

Annual Report on Academic Quality and Standards Assurance

PETER BOARD

Contents

Introduction and Overview	2
Purpose and Structure of the Report.....	2
Regulatory Background.....	2
University's Approach to Academic Governance of Awards	2
University Roles and Responsibilities Relating to Quality Assurance	3
Changes to the Quality Assurance Team	3
Management of the Academic Standards of Awards	4
Quality Assurance Systems and Processes	4
Examination Board System	4
Subject Assessment Panels (SAPs)	4
Progression and Award Boards (PABs)	4
Quality and Standards Operational Oversight	6
Academic Regulations for Taught and Research Awards	6
Operation of PABs.....	6
External Examiner Systems	8
Programme Approvals	9
Annual Programme Review	9
Partnership Review	10
Future Developments within Quality Assurance	11
Risk Based Review	11
Programme Reapproval	11
Subject Assessment Panel Review	12
Conclusion.....	13
Appendix 1 – Summary of changes to Academic Regulations and associated Student Policies and Procedures (2022/23)	14
Appendix 2 – Summary of External Examiner quantitative feedback	20
Appendix 3 – Programme Approvals During the 2022/23 Academic Year	22

Introduction and Overview

Purpose and Structure of the Report

The purpose of this paper is to allow Academic Council to provide the Governing Body with assurance that the University is continuing to meet the quality and standards conditions for its registration as a Higher Education provider in England. It will do so by presenting an overview of 2021/22 work to assure academic quality and the standards of the University's awards, and to improve the student academic experience and student outcomes.

Regulatory Background

During the 2021/22 academic year, the Office for Students (OfS) undertook a series of consultations regarding the regulation of higher education in England. These consultations include:

- [Consultation on a new approach to regulating student outcomes](#)
- [Consultation on constructing student outcomes and experience indicators for use in OfS regulation](#)
- [Consultation on the Teaching Excellence Framework](#)

Additionally, the OfS published a revised set of conditions of registration for registered higher education providers in England:

- [General ongoing conditions of registration](#)

The revised Condition B3 is subject to the outcome of the outcome from the consultation on the new approaches to regulating student outcomes.

The consultation documents demonstrate the intention of the OfS to move towards a risk-based interventionist approach to regulating higher education in England. Furthermore, the consultations indicate that the OfS intends to regulate provision at a subject or programme level rather than considering the performance of institutions as a whole. The proposed shift in the regulatory approach will have a significant impact on the way in which the University monitors the performance of its own provision, with a requirement for us to have effective mechanisms in place to regularly monitor the performance of our programmes to identify potential issues and intervene before they become a cause for concern for the OfS.

University's Approach to Academic Governance of Awards

In order to ensure that the University continues to meet the conditions of registration, the Academic Council has the following responsibility under [University's Articles of Association](#):

The Governing Body shall receive and test assurance from the Academic Council that academic governance including the standard of University awards, the student academic experience and student outcomes are adequate and effective. The Academic Council shall provide to the Governing Body such academic assurance as it may require from time to time.

This responsibility is also reflected in the terms of reference and membership of [the Academic Council](#).

University Roles and Responsibilities Relating to Quality Assurance

The Vice-Chancellor is the University's Accountable Officer with the OfS. Other staff with responsibility for quality assurance include the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Director of Student and Academic Services, Assistant Director of Student and Academic Services (Registry), Head of Quality Assurance, Head of Academic and Learning Enhancement, Faculty Associate Deans for Student Success, Heads of School and Programme Leaders.

Central oversight of quality processes and their implementation across the University, as well as local support for Faculties, is provided by the Quality Assurance Team within Student and Academic Services. Quality Officers represent the Quality Assurance Team at quality related committees, providing impartial advice and guidance to Faculty staff on University and external requirements in relation to quality, while Quality Leads have institution-wide responsibilities for academic planning; programme approval; review and monitoring; academic standards and collaboration. Support for academic learning enhancement and programme development is provided by Information and Library Services from within the function of Academic Learning and Enhancement.

The Head of Quality Assurance and the Head of Academic Learning and Enhancement ensure a coordinated approach to quality assurance and enhancement, while the Assistant Director of Student and Academic Services effects consistent and coordinated approaches to activities within the remit and function of assuring quality and standards across the academic provision.

Changes to the Quality Assurance Team

During the 2021/22 academic year, the University implemented a proposed restructure to the prior Greenwich Learning and Teaching (GLT) Team, creating two separate teams that consist of the Quality Assurance Team and the Academic Learning and Enhancement Team. The Quality Assurance Team are now located within Student and Academic Services directorate and a new Head of Quality, Peter Board, was appointed in March 2022 and Debbie Sheppard was appointed as the Quality Assurance Operations Manager.

The realignment of the teams meant that the Quality Assurance Team now reports into the Registry department within the Student and Academic Services (SAS) directorate under the management of the Assistant Director of SAS (Registry).

Management of the Academic Standards of Awards

The University ascribes to two key principles underpinning its approach to the management of the academic standards of its awards: firstly, that authority for quality management is delegated to the Faculties through their delivery of programmes of study, within mutually agreed University wide frameworks, principles, policies and protocols; and secondly, that engagement with external evaluation of University standards and quality management processes is fundamental. The University's approach to the management of academic standards of the awards we offer is comparable to that adopted by many higher education institutions across the sector.

Quality Assurance Systems and Processes

The Quality Assurance Team are responsible for developing and managing systems and processes for approving new taught programmes, approving any subsequent modifications to these programmes and approving programme discontinuations, ensuring that they comply with the University frameworks and policies and external reference points such as the Competition and Markets Authority [advice to UK higher education providers on consumer protection law](#), the [Framework for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies](#), relevant [Characteristics Statements](#) and any relevant [Subject Benchmark Statements](#).

The Quality Assurance Team also has responsibility for oversight of the Annual Programme Review and External Examiner systems. These processes are designed, and frequently reviewed, to ensure that the University's quality assurance systems and processes continue to be fit for purpose in accordance with a changing regulatory landscape. Information and guidance regarding systems and processes, managed by the Quality Assurance Team, can be found on the [Quality Assurance Team webpages](#).

Examination Board System

To assure standards of marking and the consistency of decisions relating to student progression and degree classification, the University operates a two-tier examination board system: Subject Assessment Panels address module and cohort standards, and Progression and Award Boards deal with individual students' progression and award decisions.

Subject Assessment Panels (SAPs)

The confirmation of module standards takes place at [SAPs](#), which meet prior to Progression and Award Boards and consider the nature of assessment and the resultant marks profiles for all courses within the SAP's subject area. All marks are confirmed as accurate at this meeting, which then permits these to be confirmed for student profiles that ultimately lead to an award.

Progression and Award Boards (PABs)

The [PABs](#), under the delegated authority of Academic Council, are responsible for confirmation of programme standards, student progression decisions and student awards decisions. The PAB will review student profiles of marks for all assessments on modules that a student has taken, considering any instances of extenuating circumstance or academic offence, and make decisions upon student progression and degree classification in accordance with the Academic Regulations.

The Quality Assurance Team provides independent advice on the application of the Academic Regulations alongside any emergency, temporary or derogation-based exemptions, and records all the resultant decisions, ensuring consistency of decisions across different academic disciplines. The Deputy Deans have overall responsibility for the performance of the PABs in their Faculty with delegated authority to Chair the PABs, although in some instances the Chairing of PABs is delegated to other senior members of staff within the Faculty.

Quality and Standards Operational Oversight

The Quality Assurance Team aim to regularly review and revise systems and processes related to the management of quality and standards to ensure that they continue to be fit for purpose, are aligned to the University strategic plan, and continue to meet the requirements of external regulatory bodies. This section identifies some of the key developments to systems and processes during the course of the 2021/22 academic year.

Academic Regulations for Taught and Research Awards

The University of Greenwich's Academic Regulations define the credit framework within programmes must operate, the number and level of credits required to obtain a qualification and the way in which the University will make progression and degree award decisions. At the commencement of the 2021/22 academic year the Student Regulations Committee had responsibility for approving amendments, additions and variations to the Academic Regulations. At the completion of the 2021/22 academic year the Learning, Quality and Standards Committee and Student Regulations Committee was disbanded in readiness for the new academic governance structure due to for implementation in the 2022/23 academic year. In lieu of the closure of LQSC, the Quality and Standards Task and Finish Group was established to manage the continuation of the operational business relating to quality and standards until the new governance structure had been implemented. . The Student Regulations Committee continued to operate until the end of the 2021/22 academic year and retained oversight for the academic regulations including proposed amendments. Both the Student Regulations Committee and the Quality and Standards Task and Finish Group reported into the Student Success Committee which in turn reported into Academic Council.

The latest versions of the Academic Regulations for taught and research awards are available via the below links:

- [Academic Regulations for Taught Awards](#)
- [Academic Regulations for Masters by Research \(MRes\)](#)
- [Academic Regulations for Postgraduate Research Awards](#)

During the 2021/22 academic year the Academic Registry team have made several changes to the Academic Regulations and related Student Policies in readiness for the 2022/23 academic year. Sarah Hills, Manager – Academic Registry, has produced a summary of these changes which is included in Appendix 1 of this report.

Following implementation of the revised governance structure, Learning Quality and Regulations Committee has assumed responsibility for oversight of the university's academic regulations, including the scrutiny of proposed modifications. Learning Qua and Regulations Committee reports to the Student Success Committee which has delegated authority, from Academic Council, to approve any such modifications.

Operation of PABs

Following a successful trial of the online PAB system during the 2020/21 academic year, the 2021/22 academic year saw the roll out of the online PAB system across all Faculties. Feedback received indicates that, despite some initial skepticism, the online PABs have been well received and are generally perceived as representing an improvement on the previous PAB system. In conjunction

with the roll out of the online PAB system, the Quality Assurance Team also worked with other stakeholders to review and enhance the student results letter and associated systems and processes. The revised student results letter is cleaner in its presentation, uses more accessible language and makes it easier for students to quickly understand the decision of the PAB. The introduction of the online PAB also means that we have been able to release student results letters more quickly.

On the 21st April 2022, the Head of Quality presented a proposal to the Quality and Standards Task and Finish Group for PABs to be conducted anonymously. It was outlined that student profiles presented at the PAB would not include details of the students' identities, thus facilitating impartial decisions. Where certain subject areas felt that they had a legitimate rationale to be exempted from this requirement, they were afforded the opportunity to seek an exemption and exemptions were ultimately granted to the Nursing and Social Work subject areas due to Professional Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB) issues. In term 2 of the 2021/22 academic year all PABs, with the exception of Nursing and Social Work, were conducted anonymously.

The adoption of the online PAB system has enabled the Quality Assurance Team to better identify inconsistencies across the University regarding the operation of PABs and interpretation of the Academic Regulations. The key areas identified include:

- **Consistency of approach to Chairing PABs** – This has resulted in a significant difference in the length of time required for PABs to consider student profiles with some PABs able to process hundreds of students in less than two hours, while other PABs take significantly longer to process a much smaller number of students. There are several factors which have resulted in this inconsistency, including the preparations which have been undertaken prior to the PAB, the level of discussion which has been permitted for individual students at the PAB and the particular approach adopted by the PAB to presenting student profiles;
- **Consistency of approach to offering resit opportunities** – The Academic Regulations currently permit the PAB to apply a level of discretion in determining whether to offer students resit opportunities. This has enabled PABs to decide not to offer students a resit opportunity if it felt that there is insufficient evidence that the student has engaged in their assessments and/or the number of resits required would be prohibitive for the student. The Assistant Director of SAS (Student Registry) led a discussion at the meeting of the Quality and Standards Task and Finish Group on the 21st April 2022 to gauge opinions regarding a suitable, consistent approach to offering resit opportunities. The general consensus was that offering students resits on all failed first attempts would provide a fair and consistent approach;
- **Consistency of approach to applying Best Grade Standing** – The Academic Regulations allow that, where a student has failed an assessment at their first attempt but has not been able to exceed the mark achieved with their resit attempt, the PAB can agree to the student's first attempt to stand as their best mark achieved. Generally, it has been interpreted that the best grade should only stand where the student has demonstrated engagement with their resit. However, the Faculty of Engineering and Sciences had, with the approval of the Head of Quality, chosen to interpret the Academic Regulations so that a student's best grade would apply irrespective of whether they had engaged in the resit or not.

The relocation of Quality Assurance Team into SAS, and the appointment of a new Head of Quality, has created a focus on the alignment of the PABs with other services within the SAS directorate. This has resulted in greater collaboration between the Quality Assurance Team and Student Records in planning for the PABs and has meant that both teams have been able to work together to identify

issues at an early stage and plan for any impact which might have resulted. Strengthening the cooperative relationship between the Quality Assurance and the Student Registry Teams will continue to be a priority.

Standardisation of the PABs will continue to be a priority of the Quality Assurance Team over the course of the 2022/23 academic year in order that all students are receiving a consistent and equitable experience, including receiving outcomes from assessments in a timely manner and having the same opportunities to undertake resits. However, there continues to be a number of challenges in achieving this objective, these challenges include:

- **Variations in programme structures and adherence with the academic calendar** – Across the University of Greenwich there are a variety of programmes with differing structures and needs, in many instances programme structures have been designed around specific professional requirements or a particular group of students (e.g. international students). Consequentially some programme structures do not adhere to the standard academic calendar. As such, it has not been possible to align all PAB dates in accordance with the expectations of the academic calendar meaning that some PABs occur later in the academic year than would be expected. Further investigation is needed to understand how we can accommodate the needs of these programmes while also ensuring a consistent application of the regulations for all students;
- **PSRB requirements** – Some programmes have professional accreditation requirements which have impacted upon the operation of the PABs. For example, Nursing and Teaching have traditionally held PABs later than other subject areas to enable students to complete their professional requirements, such as practice hours. However, this has impacted on the ability of some students to complete resits and re-register for the new academic session, which in turn has impacted on their ability to access funding. The Quality Assurance Team will continue to work with affected Schools to identify solutions which work for all stakeholders and avoid any negative consequences for students;
- **Variations in Faculty administrative systems/practices** – While the Quality Assurance and Student Registry Teams attempt to implement standardised systems and processes, variations across Faculties regarding their administrative support can pose a challenge. For example, while some Faculties rely on academic staff to enter marks into Banner, other Faculties have administrative support in place to do this. Similar variations in practice have been seen with the resit mark collection process. Such variations in administrative systems and practices can make it difficult for central services to implement standardised systems and processes.

External Examiner Systems

On the 1st May 2022, the revised OfS [Conditions of Registration](#) came into effect with a focus on principles based quality assurance, rather than rules based quality assurance. Significantly, this means that registered higher education providers in England are no longer required to comply with the [UK Quality Code for Higher Education](#) and, in particular, its requirement to have external examiners. However, while external examiners are no longer a requirement of the regulator, we consider that they continue to be essential for assuring that standards of awards we issue at the University of Greenwich. Additionally, we believe that the external examiner system provides a valuable source of external feedback which academic staff can use to enhance the programmes which we offer.

During the 2021/22 academic year the Quality Assurance Team undertook a review of the external examiner reporting system with a view to ensuring that the report aligns to the updated OfS Conditions of Registration and to strengthen our ability to maintain oversight of external examiner feedback. The result was a revised external examiner report template which can be completed via Microsoft Forms, including a greater number of quantitative questions which are designed to assess compliance of programmes with the Conditions of Registration. The new report template is now in use and, as of the 11th November 2022, 196 reports had been received using the revised template.

Overall responses received indicate that external examiners are satisfied that programmes at the University of Greenwich are of a high standard, provide sufficient academic rigour and are at least equivalent to programmes offered by other UK higher education institutions. Qualitative feedback received generally indicates that external examiners are particularly positive regarding the academic support provided to students.

Programme Approvals

During the 2021/22 academic year the Programme Approval Committee (PAC) had responsibility for oversight of new programme developments, with the Quality Assurance Team having responsibility for coordinating the appropriate programme approval process and reporting back to PAC upon conclusion. During this period, the Quality Assurance Team oversaw the approval of 22 new on campus programmes, of which 11 approvals were for the addition of direct level 5 direct entry routes and 11 were for the addition of new programme titles. Additionally, the Quality Assurance Team also oversaw the approval of 39 partnership programmes, including 16 transnational education partnership programmes and 23 UK partnership programmes.

In total, 2 programmes were approved via two route A approval panels, 23 programmes were approved via six Route B approval panels and 36 programmes were approved via the Faculty Learning and Quality Standards Committees (FLQSCs).

A full list of programmes which were approved during the 2021/22 academic year is included in Appendix 3 of this report.

From the 2022/23 academic year onwards, under the new academic governance structure, it will be the responsibility of Programme and Partnerships Management Committee to maintain and oversight of new programme developments. Additionally FLQSCs have been disbanded as of September 2022, meaning that validating programmes via the FLQSC will no longer be an option and it is therefore anticipated that standing panels will be required to validate new programmes.

Annual Programme Review

The role of Annual Programme Review (APR) at the University of Greenwich requires further consideration to ensure that the process encourages positive engagement for those who interact with it, whilst supporting the university's strategic objectives. Regulatory changes imposed by the OfS, particularly in regard to the condition of registration B3, and resulting institutional developments in response to these changes, such as the introduction of the NSS and Student Outcomes Taskforces, have resulted in some colleagues questioning the purpose of the APR process. Additionally, the timing of the current deadline for submitting the APR is less than favourable for academic colleagues as it falls at the same time as the main June PABs. Consequently, the Quality

Assurance Team have anecdotally seen a drop in engagement with the APR process, unfortunately this is difficult to quantify as we do not currently have reliable or comparable records of data.

The Quality Assurance Team believe that, with some careful consideration, the APR can continue to fulfil a valuable function for the University of Greenwich. For example, we will be conducting APR Scrutiny Groups in January to review APRs received, with a view to focusing on those programmes which have been identified as high-risk as a result of their performance data. We will also use the APR Scrutiny Groups to report on areas of concern which programme teams have identified which relate to either the School, Faculty or Institution and agree actions to be addressed at the appropriate level. In addition, the APR Scrutiny Groups will be asked to consider data relating to BAME Award Gaps, levels of HEA Accreditation and External Examiner feedback.

Moving forward, we hope to work more closely with colleagues across the university to undertake a full review of the APR process and ensure close alignment with the institutional objectives and the work of the NSS and Student Outcomes Taskforces.

Partnership Review

During the 2021/22 academic year, the Quality Assurance Team coordinated six Partnership Reviews for the following partner institutions:

- Mid Kent College, UK
- Yunnan University of Finance and Economics, China
- Hong Kong Space, Hong Kong
- IPMC College of Technology, Ghana
- SEGi Colleges, Malaysia
- New York College, Greece

The Partnership Review of Yunnan University of Finance and Economics identified concerns relating to the migration of the partnership into the Faculty of Engineering and Science and subsequent lack of link tutor support, the language of delivery of the programmes and the students' lack of proficiency in the English language. Consequently the review panel only reapproved the partnership for a further 2 years, with the requirement that a further Partnership Review is conducted in the 2023/24 academic year.

All other Partnership Reviews resulted in the successful reapproval of the partnership for a further period of 5 years.

A further Partnership Review was expected to be conducted during the 2021/22 academic year with the University of Modern Sciences and Arts (MSA) but was subsequently postponed due to ongoing renegotiations of the financial terms. The Partnership Review with MSA is now scheduled to take place in November 2022 during the 2022/23 academic year.

Future Developments within Quality Assurance

The Quality Assurance Team are continually looking to review and enhance our policies and processes to ensure that we are able to support the objectives of the university and respond to external changes, particularly in regard to the regulation of higher education quality assurance. This section provides a summary of areas of focus for the Quality Assurance Team during the 2022/23 academic year.

Risk Based Review

The Office for Students' consultation on a new approach to regulating student outcomes proposes that they will monitor the performance of subject areas based on a series of metrics including continuation, progression and completion. Where the Office for Students identify that a subject area falls below a defined threshold for one or more of these metrics, they may contact the university to request that we provide an explanation for the underperformance and detail what actions we are taking to improve the performance. Outcomes from the National Student Survey (NSS) will also form part of judgements as part of the revised Teaching Excellence Framework. It is therefore becoming increasingly important that institutions have mechanisms in place to identify where programmes may be at risk of falling below one of these thresholds at the earliest possible opportunity.

The objective of the risk-based review is to develop a mechanism by which the Quality Assurance Team can monitor leading metrics to identify programmes which are at risk of falling below the Office for Students' metric thresholds. This will enable us to take action to identify the cause for the underperformance and intervene to put actions in place to improve the performance before they become a cause for concern for the Office for Students. Should any programmes become a cause for concern for the Office for Students at a later date, the university will be able to evidence that we have already identified the concern and have attempted to remedy the situation.

During the 2022/23 academic year, we will continue to work with the university's Planning and Statistics team to identify suitable leading metrics, appropriate timings for monitoring of these metrics and dashboards which can be used to access this information. We will also work with other stakeholders across the university, including key faculty stakeholders and existing forums involved in monitoring the performance of programmes, including the NSS and Student Outcomes taskforces to ensure that the risk-based review process compliments existing mechanisms for enhancing the performance of our programmes.

The risk-based review process will, in part, replace the previous Programme Review process. However, it is our intention that any interventions as a consequence of risk-based review would be targeted only at those programmes which are identified as underperforming and document creation would be kept to a minimum. We believe that this proposed approach to risk-based review would enable the university to minimise the risk of regulatory intervention, reduce the bureaucratic burden associated with the previous Programme Review process and align with the regulatory approach being adopted by the Office for Students.

Programme Reapproval

The removal of the previous Programme Review process means that the university no longer has a mechanism in place for ensuring that we periodically review the content of our programmes to ensure that they continue to be up-to-date, challenging and well delivered, and equip students with

the skills they will need after graduation. The revised condition B1 of the Office for Students' [conditions of registration](#) now explicitly require higher education institutions to ensure that programmes are up-to-date, provide educational challenge, are coherent, are effectively delivered and develop relevant skills.

The Quality Assurance Team therefore intend to develop a programme reapproval process, which is separate to the risk-based review process, to periodically reapprove our programmes ensuring that they continue to meet these requirements. It is our intention that this process would involve external scrutiny of the programmes and would be conducted as a paper-based exercise to minimise the burden on programme teams.

[Subject Assessment Panel Review](#)

It is the intention of the Quality Assurance Team to undertake a review of the SAP system, during the 2022/23 academic year, to ensure that they continue to be fit for purpose and operate consistently across the University. The review will collate information regarding existing practices across faculties in implementing the SAPs, speak to various stakeholders involved in the process, and identify good practices. It is the aim of the review to develop standardised templates and guidance which colleagues in our faculties can use to ensure that SAPs operate effectively and consistently.

Conclusion

During the 2021/22 academic year, the Quality Assurance Team has been undergone a period of transition, with a relocation of the team into the Student and Academic Services directorate and an associated restructure of the team with the creation of the Head of Quality Assurance, Quality Assurance Operations Manager and Quality Assurance Administrator roles. Despite these changes, the Quality Assurance Team have continued to effectively support key functions of the university including the coordination of the validation of new programmes, coordination of Partnership Reviews, supporting the operation of the Annual Programme Review process, and supporting the operation of the university's Progression and Award Boards. During this period the team has also implemented several enhancements to our systems and processes, including the standardization of the operation of Progression and Award Boards across the university, the development of a revised External Examiner reporting system and the development of a refreshed Quality Assurance website.

Moving forward, the team will continue to review our systems and processes to ensure that they are fit for purpose, support the university's objectives and respond to sector wide developments such as the changing regulatory environment.

Appendix 1 – Summary of changes to Academic Regulations and associated Student Policies and Procedures (2022/23)

Student & Academic Services
Academic Registry



Summary of changes to Academic Regulations and related Student Policies and Procedures (2022-23)

We have made some clarifications and changes to several of our academic regulations and related student policies and procedures for the 2022-23 academic year.

Below is a summary of the changes we have made with direct links to the individual documents. You can find all our regulations, policies and procedures on our website at www.gre.ac.uk/policies. This document will also be made available on the website.

Minor changes to wording and/or terminology that do not affect how the regulations, policy or procedure work in practice have not been included in this summary.

Unless otherwise stated, changes apply to all students (continuing and new) with effect from the beginning of the 2022-23 academic year.

If you have a question about any of these changes, please contact your programme team or the [Greenwich Students' Union](#) advice service.

1. [Academic Regulations for Taught Awards](#)

Section 6. Degree classification

D6.5 – the dual calculation for the Integrated Masters award has been removed as the period of dual classification calculation has expired.

2. [Academic Regulations for the Masters by Research \(MRes\)](#)

Section F: Examination of the Research Project

- F3 Examination Panel – Updated to bring together all regulations relating to the Examination Panel (EP) under one section. Clarification has also been provided regarding the structure and requirements of the EP, experience of the examiners, and circumstances for examination for staff members on a PhD programme that subsequently leave the university. The internal and external

examiner content has been moved from section G2 to F3 and merged with the content formerly in F2.

- F4 Oral Examination – NEW SECTION. Allows Faculty Research Degrees Committee (FRDC) to approve an alternative form of examination to the standard oral examination and confirms the acceptable methods by which the oral examination will be conducted. Additionally, students that are prevented from attending the oral examination for valid reasons may now submit a claim for Extenuating Circumstances.

3. Academic Regulations for Postgraduate Research Awards

Section C: Admission of Students

- C2 Doctorate by Published Work – Updated to clarify the process of appointing a reviewer and the process by which the body of work is assessed. These changes provide a decision review process for the applicant and clarify the timelines for reapplication.
- C3 Higher Doctorates – Membership of the Higher Doctorate Panel has been amended to ensure continued rigour in the consideration of applications. A decision review process for the applicant following the decision of the FRDC has also been added.

Section D: Registration, Contractual Obligations and Engagement

D2 Permitted Period of Registration – Permitted periods for a full-time professional doctorate have been added to accommodate the introduction of this mode for the EdD programme. New regulations relating to students returning from interruption have been added including clarification for students and supervisors regarding the process for requesting an extension of interruption.

Section E: Progress and Progression

- E1 General Principles - A new regulation has been introduced and some terminology changes have been made to reflect current practice following the introduction of the new PGR management system (PULSE). The timeframe for submitting a research plan for part-time students has been extended from 4 months to 6 months.
- E2 Programme Specific Requirements: MPhil to PhD - The requirements for a transfer assessment team have been moved from the handbook into the regulations.
- E5 Professional Doctorates (EdD) - New regulations have been added and some terminology changes have been made to reflect the changes introduced by the new PGR management system (PULSE) and the introduction of a full-time mode for the EdD programme.

Section F: Examination and Assessment

- F1.3 Oral Examination - To reflect current practice, the regulations regarding the method by which the oral examination will be held have been updated.
- F1.4 Examination Panels – To ensure continued rigour in the appointment of examination panels, clarification has been provided regarding who may act as an examiner along with the requirements for both internal and external examiners. The role of the Chair has also been updated.

- F1.5 Examination Process - New regulation F1.5.8 has been introduced to clarify the position regarding the attendance of supervisors during the oral examination.
- F1.6 Outcomes - To reflect current practice, new regulation F1.6.2 has been introduced to clarify the role of the FRDC following receipt of the examiners recommended outcome.
- F3 Higher Doctorates - Changes have been made to clarify the role of FRDC in the nomination of examiners by the Higher Doctorate Panel.

4. [Assessment Misconduct Procedure \(Taught Awards\)](#)

Section 8. Assessment Offences Panel – The composition of an Assessment Offences Panel has been amended to reflect structure changes within faculties. Additionally, the requirement for a member from another faculty has been removed to improve timescales for AOPs.

5. [Extenuating Circumstances Procedure](#)

Wording throughout the document has undergone a plain English review in consultation with the Greenwich Students' Union.

Section 9. Right of Appeal - This new section clarifies the right to appeal an Extenuating Circumstances (EC) claim outcome as set out in the Academic Appeals Procedure and clarifies the appeal process where a student has been unable to submit an EC claim by the deadline.

6. [Academic Appeals Procedure for Taught Awards](#)

Wording throughout the document has undergone a plain English review in consultation with the Greenwich Students' Union.

Section 2. Scope - Updated to reflect the changes in section 4. Further amendments to clarify that Academic Registry will now determine the correct procedure and the order in which issues raised should be considered.

Section 4. Grounds for appeal - New section 4.1 has been added advising that an appeal can now be submitted against the outcome of an EC claim within 14 calendar days of the outcome. Section 4.2, dealing with appeals on the ground of an EC claim not submitted by the deadline, has been updated to reflect these changes.

Section 5. How to Appeal – **Section 5.2** has been updated to reflect the addition of section 4.1 and the related deadlines for submission. The strict 14 calendar day deadline for the submission of evidence in section 5.5 has been amended to allow flexibility where we consider that evidence may take longer to obtain.

Section 6. Initial Consideration of the Appeal (formerly Acceptance of Appeal) – this has been updated to include all reasons for rejection at this stage.

7. [Final Review Procedure](#)

Updates have been made throughout the document to align the wording with the procedures that feed into the Final Review procedure.

Section 1. Principles - The right to submit a FR request following the outcome of an Accommodation Conduct investigation has been added.

Section 4. Initial Consideration - Title amended from Filtering Stage to Initial Consideration.

Section 5. Investigation of the Final Review - Updated to reflect the wording in other student-facing procedures. Clarification added for students on how to seek external adjudication from the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIAHE).

Section 6. Final Review Committee - Updated to provide clarity on the membership and arrangements for a Final Review Committee. The membership has been reduced from four to three and can be taken from a wider, more relevant pool of staff to enable committees to be arranged more promptly.

8. [Student Complaints Procedure](#)

Section 1. General Principles

- 1.2 - Clarification has been provided on the requirements for students wishing to submit a group complaint.
- 1.3 - Wording added to clarify our position where a claim contains potential safeguarding concerns.
- 1.5 - Updated to reflect the process flow of the new Student Harassment & Sexual Misconduct Procedure.
- 1.10 - Amended to reflect that Academic Registry are best placed to determine the correct procedure and the order in which the issues should be considered.

Section 4. What does the procedure cover? - Updated to reflect the process flow of the new Student Harassment & Sexual Misconduct Procedure.

Section 5. What issues cannot be considered - Updated to clarify the issues that cannot be considered and the alternative procedures available.

Section 7. Stage 1 Formal Resolution - Addition of an immediate resolution proposal stage prior to a Stage 1 formal investigation for cases that may benefit from simple remedial action.

9. [Student Disciplinary Procedure](#)

This procedure came into effect on 1 June 2022.

How investigations are carried out has been divided into two distinct sections:

- **Section 11. Stage 0 – Preliminary Investigation** which supports quicker resolution prior to a potential formal investigation.
- **Section 12. Stage 1 – Formal Investigation** deals with cases that are either too serious or cannot be resolved at Stage 0. Clarification has been provided regarding the outcome of Stage 1 investigations undertaken by external investigators.

Section 5. Definitions of Misconduct - Clearer definitions of the behaviours that constitute misconduct.

Section 14. Appeals Procedure - This new section specifies the grounds and process by which a student can appeal a summary outcome or sanction issued at any stage of the procedure.

Section 13. Stage 2 University Disciplinary Committee - Clarification of the decision-making power of the University Disciplinary Committee.

Appendix A. Outcomes and Sanctions - All potential outcomes and related sanctions at each stage have been added into a separate appendix for ease of reference.

10. [Accommodation Conduct Procedure](#)

This new procedure provides a simplified disciplinary procedure for minor conduct issues in our halls of residence, replacing conditions that were previously in our accommodation contract. Please see the [article published on 1 August](#) regarding this new policy.

11. [Interruptions, Withdrawal and Transfer Procedure](#)

All sections containing Information for international students on a visa have been updated to reflect current processes.

12. [Student Harassment and Sexual Misconduct Procedure](#)

This policy replaces previous policies on bullying and harassment and sexual violence with a single, over-arching statement of our commitment to preventing and addressing student-related bullying, harassment, discrimination and sexual misconduct. Please see the [article published on 1 August](#) regarding this new policy.

13. [Student Engagement Policy and Procedure](#)

Wording relating to the introduction of Flexible Learning programmes has been added at appropriate sections throughout the document.

Section 3. Key Principles - Clarification on the engagement point of contact for EdD and MRes students has been added.

Section 5. Measuring attendance and engagement

- Taught students Online Teaching – This section has been removed.
- Taught students at project/dissertation stage (postgraduate programmes only) – The engagement point of contact has been increased from monthly to fortnightly. Two consecutive weeks (previously one month) without a point of contact will now be considered as a missed contact.
- Taught students on work or clinical placement – The engagement point of contact has been increased from monthly to fortnightly. Two consecutive weeks (previously one month) without a point of contact will now be considered as a missed contact.
- Students' Union Officers – This new section has been added to clarify the position for students on a student visa undertaking an official role within the Students' Union.

Section 6. Engagement monitoring escalation procedure

The former section on Taught Students has been split out into two distinct sections:

- *Taught students on a student visa* - There is no change to the process, with the escalation point remaining at weekly intervals.
- *All other Taught students* - The escalation interval has been increased from one week to two weeks resulting in one withdrawal point per term. There is no change to how attendance for all other taught students is *recorded* and *monitored*, the change only applies to how non-attendance is *escalated*.

Section 7. Appeals against a withdrawal - Retention and Success Officers (RSO) have been removed from the consideration of appeals, with initial consideration now being undertaken by senior Faculty staff. Additionally, the response time for providing the appeal outcome to students has been reduced from 21 calendar days to 14 calendar days.

Update provided by:

[University of Greenwich Academic Registry](#)

September 2022

Appendix 2 – Summary of External Examiner quantitative feedback

The below tables provide a summary of responses received from external examiners so far in the 2021/22 academic year to quantitative questions in the external examiner report:

Question	Yes	No	Other
Did the sample of student work provided enable you to complete your External Examiner duties?	174	5	17

Question	Agree/ Strongly Agree	Disagree/ Strongly Disagree	Blank	Not enough information to say	Other
The assessments enabled students to demonstrate the knowledge and skills they have developed?	192	1	3	0	0
Assessment design enables all learning outcomes to be assessed at the appropriate level?	187	4	3	2	0
Assessments are designed to enable students to demonstrate their proficiency in written English?	181	2	3	10	0
Assessments are marked consistently and to an appropriate standard?	187	2	3	3	1
Assessments show evidence of moderation and/or second marking to an appropriate standard?	184	3	3	5	1
Assessment feedback is clear and constructive?	177	8	3	7	1
The decision of the PAB was fair, equitable and consistent?	154	0	3	14	25
Assessment design minimises the opportunities for academic misconduct and facilitates the detection of such misconduct where it does occur?	173	0	3	20	0
The curriculum is representative of current thinking and practices in the subject matter?	191	1	3	1	0
The programme/module provides educational challenge that is no less than the minimum level of rigour and difficulty reasonably expected?	190	2	3	1	0

The subjects' content and skills are taught in an order that introduces key concepts at appropriate points?	177	0	3	16	0
The programme/module makes use of subject benchmark statements and the national qualifications framework?	177	0	3	16	0
Resources and support are appropriate to ensure that students receive a high-quality academic experience?	174	5	3	14	0
Students are assessed in a challenging and appropriately comprehensive way, providing stretch and rigour consistent with the level of the course?	189	2	3	2	0
The standards of student performance are comparable to similar programmes/modules in other UK institutions with which you are familiar?	181	9	3	3	0
Student performance has demonstrated their development of knowledge and understanding relevant to the subject matter and level, and other skills including, but not limited to, cognitive skills, practical skills, transferable skills and professional competences?	185	5	3	3	0

Appendix 3 – Programme Approvals During the 2022/23 Academic Year

This Appendix provides a comprehensive list of programmes which were approved by Programme Approval Committee during the 2021/22 academic year. This list does not include programmes where approval was undertaken during the 2020/21 academic year but noted at PAC during the 2021/22 academic year, or new programme proposals which were presented to PAC during the 2021/22 academic year but had not obtained final approval from PAC prior to the end of the 2021/22 academic year.

On Campus

Faculty of Education, Health and Human Sciences:

- PG Cert Academic Professional (Degree Apprenticeship) – School of Education
- MSc Forensic Psychology – School of Human Sciences
- MSc Global Health Management – School of Human Sciences
- MSc Occupational Psychology – School of Human Sciences

Faculty of Liberal Arts and Sciences:

- LLB Law in Practice – School of Law and Criminology
- BA (Hons) Creative Advertising and Art Direction – School of Design

Faculty of Science, Engineering and Computing:

- BSc (Hons) Forensic and Digital Investigation – School of Science
- BSc (Hons) Forensic and Digital Investigation with Industrial Placement – School of Science
- MSc Transformative Change for Sustainable Development – Natural Resources Institute

Greenwich Business School:

- BA (Hons) Business Studies (Yr 2 Entry) – School of Business Operations and Strategy
- BA (Hons) Business with Finance (Yr 2 Entry) – School of Accounting, Finance and Economics
- BA (Hons) Business Logistics and Transport Management (Yr 2 Entry) – School of Business Operations and Strategy
- BA (Hons) Business with Marketing (Yr 2 Entry) – School of Marketing and Management
- BA (Hons) Business Purchasing and Supply Chain Management (Yr 2 Entry) – School of Business Operations and Strategy
- BA (Hons) Business Management (Yr 2 Entry) – School of Business Operations and Strategy
- BA (Hons) Advertising and Digital Marketing Communications (Yr 2 Entry) – School of Marketing and Management
- BA (Hons) Hospitality Management (Yr 2 Entry) – School of Marketing and Management

- BA (Hons) Accounting and Finance (Yr 2 Entry) – School of Accounting, Finance and Economics
- BSc (Hons) Finance and Investment Banking (Yr 2 Entry) – School of Accounting, Finance and Economics
- BSc (Hons) Economics (Yr 2 Entry) – School of Accounting, Finance and Economics
- BA (Hons) Business Management and Leadership – School of Business Operations and Strategy
- MBA Finance – Executive Business Centre

TNE Partnerships

FPT University, Vietnam:

- BA (Hons) Business Management (FPT Hanoi) (Not endorsed + Events Management, Marketing, Public Relations and Communications)
- BA (Hons) Business Management (FPT Ho Chi Minh City) (Not endorsed + Events Management, Marketing, Public Relations and Communications)
- BA (Hons) Business Management (FPT Danang) (Not endorsed + Events Management, Marketing, Public Relations and Communications)
- BA (Hons) Business Management (FPT Can Tho) (Not endorsed + Events Management, Marketing, Public Relations and Communications)
- BSc (Hons) Computing (FPT Hanoi)
- BSc (Hons) Computing (FPT Ho Chi Minh City)
- BSc (Hons) Computing (FPT Danang)
- BSc (Hons) Computing (FPT Can Tho)
- BA (Hons) Graphic and Digital Design (FPT Hanoi)
- BA (Hons) Graphic and Digital Design (FPT Ho Chi Minh City)
- BA (Hons) Graphic and Digital Design (FPT Danang)
- BA (Hons) Graphic and Digital Design (FPT Can Tho)

New York College, Greece:

- BSc (Hons) Biomedical Science (Thessaloniki)
- BSc (Hons) Human Nutrition and Dietetics (Thessaloniki)

Pioneer Institute of Business and Technology, Sri Lanka:

- BSc (Hons) Computing (Cyber Security)

University of Modern Sciences and Arts, Egypt:

- MSc Biotechnology

UK Partnerships

Hadlow College:

- BSc (Hons) Agriculture (Final Year Entry)
- BSc (Hons) Animal Conservation & Biodiversity (Final Year Entry)
- BSc (Hons) Animal Management (Final Year Entry)
- BSc (Hons) Applied Animal Behavioural Science (Final Year Entry)
- BSc (Hons) Equine Training & Management (Final Year Entry)
- BSc (Hons) Horticulture – Commercial (Final Year Entry)

London South East College:

- FdEng Civil Engineering
- FdEng Civil Engineering (Extended)
- FdEng Electrical and Electronic Engineering
- FdEng Electrical and Electronic Engineering (Extended)
- FdEng Mechanical Engineering
- FdEng Mechanical Engineering (Extended)

Mid Kent College:

- HNC Building Services Engineering (Higher Apprenticeship)
- BEng (Hons) Building Services Engineering (Degree Apprenticeship)
- HNC Civil Engineering (Higher Apprenticeship)
- BSc (Hons) Civil Engineering (Degree Apprenticeship)
- HNC Construction (Higher Apprenticeship)
- BSc (Hons) Construction (Degree Apprenticeship)
- HNC Mechanical Engineering (Higher Apprenticeship)
- HNC Electrical Engineering (Higher Apprenticeship)
- HNC Electronic Engineering (Higher Apprenticeship)

Truro and Penwith:

- BSc (Hons) Adult Nursing (Full Time route)
- BSc (Hons) Mental Health Nursing (Full Time route)