academic Council held on 16 December 2020 were noted. The following matters arising were noted:</p>	
<p>1.1.1 <b>Fitness to Practise (ARSC/21/1/5)</b></p> <p>The <i>Fitness to Practise Procedure</i> was in the process of being finalised for submission to the Sub-Committee for approval. A further meeting of the working group would be held prior to the next meeting of the Sub-Committee in April 2021 with a view to submitting the final draft of the <i>Procedure</i> to the Sub-Committee for approval in April 2021.</p>	<p>H Castle &amp; L Jack</p>
<p>1.1.2 <b>Regulation A4: Assessment and Recommendations of Assessment Boards (ARSC/21/1/6)</b></p> <p>L Jack had met with C Paterson and J Strachan from DELTA to discuss whether there was a technical solution within <i>CampusMoodle</i> to prevent the submission of work to drop-boxes by those students ineligible for assessment at that point in time. Both were confident that there was a technical solution to the issue and the 'job' had been added to DELTA's <i>Moodle Enhancement Plan</i>. Further feedback would be provided at the next meeting.</p> <p>In discussing this item it was suggested that a review of the timing of the dates for the submission of re-assessments might be helpful as students were often waiting an inordinately long period to submit. This was particularly the case for those students on courses with non-standard entry points and the Academic Calendar could usefully be revisited to make it explicit that the re-assessment period for such courses might vary from the norm.</p>	<p>Holding File (April '21 Meeting)</p> <p>V Strachan</p>
<p>2. <b>FIT TO SIT VIDEO</b></p>	
<p>The Sub-Committee received a presentation by Liv Jonassen, DELTA, on the recently developed <i>Fit to Sit Video</i>. The video had been generated, in liaison with the Student Union, following the development of materials for the <i>Welcome</i> project and informed by feedback from the School of Creative and Cultural Business on the need for student friendly videos/materials.</p>	

The video would eventually form one of three, namely:

- Fit to Sit
- How Assessment Works
- Academic Honesty

The Fit to Sit video was ready for launch whilst the intention was to have the remaining two videos available prior to the next assessment period in April 2021.

Members were positive and supportive of the video and noted that it:

- was clear, concise and the tone appropriate in terms of supporting students in their studies whilst also encouraging them to engage with the support processes and packages available;
- provided an indication of the range of support services available to students and how to access them; and
- highlighted the importance of keeping their Schools updated on their circumstances.

The roll-out of the resource was discussed and it was agreed that:

- The video would be made available on the student Welcome pages.
- Details of the video with the relevant link would be included in the forthcoming *Student Bulletin*.
- The link would be shared with Ross Leven, Student President (Communication and Democracy), for distribution to the School Student Officers.
- Following the issue of the *Student Bulletin*, the Academic Quality Officers would forward the link to all Course Leaders.
- It would be highlighted at the forthcoming Academic Regulations Seminar.

L Jonassen

AQOs

L Jack

Thanks were extended to L Jonassen and the Team on the development of a resource which would benefit both staff and students.

### 3. EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY

Members received a report from Fiona Hall, Project Coordinator in Student Life, on progress with regulations and policies relating to hate crime, gender based violence (GBV) and safe guarding.

There was a significant amount of activity being undertaken across the sector in relation to these particular areas and the *Advance HE* was also producing a toolkit with various guidance which would inform the approach taken by universities; these resources would be available by the end of March 2021. A number of initiatives had already been actioned within the University, including the restructuring of the Equality and Diversity Advisory Group (EDAG) into the Equality and Diversity Sub-Committee, a Sub-Committee of the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee. Filippo Antoniazzi, Director of Student Life, had been assigned the lead role in progressing the work around hate crime, gender based violence and safe guarding.

F Hall explained that Student Life had three specific workstreams around these areas, namely: Gender Based Violence, Tackling Racial Harassment and Online Safety and Welfare with safeguarding being common to all three areas. It was explained that general areas of good practice for which guidance was being developed related to: use of non-gender specific language; providing clear definitions of forms of misconduct within *Regulation A3-Section 2 Student Misconduct Procedure* (for example including specific reference to cyber stalking, image abuse, complicity and retaliation); being cognisant of the language used in relation to the individual parties involved; clarity around support, interim measures and reporting, including risk assessment; and clarity of processes relating to investigation, adjudication, discipline, review and appeal.

The *Advance HE* toolkit and guidance would be considered at the April 2021 meeting of the Sub-Committee and policies and *Academic Regulations* revised thereafter. The timescales for completing any revisions to these documents would vary depending on the scale of the changes. It was anticipated that some would be addressed during the scheduled review of the *Dignity at Work and Study Policy* in June 2021. As part of their conditions of enrolment, students signed up to the *Academic Regulations* and so it would be hoped that any updates to the *Regulations* could be made to meet the timescales for enrolment for Session 2021-22. Consistency of information and language between the *Regulations* and *Policy* was important.

**Holding File  
(April '21  
Meeting)**

F Hall presented a number of areas for consideration by the Sub-Committee for adoption within the *Policy*, *Academic Regulations* and associated processes in relation to misconduct investigations, including:

- the use of specially trained gender based violence investigators;
- provision of training to staff to undertake investigations and risk assessment of cases;
- adopting a non-evidence based approach with, instead, a focus on the emotional impact on the party raising the allegation;
- opportunities for either party to appeal an outcome;
- clarity and proportionality of sanctions applicable for each specific form of non-academic misconduct and making this explicit within the *Academic Regulations*;
- timeliness of investigations whilst also being cognisant of the complexities of particular cases;
- availability of investigation outcomes;
- clarity around concurrent police investigation and misconduct investigations.
- encouraging reporting and/or breaking down barriers to reporting;
- gender expression.

Members commented as follows:

- Concerns were expressed regarding the non-evidence based approach to investigations and members would welcome further discussion around how this would operate in practice and within the parameters of the current *Academic Regulations*.
- Allocating sanctions to specific forms of misconduct could prove difficult given the variability and nuances of different cases.
- The *Regulations* currently accommodated the situation where a police investigation was in process and mechanisms were in place to avoid any parallel and/or conflicting investigations. It was noted that the length of police investigations could be quite extensive and potentially impact on a student's graduation.

- Care needed to be taken to ensure that the terminology used by the police in relation to the relevant parties did not prejudice the University's processes.
- The University had a process for the consideration of unspent convictions.
- There would be a responsibility on individuals to reflect any changes to the *Regulations* and policies in, for example, their professional behaviours and language.

Thanks were extended to F Hall and it was agreed that a working group be convened to progress any revisions to the *Academic Regulations* and associated documents. F Hall would be included in the group and any Sub-Committee members interested in participating in the working group should contact L Jack.

Members were advised of some guidance recently issued to the sector by:

- Pinset Masson: [How to Handle Alleged Student Misconduct Which May Also Constitute a Criminal Offence](#)
- Advance HE: [Supporting Staff & Students Experiencing Gender-based Violence \(GBV\) During the COVID-19 Crisis \(sfc.ac.uk\)](#)

#### 4. **ACADEMIC INTEGRITY CHARTER FOR UK HIGHER EDUCATION**

Members considered the [Academic Integrity Charter for UK Higher Education](#), published by the QAA on 21 October 2020, of which the University was a signatory, with a view to identifying any specific actions required on the part of the Sub-Committee and the University. The following points were discussed:

##### **Principle 4: Engage with and empower students**

(i) Whilst information on academic honesty and student integrity was made available in a number of locations, such as *Student Handbooks* and guidance on assessment, there was perhaps less focus on the consequences of established misconduct and the potential sanctions and long term impact which it could have on a student's course of study and their future careers. Members **agreed** that there would be benefit in expanding the information which the University currently provided to students in relation to misconduct, for example by expanding the standard information provided within the *Student Handbook*.

(ii) Engaging students in discussions and activities related to academic integrity could be achieved through the identification of student academic integrity 'champions'. Members **agreed** that it would be reasonable for the School Student Officers to be the student academic integrity champions given that academic integrity was inherent to their role.

##### **Principle 5: Empower and Engage with Staff**

(i) There was a suggestion in the *Charter* that academic champions could be identified within an institution. It was **agreed** that, given their close engagement with the Regulations, members of the Sub-Committee (both academic and non-academic) would be the ideal academic integrity champions within their Schools and Departments.

**Action**

**Sub-Committee Members to L Jack**

**L Jack & V Strachan**

**R Leven (Student President)**

**Sub-Committee Members**

Action

(ii) Whilst the Academic Regulations Seminar often focused on Student Misconduct and sharing of practice, members **agreed** there was a need for more formalised staff training and development around Student Misconduct, particularly in relation to those leading misconduct investigations. The existing expertise within the Schools of Law and Applied Social Studies could potentially be drawn upon for any training materials. Human Resources would be contacted to progress a training programme.

V Strachan to  
Human  
Resources

## 5. REGULATION A1: COURSES

A review was recently undertaken of *Regulation A1: Courses, Schedule 1.1: Awards of the University*. This identified that a number of courses had been ceased and/or award titles changed with the result that a number of those awards listed in *Schedule 1.1* were no longer offered by the University and so could be removed. It was confirmed that a new process had now been adopted between the Academic Development Committee, Academic Council and the Academic Regulations Sub-Committee to ensure more timely updates were made going forward.

### **Recommendation from the Sub-Committee to Academic Council:**

Awards to be removed with immediate effect [following approval by Academic Council) were ~~scored through~~ and those requiring removal in Session 2021-22 and/or once all students were completed were underscored (refer [Appendix](#))

L Jack to  
Academic  
Council  
17/03/2021

## 6. REGULATION A3: STUDENT CONDUCT AND APPEALS

### 6.1 Enrolment Pending an Appeal

Members considered a paper relating to a student's enrolment status pending an appeal (also refer ARSC/21/1/5.2). In accordance with *Regulation A3: Student Conduct and Appeals*, paragraph 5.1, a student's enrolment shall be continued pending the outcome of an appeal.

Whilst the Regulation related specifically to where a student's studies had been discontinued, the general principle of the Regulation was applied to the majority of appeals with a view to ensuring that students were not disadvantaged in the event their appeal was successful. However, there were instances where a student's desired outcome as detailed in their *Student Appeal From: Academic Appeal* might be unrealistic and contrary to the Academic Regulations, for example proceed carrying numerous failed modules to the subsequent stage. It would not be appropriate to prevent the student from continuing, though, as this would be pre-judging the outcome of the appeal.

Members agreed that the approach adopted was appropriate and permitting students to continue pending an appeal posed less of a risk than not permitting a student to continue. The wording of paragraphs 5.1 (*Regulation A3-1*) and 5.1.1 (*Regulation A3-2*) was updated to:

- reflect the current practice of permitting students to continue to a subsequent stage of the course whilst an appeal was pending;
- make it explicit that the student's desired outcomes, as articulated in the *Student Appeal Form Academic Appeal – Award and Progression* and *Student Appeal Form Misconduct*, would not necessarily be approved thereby helping to manage students' expectations.

***Recommendation from the Sub-Committee to the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee:***

L Jack to  
QAEC  
[4/3/21]

From Session 2021-22, *Regulation A3, paragraphs 5.1 (A3-1) and 5.1.1 (A3-2)* be amended as follows [new text underlined]:

## **5. Implications for Enrolment and Graduation**

- 5.1 Where a student has had their studies discontinued or progression curtailed and has initiated an academic appeal, the student's enrolment and progression shall be continued and, assuming all pre-requisites for the modules concerned have been met, the student shall be permitted to attend classes and to undertake assessments pending the resolution of the appeal. Any such enrolment shall in no way imply that the student's appeal will be successful or that the student's desired outcome shall be approved.

[*Regulation A3 – Section 1: Academic Appeals (Award and Progression) Procedure*]

### **5.1 Enrolment status pending an Appeal**

- 5.1.1 Where a student has had their studies discontinued or progression curtailed and an appeal is pending, the student's enrolment and progression shall be continued and, assuming all pre-requisites for the modules concerned have been met, the student shall be permitted to attend classes and to undertake assessments pending the resolution of the appeal. Any such enrolment shall in no way imply that the student's appeal will be successful or that the student's desired outcome shall be approved.

[*Regulation A3 – Section 2: Student Misconduct Procedure*]

## **6.2 Protocols for Misconduct Hearings**

Members considered a paper relating to *Regulation A3 - Section 2, paragraph 7: Misconduct Hearing Arrangements* (also refer ARSC/21/1/5.4). The Regulation indicated that 'other relevant parties' might be included in a *Misconduct Hearing* and this provided the Head of School with discretion to include staff relevant to the case, for example representation from the IT Department, Department for the Enhancement of Learning, Teaching and Access (DELTA) and Estates. This was of particular benefit where the alleged misconduct may be outwith the expertise of the School staff, for example inappropriate use of IT.

The *Sample Correspondence and Guidance* had been updated to include a reminder to Heads of School that 'relevant parties' should be invited to the *Misconduct Hearing* as appropriate and specific examples had been provided. Members indicated a general satisfaction with the *Regulation A3 – Section 2, paragraph 7.2(ii)* in its current form but agreed some minor rewording to make it clear that the Head of School might include representatives from other Departments or Schools relevant to the case and that such individuals might be part of the *Misconduct Hearing* decision making body or be called as witnesses depending on the circumstances. In addition, it was thought helpful to include reference to a 'nominee' as, depending on the particular circumstances, the Head of School might nominate the Convener-ship to an alternative member of staff.

***Recommendation from the Sub-Committee to the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee:***

L Jack to  
QAEC  
[4/3/21]

From Session 2021-22, *Regulation A3 – Section 2, paragraph 7.2*, be revised as follows [new text underlined]:

**7.2 Misconduct Hearing Arrangements**

The Head of School shall:

- (i) arrange a *Misconduct Hearing* with the student at the earliest possible opportunity and normally not later than 10 working days after the allegation has been received by the Head of School;
- (ii) be accompanied to the *Misconduct Hearing* by a note-taker and staff appropriate to the circumstances of the allegation, though typically no more than three members of staff will be present (in addition to the note-taker), and may include the Course Leader, Module Coordinator, Personal Tutor, Head of Graduate School or any other parties relevant to the allegation, such as staff from other Schools or Departments. The Head of School, or nominated Convener of the *Misconduct Hearing*, may also call witnesses relevant to the allegation;
- (iii) issue such notification of the date, time and venue of the *Misconduct Hearing* and the details of the alleged misconduct to the student by email, and advising of their entitlement to be accompanied by two persons (who should not be materially involved), to call witnesses, and that the Student Union may be contacted for advice and support;
- (iv) advise the student in writing that if they fail to attend, without good reason, the *Misconduct Hearing* may proceed in their absence, without this constituting grounds for appeal.

**6.3 Academic Appeals and Temporary Suspension of Studies**

Members considered a paper relating to the application of the timescales for submitting an academic appeal to students who were on a period of temporary suspension of studies.

In accordance with *Regulation A2, paragraph 9: Temporary Suspension of Studies*, when a student was on a period of suspension there was no expectation that they would engage with their studies or University associated activities. In the event a student had undertaken assessments prior to commencing their period of suspension then practice was to take those provisional grades to the relevant Assessment Board for consideration. This not only allowed pass grades to be confirmed but it also allowed for any re-assessment(s) to be identified and to be undertaken on the student's return to studies following their suspension.

In accordance with *Regulation A3 – Section 1, paragraph 7: Academic Appeals Procedure: Stage 1 – Submission of Appeal*, any appeal should be submitted no later than 10 working days following publication of results from the Assessment Board. Members' discussed the timescales for submission of an appeal by a suspended student in relation to whether the student's 10 working day period for appealing should be calculated from the date of the Assessment Board or the date that the student returned from their period of suspension.

To date Heads of School and Conveners of Assessment Boards had exercised a degree of discretion around such appeals, thereby ensuring the suspended student was not disadvantaged and members confirmed support for this approach. An individual's circumstances and their reasons for embarking on a period of suspension could vary quite significantly and it would be inappropriate to expect a student to appeal whilst on a period of suspension. Conversely there might be instances where it would be of benefit to the student to pursue an appeal, or continue with an appeal, whilst suspended.

Members were not minded to revise the Regulation in its entirety but instead suggested that a footnote be applied to the Regulation to make it clear that there might be discretion to those timescales in the situation where a student was suspended.

L Jack

It was agreed that the *Suspension of Studies Request Form* be further amended to incorporate guidance on the applicable timescales for appeals. In addition, it was agreed that the *Form* would also benefit from a statement encouraging students to contact their Course Leader at least one month prior to re-entry to the course thereby permitting any relevant support to be in place in time for the student's re-entry.

L Jack

***Recommendation from the Sub-Committee to the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee:***

L Jack to  
QAEC  
[4/3/21]

From Session 2021-22, *Regulation A3 – Section 1, paragraph 7.3*, be revised to include a footnote as follows [new text underlined]:

## 7. Academic Appeals Procedure: Stage 1 - Submission of Appeal

7.3 The student shall submit the *Student Appeal Form: Academic Appeal* normally no later than <sup>±</sup>10 working days after publication of the results. The *Student Appeal Form: Academic Appeal* shall be submitted electronically to the School's specified email address; an automatic acknowledgement of receipt will be sent to the student and it shall be the student's responsibility to ensure that they receive such a receipt. It shall be the student's responsibility to ensure full and accurate contact details are provided on the *Student Appeal Form: Academic Appeal*. All communications to a student relating to the *Student Appeal Form: Academic Appeal* shall be sent by email.

- <sup>1</sup> If a student is on a *Temporary Suspension of Studies* then the 10 working days shall commence from either the date of the publication of the results or from the date the student resumes their studies. If the *Student Appeal Form: Academic Appeal* is not received within 10 working days of the publication of results then it will be assumed that the ten working days will commence from the date the student resumes their studies.

## 7. SUPPORT FOR DEFERRING/APPEALING STUDENTS

Members considered a paper provided by Annette Davidson, Inclusion Manager, on the provision of support for those submitting *Deferral Request Forms* and/or academic appeals. (Note: relevant forms and guidance were located at: [www.rgu.ac.uk/academicregulationsstudentforms](http://www.rgu.ac.uk/academicregulationsstudentforms))

The Inclusion Centre: Disability and Dyslexia and Counselling & Wellbeing was available to support all students and could be instrumental in providing letters and/or evidence in support of deferral requests and academic appeals. Such support also negated the need for students to seek additional evidence from third parties and potentially 'overshare' personal details within the relevant forms. Not all students were aware of the support that was available to them and feedback from Schools was that students raised issues in appeals which they had failed to divulge previously. Early intervention was preferable to crisis intervention and mechanisms for directing students to such support at the earliest opportunity were discussed. It was agreed that it would be helpful if the *Academic Regulations Student Forms* web page and relevant forms could include a link to the available support services.

L Jack

Furthermore, there were times when students could cite quite complex mental health issues and there would be benefit to them engaging with central support services. The potential to augment the relevant forms with an 'opt in' box for students to indicate if they would be happy for central support services to contact them was considered and it was agreed that this would benefit from further discussion.

Holding File

The duration of extensions in relation to submission dates and the timescales for the consideration of *Deferral Request Forms* were also discussed, particularly in relation to students being unaware of the outcome of their request(s) prior to the assessment date. It was agreed that this would be included in the Academic Regulations Seminar.

L Jack

## 8. COMPLAINTS HANDLING PROCEDURE

### 8.1 Revised Complaints Handling Procedure

Members considered the draft revised *Complaints Handling Procedure* (CHP) and associated staff training schedule prepared by F McLean Whyte. It was noted that it was a legal requirement that all *Complaints Handling Procedures* across the Scottish higher education sector were updated to reflect the revised *Model Complaints Handling Model* as developed by the *Scottish Public Services Ombudsman* (SPSO). The revised CHP had been divided into five separate sections comprising:

- Introduction and overview;
- *When to use this procedure*
- *The Complaints Handling Procedure*;
- *Governance*;
- *A guide for complainants*.

F McLean Whyte highlighted a number of key aspects including:

- Incorporation of provision for resolution of a complaint through mutual consent;
- Guidelines on the processes for acknowledging a complaint and the requirement to clearly detail the points of investigation and to seek agreement from the complainant on those points.
- Reduction in the timescales for the submission of a Stage 2 complaint from 12 months to 6 months.

A programme of awareness-raising and training sessions would support the implementation of the new *Complaints Handling Procedure* and the potential to develop an online module, drawing on the SPSO's training materials, was being explored. Furthermore, three members of University staff would be attending a 2-3 day SPSO Stage 2 Investigation Skills training event during March 2021 and, thereafter, training would be rolled out to the University Management Group during March and April 2021.

It was anticipated that there would be common skills required for any staff undertaking investigation whether it be for complaints or *Misconduct Hearings* and there could be benefit in having some joint investigation skills training sessions (also refer items 3 and 4.).

F McLean  
Whyte

Members views were sought on a number of specific points as follows:

- CHP1.20 Recording and the use of recordings: It was **agreed** that it would be helpful to include a statement that recording of meetings/hearings associated with the *Complaints Handling Procedure* would not normally be permissible. The written record of any meetings/hearings produced by the University would be the official record and could be made available in alternative formats as required. In the event there was a specific reason to record a particular meeting then this would be undertaken by the University.
- CHP2:16 Supporting vulnerable groups: It was **agreed** that F McLean Whyte would liaise on this section with H Castle and A Davidson outwith the meeting.
- CHP2:21 Receiving complaints through social media: Members **agreed** that complaints received via this medium could be directed to the CHP.
- CHP3:26 Receipt of complaint: Members **agreed** that managing the expectations of complainants was important and explicitly stating that any correspondence received after 16:00 GMT would be marked as having been received on the next working day would help manage those expectations.

F McLean  
Whyte

- CHP3:27 Consent: It was **agreed** that the University would deem consent to handling a complaint in line with the CHP unless the party indicated otherwise.

Members confirmed support for the revisions to the *Complaints Handling Procedure*, subject to the above points. Members were asked to direct any further comments to F McLean Whyte prior to the submission of the document to the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee.

During discussions around investigations, the arrangements for virtual *Misconduct Hearings* were explored and, specifically, whether it should be a requirement that a student should be visible on screen for such *Hearings*. It was agreed that there was an expectation a student would *normally* be visible and it was agreed that this could be incorporated in to the [Guidance on Misconduct Hearings](#). Furthermore, it was agreed that it could be explored at a future Academic Regulations Seminar.

Action

All Members  
to F McLean  
Whyte

L Jack

Holding File

## 8.2 Annual Report of Complaints

Members considered the Annual Report of Complaints: 1 August 2019 to 31 July 2020. It was a particularly helpful report and indicated that a reasonable number of complaints were being processed. It was noted that complaints could span different categories and that had been accommodated within the figures detailed within the Report (and was detailed in the centrally shared spreadsheet) though it was not entirely transparent in the Report. Members were encouraged to share the Report with their Schools and Departments.

All Members

## 9. ACADEMIC REGULATIONS SEMINAR

The next Academic Regulations Seminar was scheduled for Monday, 22 February 2021 and would focus on the areas of: self-certification; Assessment Boards; and the role of the External Examiner.

## 10. FUTURE BUSINESS

No items were identified for consideration at future meetings at this point. If any items did arise then members should submit these to the Committee Secretary and/or Convener .

Members to  
L Jack/V  
Strachan

## 11. ANY OTHER COMPETENT BUSINESS (AOCB)

There was no further business to consider.

## 12. FUTURE MEETING DATES

The next meeting of the Academic Regulations Sub-Committee would be held on Thursday 22 April 2021 at 9.15 am on [Teams](#).

## REGULATION A1: COURSES

Awards to be removed with immediate effect are ~~scored through~~ and those requiring removal in Session 2021-22 and/or once all students are completed are [underscored](#).

### SCHEDULE 1.1: AWARDS OF THE UNIVERSITY\*

1. Undergraduate awards conferred by the University are:

Certificate of Higher Education	CertHE
Diploma of Higher Education	DipHE
Graduate Certificate	GradCert
Graduate Diploma	GradDip
Bachelor of Arts with Honours	BA (Hons)
Bachelor of Arts	BA
<del>Bachelor of Design with Honours</del>	<del>BDes (Hons)</del>
<del>Bachelor of Design</del>	<del>BDes</del>
Bachelor of Engineering with Honours	BEng (Hons)
Bachelor of Engineering	BEng
Bachelor of Laws with Honours	LLB (Hons)
Bachelor of Laws	LLB
<a href="#">Bachelor of Midwifery</a>	<a href="#">BMidwifery</a>
<a href="#">Bachelor of Nursing with Honours</a>	<a href="#">BNursing (Hons)</a>
<a href="#">Bachelor of Nursing</a>	<a href="#">BNursing</a>
<del>Bachelor of Science (Engineering) with Honours</del>	<del>BSc (Eng) Hons</del>
Bachelor of Science (Engineering)	BSc (Eng)
Bachelor of Science with Honours	BSc (Hons)
Bachelor of Science	BSc
Master of Diagnostic Radiography	MDRad
Master of Dietetics	MDiet
Master of Engineering	MEng
Master of Occupational Therapy	MOccTh
Master of Pharmacy	MPharm
Master of Physiotherapy	MPhys
Master of Science	MSci

In addition, Graduate Apprenticeship awards conferred by the University are:

Higher Apprenticeship in:

- |                                   |                                 |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| - Certificate of Higher Education | Higher Apprenticeship in CertHE |
| - Diploma of Higher Education     | Higher Apprenticeship in DipHE  |

Graduate Apprenticeship in:

- |                                 |                                      |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| - Bachelor of Arts              | Graduate Apprenticeship in BA        |
| - Bachelor of Arts with Honours | Graduate Apprenticeship in BA (Hons) |
| - Bachelor of Engineering       | Graduate Apprenticeship in BEng      |

\* The University also confers Higher Doctorates and Honorary Degrees as contained in [Regulation A7, paragraph 1](#), and [Regulation A8, paragraph 1.1](#) respectively. Such awards may also be conferred posthumously in accordance with [Regulation A4, paragraph 16](#).

- Bachelor of Engineering with Honours Graduate Apprenticeship in BEng (Hons)
- Bachelor of Science Graduate Apprenticeship in BSc
- Bachelor of Science with Honours Graduate Apprenticeship in BSc (Hons)

An Aegrotat Degree or an Aegrotat Degree (Unclassified Honours) may be conferred in accordance with [Regulation A4](#) and only where it is not precluded by the relevant professional, statutory or regulatory body.

2. Postgraduate awards conferred by the University are:

Postgraduate Certificate	PgCert
Postgraduate Diploma	PgDip
Master of Architecture	MArch
Master of Arts	MA
Master of Business Administration	MBA
<del>Master of Business Management</del>	<del>MBM</del>
<del>Master of Design</del>	<del>MDes</del>
<del>Master of Education</del>	<del>MEd</del>
<del>Master of Fine Art</del>	<del>MFA</del>
Master of Laws	LLM
<del>Master of Midwifery</del>	<del>MMidwifery</del>
<del>Master of Nursing</del>	<del>MNursing</del>
<del>Master of Public Administration</del>	<del>MPA</del>
Master of Science	MSc

3. Research degrees conferred by the University are specified in [Regulation A6: Research Degrees, paragraph 1](#).