

Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee

Thursday 19 March 2026 at 2:00pm

Cuillin Room, Charles Stewart House / Teams

AGENDA

1.	Welcome and apologies	
2.	Minutes of the previous meeting For approval <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 22 January 2026 	APRC 25/26 3A
3.	3.1 Matters Arising <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convener's communications • Actions log 3.2 Report of Convener's Action <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of approved concessions 	Verbal Update
4. SUBSTANTIVE ITEMS		
4.1	Undergraduate Degree Regulations 2026/27 For discussion and recommendation to Court	APRC 25/26 3B
4.2	Postgraduate Degree Regulations 2026/27 For discussion and recommendation to Court	APRC 25/26 3C
BREAK		
4.3	Taught Assessment Regulations Resit Proposal For discussion and approval	APRC 25/26 3D
4.4	Late Exceptional Circumstances – handling of accepted cases For discussion and approval	APRC 25/26 3E
5. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/NOTING		
5.1	Committee Administration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • APRC Membership • APRC Terms of Reference To note Committee Priorities 2025/26: To note <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of curriculum framework arising from Learning and Teaching Workstream • Scheduled review of policies 	
6.	Any Other Business	

<p>Date of next meeting Thursday 21 May 2026, 2-5pm, Cuillin Room, Charles Stewart House</p>		

Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee**Thursday 22 January 2026 at 2:00pm****Cuillin Room, Charles Stewart House / Teams****AGENDA**

<p>Present: Victoria Buchanan</p> <p>Dr Adam Bunni Dr Lawrence Dritsas Lisa Dawson Amanda Fegan Clair Halliday Karen Howie</p> <p>Heather Innes</p> <p>Professor Linda Kirstein Professor Dave Laurenson Isabel Lavers Meg Batty (Secretary) Catriona Morley Dr Chris Mowat Dr Emily Taylor (Convener) Kirsty Woomble Dr Matt Bell Professor Ruth Andrew Dr Kirsten Phimister</p>	<p>Director, Disability and Learning Support Service (Co-opted member)</p> <p>Head of Academic Policy, Academic Quality and Standards Dean of Students (CAHSS) Academic Registrar, Registry Services Head of Postgraduate Research Student Administration (CSE) Deputy Manager, The Advice Place Head of Digital Learning Applications and Media, Information Services Academic Engagement Coordinator, Students' Association (Co-opted member) Dean of Education (CSE) Senate representative (CSE) Academic Administration Manager (CMVM) Academic Quality and Standards Manager Head of Taught Student Administration & Support (CAHSS) Dean of Students (CSE) Dean of Quality Assurance and Curriculum Validation (CAHSS) Head of Postgraduate Research Student Office (CAHSS) Senate representative (CSE) Director of Postgraduate Research (CMVM) Head of Taught Student Administration (CSE)</p>
<p>In attendance: Katy McPhail Daniel Davis Wood (Observer)</p>	<p>Head of Taught Student Administration (CSE) Student Advisor (MHSES)</p>
<p>Apologies: Lucy Evans Katya Amott Professor Gill Aitken Dr Valentina Ferlito</p>	<p>Deputy Secretary, Students (Co-opted member) Vice President Education, Students' Association Dean of Education (CMVM) Senate representative (CMVM)</p>

1.	<p>Welcome and apologies</p> <p>The Convener welcomed new members of the Committee, as well as staff who were in attendance in order to present a paper or observe the meeting.</p> <p>The Convener also noted apologies for the meeting and confirmed that there were no substitutions.</p>																				
2.	<p>Minutes of the previous meeting</p> <p>To Note</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18 September 2025 OPEN • 18 September 2025 CLOSED <p>The Convener noted both the Open and Closed September 2025 meeting minutes were confirmed via electronic business following the cancellation of the November 2025 meeting. The open minutes have been published on the website.</p>																				
3.	<p>3.1 Matters Arising</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convener's communications • Actions log <p>The action log is up to date and the following actions are ongoing:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="279 1037 1465 1532"> <thead> <tr> <th>Action</th> <th>Responsible</th> <th>Target date</th> <th>Action status</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Confirm whether we can obtain data on degree completion rates for PGR Students with concessions, as well as numbers of College-level concessions</td> <td>APRC Administrator</td> <td>Not defined</td> <td>Ongoing</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Discuss readmission processes following withdrawal with Student Recruitment and Admissions.</td> <td>Academic Quality and Standards</td> <td>Not defined</td> <td>Ongoing</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CMVM to work with Academic Quality and Standards to ensure parity between Undergraduate Degree Regulation 6 and required credits for BVM&S.</td> <td>BVM&S staff / CMVM</td> <td>March-26</td> <td>Ongoing- to update at the March Meeting</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Consult with Health and Safety regarding who is to conduct the risk assessment and how these should be reviewed, where necessary.</td> <td>Academic Quality and Standards</td> <td>March-26</td> <td>Ongoing- to update at the March Meeting</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Head of Academic Policy gave an update on Action 2. Student Recruitment and Admissions are liaising with admission leads in Colleges to discuss this process. The proposal is for students who are accepted for readmission not to have to go through the full UCAS process but a lighter touch process. Readmission is, however, not guaranteed and remains at the discretion of the University. The aim is to put together guidance for Student Advisors to advise students at the point of withdrawal.</p> <p>Members felt that advice on fees and Immigration would be useful in the Student Advisor guidance.</p> <p>3.2 Report of Convener's Action</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceptional Amendment to TAR Regulation 55.3 	Action	Responsible	Target date	Action status	Confirm whether we can obtain data on degree completion rates for PGR Students with concessions, as well as numbers of College-level concessions	APRC Administrator	Not defined	Ongoing	Discuss readmission processes following withdrawal with Student Recruitment and Admissions.	Academic Quality and Standards	Not defined	Ongoing	CMVM to work with Academic Quality and Standards to ensure parity between Undergraduate Degree Regulation 6 and required credits for BVM&S.	BVM&S staff / CMVM	March-26	Ongoing- to update at the March Meeting	Consult with Health and Safety regarding who is to conduct the risk assessment and how these should be reviewed, where necessary.	Academic Quality and Standards	March-26	Ongoing- to update at the March Meeting
Action	Responsible	Target date	Action status																		
Confirm whether we can obtain data on degree completion rates for PGR Students with concessions, as well as numbers of College-level concessions	APRC Administrator	Not defined	Ongoing																		
Discuss readmission processes following withdrawal with Student Recruitment and Admissions.	Academic Quality and Standards	Not defined	Ongoing																		
CMVM to work with Academic Quality and Standards to ensure parity between Undergraduate Degree Regulation 6 and required credits for BVM&S.	BVM&S staff / CMVM	March-26	Ongoing- to update at the March Meeting																		
Consult with Health and Safety regarding who is to conduct the risk assessment and how these should be reviewed, where necessary.	Academic Quality and Standards	March-26	Ongoing- to update at the March Meeting																		

Following approved changes to the programme by CSE College Boards of Studies, the weighting information for the Physics with Year Abroad programme in Regulation 55.3 of the Taught Assessment Regulations was removed. This had gone through the right process at College level but had not been reflected in the TAR.

- **Update to the Sensor and Imaging Systems (SIS) MSc**

A paper was submitted to APRC for approval via electronic business in June 2025. The paper author notified the Convener of a change in the publicised wording to remove ambiguity on the availability of the approved resit type for non-SIS MSc Students. It was agreed the wording does not materially change anything about the nature of the exemption previously approved in June via APRC.

- **Summary of approved concessions approved via Convener's Action 25/26 (since previous meeting on 18 September 2026)**

The 24/25 annual concession report was shared via electronic businesses following the cancellation of the November meeting.

2025/26 (from last meeting in September- Mid January)

Total number of individual Student concessions approved: 35

Total number of individual Student concessions rejected: 0

Total number of cohort concessions approved: 0

The Convener reflected on a number of themes apparent from the concession requests and the Committee discussed:

- In 24/25 we saw majority AIS concession requests, these have substantially reduced and we are seeing increasing numbers of programme extensions.
- We are increasingly seeing the extension of full-time PGR programmes up to 8/9 years. Within some of the concession requests where a student is in the process of writing up their thesis, staff are stating that these extensions have no financial impact to the University. This is, however, incorrect as it will result in additional Student Services time and additional supervisor time.
- A number of cases have been received after the student's end date has passed resulting in the concession request being applied retrospectively. Whilst this is in evidence in PGT and UG, it has been most prevalent at PhD level. This is poor governance and creates a risk.
- In several concessions' requests, the filing on EUCLID is not kept up to date e.g., years without supervisory meetings, annual reviews, attendance not recorded or EC decisions not recorded. This makes it difficult for College Committees to understand what has been happening and on follow up supervisory and annual reviews have not been happening.
- APRC has sought to encourage more withdrawal with the opportunity to return to study at a later date and not permit continuous extensions as in many cases this can be in the best interest of the student. Director, Disability and Learning Support Service supported this as there are complex circumstances where Schools extend as they feel that is the right thing to do but it may be best to withdraw them and allow readmittance.

In relation to EUCLID recording, the Committee discussed how supervisors' recording of supervision is not a uniform practice and have differing expectations within Colleges on the expectations around EUCLID filing e.g., CAHSS record every supervisory meeting, whereas CSE and CMVM supervisors may see their students in labs on a daily basis, so are not expected to record every session. The Director of the Disability and Learning Support Service supports improved record keeping on the basis of legal challenges for not providing adjustments and cases with no records makes it difficult to respond.

	<p>CSE brought a report on the PGR annual review completion data to their College Committee which successfully encouraged supervisors to ensure meetings and annual reviews are completed and recorded in EUCLID.</p> <p>Action: Colleges are asked to remind supervisors of the need to maintain effective records in Euclid of periodic supervision and all annual reviews.</p> <p>Action: Colleges are asked to advise schools of the need to keep track of student journeys to avoid the need for retrospective concession requests.</p>
4.1	<p>Board of Examiners Review – Implementation of a New Late Applications Process for Exceptional Circumstances For discussion</p> <p>The Convener clarified that Senate had voted to withdraw the delegated authority from APRC to approve any policy in relation to the Board of Examiners Project. The role of APRC is to discuss and decide whether to endorse the paper for the March Senate Meeting. This paper does not outline a policy change but a process change therefore we need to consider if the process is compliant with existing policy.</p> <p>The paper was presented by Dr Adam Bunni, Head of Academic Policy, Academic Quality and Standards and Katy McPhail Head of Student Record Operations.</p> <p>Head of Academic Policy summarised that the main goal is to create a standard process to address inconsistency in the handling of what are currently referred to as retrospective Exceptional Circumstances. This inconsistency poses a significant a risk to the Student Experience. The new process puts an end to the retrospective process- which does not exist in writing - and expands the window for late ECs. Some elements of the initial proposal were consulted on but not taken forward in the final proposals.</p> <p>The process will tie the approach to decision-making for late ECs to the approach for Ground A Academic Appeals. Students may interact with either process and it is not reasonable for one process to be a “softer touch” than the other. For any applications received after the late deadline has passed, the student would be directed to Appeals. For complex cases, Appeals has the process of requesting Voluntary Consideration by Schools as an early resolution to avoid students unnecessarily going through the whole Appeals process. The intention is for the process, with Senate approval, to be rolled out for May/June. It was noted, however, that there would need to be careful handling regarding Schools who have already communicated deadlines.</p> <p>Senate Representatives fed back that members are generally supportive of the proposed approach to late ECs but there are some serious misgivings of the EC process itself particularly on the thresholds on what is considered an EC. The view on the proposal was that where the late ECs are rejected, they should not have route to appeal based on the same circumstances. Members of the APRC Committee who sit on the Appeals Committee stated that there must be a hard line on what is acceptable and if submitted with the same information this will be rejected and not processed further.</p> <p>Members of the APRC Committee who sit on the Appeals Committee stated that they foresee this process could increase the number of appeals as previously retrospective ECs were not appealable and that there is currently one case worker in the Appeals Team for 500+ appeals. The Academic Registrar updated that the Office for Student Conduct, Complaints and Appeals are cross skilling across the team to remove the pressure on single points of failure and recognise the pressure on staff.</p>

	<p>Senate Representatives requested that the word School is removed from paragraph 12 as it implies that students do not feel comfortable reporting ECs to their School. The Committee supported this change.</p> <p>The Committee discussed where late cases are accepted, what is the ask of Schools. Head of Student Record Operations noted that feedback from Schools during the consultation was that Schools may like to start the process of applying outcomes in relation to late ECs immediately. Several members of the Committee expressed the view that Schools should not try to take them forward before the publication date for course results, as this may lead to inconsistencies in the student experience. It was suggested that it would be more transparent to students if the process clearly noted that outcomes will not be processed until X date.</p> <p>The Committee discussed the previous proposal within the paper to group the Honours exam block to a three-week block to allow additional time to process EC outcomes before Boards and prevent delays to graduation. Senate Representatives noted that members were not supportive of the proposal and that students want their assessments spread out to allow time for revision. It was agreed that graduating students, as with the current process, should be made aware that submission of a Late EC application may impact their ability to graduate on time.</p> <p>CSE Representative noted that they received support from the College but commented that the proposed final deadline for late ECs is too late and that bringing the deadline 1 week forward would support School administration time to process these, with any late applications requiring a reconvened board. It was agreed that the dates could be amended, and would be subject to consultation with Schools.</p> <p>The Committee discussed students who may not be able to engage with the EC process or Late EC process. A member suggested that directing them to the Appeals Process does not seem in the best interest of the student. It was noted that if information becomes available to the School, they have the power to reconsider the decision under TAR 64 or if students are directed to the Appeals process, and it is a complex case, the Appeals Team will approach the School to discuss voluntary reconsideration under TAR 64 to prevent the student going through the full Appeals process.</p> <p>One member questioned why the prioritisation of the project would have implications on the development of PATH. The Academic Registrar explained that the staff who would support the developments to the EC system are currently working on the PATH system updates therefore resource would need to be reassigned. It was confirmed that during this period it would not impact the use of the PATH system.</p> <p>The Convener summarised that the Committee were supportive of the implementation of this process for May/June 2026 as long as deadline dates for both UG and PG are agreed following consultation with Schools. The Committee were supportive of the rigorous approach taken to cases within the Appeals process, and agreed that the late EC process must operate with the same rigour. The Committee noted the need for the volume of Appeals to be monitored following the implementation of this process. The Committee noted that the EC process, Late EC process and Appeals process must work in a way that is supportive of complex cases.</p>
4.2	<p>Academic Year Dates 2027/28 and Provisional Academic Year Dates 2028/29 For approval</p>

The paper was presented by Dr Adam Bunni, Head of Academic Policy, Academic Quality and Standards.

The Academic Year dates are drafted following the model approved by Senate and published at [Academic year structure](#). It was noted the proposed dates are designed to ensure 2 weeks for the Accommodation, Catering and Events (ACE) Team to prepare the University buildings following the Edinburgh Fringe and there is an agreement with EUSA that exams will not be taken past 21st December.

The paper requested approval from the Committee for the academic year dates for 2027/28, which the Committee approved as provisional dates at its November 2024 meeting. The paper also requests Committee approval for the provisional academic year dates for 2028/2029.

The VP Education had passed on thoughts on this item. It was questioned if Schools were using exams effectively or whether some assessments could be in other formats. In addition, feedback from students was that they find out their exam timetable too late. The Academic Registrar noted the Timetabling Team are working towards releasing personal exam timetables earlier but there are a number of things in the chain to happen before release which they are working with Schools to shift to an earlier point.

The Committee discussed the fact that the number of exams has risen to approach pre-COVID levels. The Committee agreed that with the compressed exam diet the number of students with two exams in one day may rise however, this was not seen as an issue if the University's position is that having two exams on one day is not inherently disadvantageous. The Committee discussed that the compressed exam diet creates issues for applying reasonable adjustments and Schools should give more consideration to alternative assessments. A member suggested that students with adjustments for exams could be scheduled at King's Buildings which may ease pressure at the central service.

Action: Academic Registrar to explore using King's Buildings as a satellite campus for exams with adjustments.

The Committee discussed the disparity between the length of Semester 1 and Semester 2. It was noted that Semester 1 is 11 weeks long where the last week for UG taught material is week 10 allowing week 11 as a buffer. Within semester 1 some Schools do not offer teaching in week 6 to allow for a reading week. A student who chooses a course in Semester 2 over semester 1 receives an extra month of revision. The Committee agreed that the lack of symmetry between semesters is problematic.

Action: Academic Registrar to discuss the asymmetric academic year structure with Lucy Evans, Associate Principal and Deputy Secretary, Students.

The Committee raised that the paper included the position from ACE was that the semester could not start on the 7th September 2026 as the festival tenants do not vacate quickly enough and the festival dates are set well in advance and cannot be amended. The Committee queried whether ACE could shorten the two weeks turnaround by, e.g., investing in more support or resource to turn University buildings around. The Committee agreed that it was too late to amend the dates for 2026/27, however, agreed that this position should be explored for the 27/28 academic year and subsequent years.

Action: Academic Registrar to discuss with ACE the possibility of starting the 27/28 academic year a week earlier than proposed.

	<p>Whilst agreeing to explore the earlier start of semester 1 for academic year 27/28, the Committee acknowledged that this would have an impact on turnaround times for resit exam results and progression decisions, as well as admissions, especially for students requiring visas.</p> <p>The Committee discussed the December 2026 exam diet dates, proposed as a 10-day exam diet contingent on 2 Saturdays. The Committee regarded it as undesirable for Professional Services staff to be asked to work two Saturdays before Christmas. In previous years where there was the same issue with the December diet, the exam diet started on the Thursday of revision week. However, the Committee were more inclined for the exam diet to start on the Wednesday and to only make use of the first Saturday. It was noted that Hanukkah 2026 is 5th -12th December 2026, which falls during the exam diet, and that some Jewish students cannot sit exams on a Saturday, therefore this would need to be considered using the provisions for religious observance in the Taught Assessment Regulations.</p> <p>The Committee recommended that the December 2026 exam diet should run from Wednesday 9th December 2026 - Monday 21st December 2027 (inclusive) and make use of one Saturday (first Saturday).</p> <p>The Committee agreed to defer making a decision regarding the academic year dates for 2027/2028, and the provisional academic year dates for 2028/2029.</p>
<p>4.3</p>	<p>Appointment of APRC Vice-Convener For approval</p> <p>This item was presented by the Committee Convener.</p> <p>The Vice Convener left the University earlier this year therefore the Vice Convener role is currently vacant. Dr Linda Kirstein expressed their interest in the Vice-Convener role in advance of the meeting.</p> <p>There were no further notes of interest from members present.</p> <p>For discussion of the role of Vice-Convener, Dr Kirstein left the room. The Committee discussed and approved Dr Kirstein taking the role of Vice-Convener for the remainder of the academic year 2025/26.</p>
<p>4.4</p>	<p>Postgraduate Research Thesis Guidance For approval</p> <p>The paper was presented by Dr Adam Bunni, Head of Academic Policy, Academic Quality and Standards.</p> <p>The proposed Postgraduate Research Thesis Guidance is a combination of documents that were due for review this academic year. The documents have been made into a single guidance document to support ease of use for students and staff. A consultation was conducted with Colleges and Graduate Schools who have been supportive of the proposal. Overall, the documents have been reordered and repetition removed. The new Postgraduate Research Thesis Guidance will be introduced from 1st August 2026 and the existing documents will be archived.</p> <p>Members were supportive of the proposal.</p>

	<p>One member noted that the formatting guidance within the documents should be consistent with the university formatting guidance. The weblink to the accessibility formatting is included however, the document did not direct students to follow this.</p> <p>Members approved an amendment to the proposed guidance document to include wording stating that 'Students are expected to follow the guidance on accessible formatting'. With this amendment the Committee approved the document and the changes outlined in 1.2 – 4.7.</p>
<p>5.1</p>	<p>APRC Priorities 2025/26 – mid-year update To note</p> <p>The paper was presented by Dr Adam Bunni, Head of Academic Policy, Academic Quality and Standards.</p> <p>The paper provides the Committee information on the updated priorities. The Curriculum Transformation Project is no longer an ongoing project; however, the Committee are now responding to the Learning and Teaching Workstream.</p> <p>Due to resource constraints in Academic Quality and Standards Policy Team, there has been a reprioritisation of the policy review requirements: the Degree and Assessment Regulations will be updated; the Code of Student Conduct will be coming to APRC In due course. The review of the Dual Awards Policy has been deprioritised as this policy is not heavily used.</p> <p>The Committee discussed the de-prioritisation of the Dual Awards Policy as it was noted that there are issues with Dual Awards within Colleges that need to be addressed e.g. If an assessment is submitted to the University of Edinburgh, can it be uploaded to their partner institution in their language and marked separately there.</p> <p>The Head of Academic Policy noted that the policy would not address these more specific scenarios but if the issues raised are pressing, they can be addressed in advance of reviewing the policy.</p> <p>Members discussed that the Framework for Curricula is out of date and many of the points are not adhered to e.g., not scheduling classes at the same time or no umbrella courses. It was agreed that AQS would seek to prioritise this in conjunction with the L&T workstream to align the frame work to ongoing best practices.</p>
<p>5.3</p>	<p>Committee Administration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • APRC Membership • APRC Terms of Reference <p>To note</p> <p>Committee Priorities 2025/26: To note</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of curriculum framework arising from Learning and Teaching Workstream • Scheduled review of policies
<p>6.</p>	<p>Any Other Business</p>

Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee

19 March 2026

Undergraduate Degree Regulations 2026/27

Description of paper

1. This paper contains the draft Undergraduate Degree Regulations for 2026/27. A “Key Changes” section is included to draw the Committee’s attention to the proposed changes.

Fit with remit

Academic Policy and Regulations Committee	Y/N
Oversee the development, maintenance and implementation of an academic regulatory framework which effectively supports and underpins the University’s educational activities.	Y
Ensure that the academic regulatory framework continues to evolve in order to meet organisational needs and is responsive to changes in University strategy, and in the internal and external environments.	Y

Action requested / recommendation

2. For discussion and recommendation to Court. The Degree Regulations are approved via the Court Resolution process.

Background and context

3. The Degree and Assessment Regulations are reviewed annually to ensure that they remain fit for purpose and that enhancements can be made on a cumulative basis.
4. In December 2025, all Colleges were invited to consult Schools regarding proposals for changes to the Degree Regulations, with the intention of identifying any necessary updates due to changes in related policies or practices, and to address any errors or lack of clarity.
5. In drafting proposed amendments regarding some aspects of the regulations, Academic Quality and Standards consulted with other relevant stakeholders. Student Recruitment and Admissions, Admissions leads in Colleges, and the Student Immigration Service were consulted regarding changes to regulations relating to readmission following withdrawal and exclusion. The Study and Work Away service (SWAY) were consulted regarding changes to regulation relating to optional study abroad.

Discussion

6. APRC is invited to discuss the draft Undergraduate Degree Regulations for academic year 2026/27. Appendix 1 includes only those regulations which include proposed changes. Following this meeting, Academic Quality and Standards will amend the draft regulations to take account of any Committee comments.

7. Degree Regulations are formally approved by University Court as a “Resolution”. Academic Quality and Standards will submit a draft Resolution to Court at its 20 April 2026 meeting. Court will consult with Senate in May 2026, before considering a final Resolution at its 15 June 2026 meeting.

Key Changes to Undergraduate Degree Regulations 2026/27

8. The table below provides information about the proposed changes to the Regulations for 2026/27. Links within the regulations to other information and changes in terminology have been updated as necessary. Other minor changes to wording are included in Appendix 1.

Regulation Updated	What has changed
6 Undergraduate awards	Amended the credit volumes for the MBChB and the BVM&S to reflect the current structure of these programmes.
19 Authorised Interruption of Study	Amended to remove content duplicated from the Authorised Interruption of Study Policy and instead refer to that Policy for more information. This removes existing misalignment between the wording of the Regulation and the Policy (for example regarding retrospective approval of interruptions) and prevents this recurring.
28 Optional Study Abroad	<p>Amended to clarify the position regarding the requirement to have passed all credits before undertaking optional study abroad. The clarification states that all courses taken in Year 2 must be passed at the first attempt, rather than simply Year 2 courses, as students in Year 2 may be carrying courses with fails or null sits from Year 1. The amendment also notes that the College may allow exceptions to this where students are awarded null sits for courses taken in Year 2 due to Exceptional Circumstances.</p> <p>The amendments reflect existing practice, which has developed to support the interests of students with the offer of a place to study abroad. It is not desirable for students to prepare for study abroad, including e.g. securing accommodation, and find subsequently that they are unable to take up a place at short notice due to having failed resits. The regulation allows sufficient flexibility for cases where there are Exceptional Circumstances, and it may be possible to provide an alternative form of assessment before the resit diet.</p>

33 Withdrawal and Exclusion

Amended to bring the regulation into line with the PG equivalent (45) and the expectations of the Withdrawal and Exclusion Procedure. The amendment explicitly extends the permission to apply for readmission onto the same, or a related programme of study to students who have been excluded due to debt, non-matriculation, or lack of visa permission. It maintains the existing requirement that the gap between withdrawal or exclusion and readmission must be no more than three years, but notes that there are some exceptions to this, e.g. on professional programmes where two years is the maximum.

The regulation states that the decision as to whether to readmit a student remains at the University's discretion, and provides information regarding factors to be considered when assessing applications. This provides effective mitigation against the risk that a student may be readmitted where this would not be appropriate or feasible, and serves to manage students' expectations regarding the process of readmission.

The regulation also clarifies that, where a readmitted student has previously received an exit award, this will be rescinded, in the event that they achieve a higher award following resubmission.

Students face increasing challenges with the affordability of study, so it will be of benefit to provide explicit reassurance that students excluded due to debt can seek readmission once their debt is settled. This benefit will be particularly relevant for students from lower-income backgrounds.

Students requiring a visa to study can also face challenges securing or maintaining the appropriate visa through no fault of their own. Providing a route to readmission following exclusion due to lack of visa permission is therefore a significant benefit to international students.

There are situations where students fail to matriculate at the appropriate time due to serious health or personal issues, and they do not respond to contact before the exclusion process is completed. Providing an explicit route to seek readmission in these circumstances will therefore be of significant benefit to these students.

Changes to Degree Specific Regulations	
78 MBChB	Amended to reflect new requirements from the General Medical Council, including the Medical Licensing Assessment Applied Knowledge Test.
85-91 BVM&S	<p>Various amendments to align the regulations with current practice regarding progression requirements on the programme.</p> <p>87 states that the permitted maximum of two years of interruption or of repeat years may not be taken consecutively. This reflects the experience within R(D)SVS that students with such interrupted progress have a very low likelihood of completing the programme subsequently. It is therefore considered in a student's best interest that they withdraw voluntarily in these circumstances, although there remains the option for the School to request a concession in exceptional cases.</p> <p>91 provides new content regarding attendance requirements on the programme. These are existing requirements, being added to the Regulations for the sake of clarity. The requirements are set out in detail in the BVM&S Attendance Policy.</p>

Resource implications

9. Any resource implications associated with the proposed amendments are covered in the Key Changes table, above.

Risk management

10. Any risks associated with the proposed amendments are covered in the Key Changes table, above.

Responding to the Climate Emergency & Sustainable Development Goals

11. The proposed amendments do not contribute to the Climate Emergency and Sustainable Development Goals.

Equality & diversity

12. Any equality and diversity implications associated with the proposed amendments are covered in the Key Changes table, above.

Communication, implementation and evaluation of the impact of any action agreed

13. Academic Quality and Standards will communicate approved regulations in the annual email update to Schools and Colleges on regulations and policies. Academic Quality and Standards will also cover any changes to regulations in

Boards of Examiners briefings and other relevant briefing events for staff in Schools and Colleges.

Author

Dr Adam Bunni
Head of Academic Policy and
Regulations
Academic Quality and Standards

Presenter

Adam Bunni

Freedom of Information Open

Degree Regulations and Programmes of Study

Undergraduate Degree Programme Regulations

2025/26/27



THE UNIVERSITY
of EDINBURGH

6. The University awards the following types of undergraduate degrees, diplomas and certificates. The University's undergraduate awards and degree programmes are consistent with the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF, www.scqf.org.uk/), unless an exemption has been approved by the Academic Policy and Regulations Committee. The credit levels required for each programme are specified within the appropriate Degree Programme Table (DPT).

I	Undergraduate Certificate of Higher Education	At least 120 credits of which a minimum of 90 are at level 7 or higher.
li	Undergraduate Diploma of Higher Education	At least 240 credits of which a minimum of 90 are at level 8 or higher
A.	Single Honours (in a named subject/discipline)	At least 480 credits of which a minimum of 180 is at levels 9 and 10, including at least 90 at level 10.
B.	Single Honours (with a subsidiary subject)	At least 480 credits of which a minimum of 180 is at levels 9 and 10, including at least 90 at level 10.
C.	Combined Honours (in two disciplines)	At least 480 credits of which a minimum of 180 is at levels 9 and 10, including at least 90 at level 10.
D.	Group Honours (more than two disciplines)	At least 480 credits of which a minimum of 180 is at levels 9 and 10, including at least 90 at level 10.
E.	Non-Honours Degrees	At least 360 credits of which a minimum of 60 is at level 9.
F.	General and Ordinary	At least 360 credits of which a minimum of 60 is at level 9.
G.	Intercalated Honours Degrees	See appropriate Degree Programme Table
H.	Integrated Masters with Honours (in named subject/discipline)	At least 600 credits of which a minimum of 120 is at level 11.
	Integrated Masters (with a subsidiary subject)	At least 600 credits of which a minimum of 120 is at level 11.
	Integrated Masters (with combined honours in two disciplines)	At least 600 credits of which a minimum of 120 is at level 11.
I.	MChB (5 year programme)	720 credits
	MChB (6 year programme)	780 900 credits
J.	BVM&S Graduate Entry Programme	560 credits
	BVM&S 5 Year Programme	76 40 credits

Degree Regulations and Programmes of Study

Undergraduate Degree Programme Regulations

2025/266/27



THE UNIVERSITY
of EDINBURGH

19. ~~A student may apply for an authorised interruption of study and it may be authorised by the Head of College if there is good reason for approving the interruption. Students may be required to provide evidence to support their applications. Interruptions of study will not be applied retrospectively. Any one period of authorised interruption of study will not exceed one academic year, unless authorised by the Head of College. The total period of authorised interruption of study is the same for full-time and part-time students and will not exceed 100% of the prescribed period of full-time study.~~ Students may apply for an authorised interruption of study, in line with the Authorised Interruption of Study Policy.

[Authorised Interruption of Study Policy](#)

Optional Study Abroad

27. Students may be eligible to undertake Optional Study Abroad as part of their undergraduate degree programme, providing they meet the selection criteria. Periods of Optional Study Abroad must only be undertaken at a higher education institution with which the University of Edinburgh has a formal exchange agreement. Students are not permitted to arrange their own opportunities to study at another higher education institution. Periods of Optional Study Abroad may be for one academic year, or one semester depending on the exchanges offered in each discipline.

28. Students must have achieved 240 credits before participating in Optional Study Abroad in year Year 3. All ~~year 2~~ courses taken in Year 2 must be passed at the first attempt; ~~resits during the summer diet are not permitted.~~ Students who have assessments to complete in the summer diet will be ineligible for Optional Study Abroad, unless these result from a null sit, in which case the College may apply an exception. Students must have achieved 360 credits before participating in Optional Study Abroad in year 4 of a 5 year programme.

Withdrawal and Exclusion

33. Any student may withdraw permanently from their programme of study at any point in the year. Students may be excluded for reasons outlined within the procedure for Withdrawal and Exclusion from Studies:

www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/withdrawal_exclusion_from_study.pdf Withdrawal and Exclusion from Studies Procedure

A former student ~~who has withdrawn voluntarily from study~~ will be permitted to apply for readmission to the same (or a related) programme of study ~~subsequently~~, provided that:

- They had withdrawn voluntarily from study, and had not failed to meet the progression requirements for their degree at the point they withdrew; or
- They had been excluded due to debt, non-matriculation, or lack of visa permission, and had not failed to meet the progression requirements for their degree at the point they were excluded;

Degree Regulations and Programmes of Study

Undergraduate Degree Programme Regulations

2025/26/27



THE UNIVERSITY
of EDINBURGH

And

- Not more than three* years have elapsed between the student's withdrawal or exclusion and their proposed return start date.

*On some programmes, students will not be readmitted where more than two years have elapsed between withdrawal or exclusion and return to the programme.

~~they had not failed to meet the progression requirements for the degree at the point they withdrew, and that not more than three academic years have elapsed between the point at which they withdrew and their readmission to study~~The decision as to whether to readmit a student will remain at the University's discretion, and factors taken into account include (but are not limited to):

- the passage of time and its implications for the programme of study;
- any major changes to the structure of the programme, or its closure;
- restrictions affecting numbers of students on a programme.

Where a student is readmitted to study on the same, or a related programme, the College may permit the transfer of some or all of the credit previously gained at the University towards the new enrolment, in line with Regulation 22. Where a student had previously gained an exit award, this will be rescinded in the event that they achieve a higher award following readmission.

The Withdrawal and Exclusion Procedure provides further information about other categories of exclusion and their implications for eligibility to seek readmission to the University.

Withdrawal and Exclusion Procedure

MBChB

Progression

78. MBChB students are only entitled to two assessment attempts for courses which are part of the MBChB programme. This regulation supersedes the resit assessment regulation within the Taught Assessment Regulations for all programme years, ~~with the exception of Year 1 where this regulation still applies (i.e. students may have up to four attempts to pass Year 1).~~ Students in Years 1 and 2 have their second attempt in the August resit diet. Students who have not passed by the end of the academic year, and are eligible for another attempt, will be required to repeat all teaching and assessment in the following year. Students who have not passed by the end of the academic year, and are eligible for another attempt, will be required to repeat the full year of teaching and assessment regardless of component marks.

Students in their final year must achieve a passing result for the General Medical Council Medical Licensing Assessment Applied Knowledge Test within a maximum of four attempts, undertaken over the course of two academic years.

Degree Regulations and Programmes of Study

Undergraduate Degree Programme Regulations

2025/266/27



THE UNIVERSITY
of EDINBURGH

79. A student who fails the professional requirements (attendance, engagement, and conduct) of the programme may be required by the relevant Board of Examiners to undertake additional clinical attachments before being permitted to progress.

80. No student may proceed to the next year of study for the MBChB programme until they have passed all components of the previous year of the programme in a single academic year, unless the Board of Examiners has exceptionally granted permission.

81. Students on the 6-year MBChB programme may omit Year 3 of the MBChB Programme if they enter with an approved BSc degree. In this situation students proceed directly from Year 2 to Year 4 of the 6-year MBChB Programme.

82. Students on the 6-year MBChB programme may be permitted to interrupt their studies during the honours year with medical evidence and proceed directly into Year 4 of the MBChB programme the following academic year with approval of the Programme Director.

BVM&S

Compliance

85. Students should refer to the appropriate Course Books for detailed curriculum and assessment information. Students should refer to the Animal Husbandry ([AHEMS](#)) and Clinical ([CEMS](#)) Extramural Studies (EMS) Handbooks for all detailed EMS information and arrangements.

86. Students are subject to health clearance as they are admitted to the BVM&S programmes. Failure to comply with this regulation may result in exclusion from a programme of studies.

Attendance and Participation

87. In exceptional circumstances students may be permitted to interrupt studies or repeat a year of study because of ill-health, service or sporting commitments, or an episode of academic failure. Only in highly exceptional circumstances will students be permitted more than two such years of interrupted progress, ~~whether taken consecutively or at intervals throughout the programme.~~ [These two years cannot be taken consecutively.](#) Exceptions are very unlikely to be considered in the case of prolonged or repeated academic failure. Approved study for an intercalated degree does not constitute interrupted progress.

Progression

88. Students are required to complete a specified number of [animal husbandry extramural studies \(AHEMS\)](#) and [clinical extramural studies \(cCEMS placement weeks\)](#). [The specified number of AHEMS and CEMS weeks for each cohort can be found on the RCVS website.](#)

Degree Regulations and Programmes of Study

Undergraduate Degree Programme Regulations

2025/26/27



THE UNIVERSITY
of EDINBURGH

- a. ~~Students must submit satisfactory evidence of completion of the specified number of weeks of approved animal husbandry extramural studies (AHEMS) by the submission deadlines provided set by the School. Students who fail to satisfy this the AHEMS requirement will be unable to progress into third year of the BVM&S programme Year 3 (Graduate Entry Programme Year 2) and will be reported-referred to the BVM&S Progression Committee. ~~Students who have not completed the specified number of weeks of approved cEMS prior to the end of final year will be unable to graduate. The specified number of AHEMS and cEMS weeks for each cohort are provided in the programme handbook.~~~~
- b. Students must submit satisfactory evidence of completion of the specified number of weeks of approved CEMS by the submission deadlines set by the School. Students must complete a minimum of eight weeks CEMS during Final Year. Students who fail to satisfy these requirements will be unable to progress to the next year of study or graduate and will be referred to the BVM&S Progression Committee.

89. Students cannot commence CEMS until they have submitted satisfactory evidence of completion of the specified number of weeks of approved AHEMS. Only in exceptional circumstances will students be permitted to commence CEMS prior to the start of Year 3 (Graduate Entry Programme Year 2).

~~89. — Clinical EMS can be started in the summer vacation between second and third year, provided all animal husbandry EMS has been signed off as complete in line with the arrangements and deadlines approved by the School, and provided the Clinical EMS Driving License has been completed.~~

~~90. — Students who fail to submit required clinical EMS evidence by the deadline set by the School each year will not have that EMS added to their total and will be reported to the BVM&S Progression Committee. The deadline for each preceding year is 31st January, e.g. deadline for all EMS submissions for 2017 is 31st January 2018.~~

9490. No student may proceed to the next year of study for the BVM&S programme until they have passed all components of the previous year of the programme, unless a concession is awarded by the Head of College. Students failing to complete all components will be reported-referred to the BVM&S Progression Committee and exclusion from further attendance at courses and examinations may be recommended.

91. In the event of a student failing a course, attendance will be evaluated by the Progression Committee when deciding recommendations. Students with a poor attendance record may not be eligible for an exam only course repeat. Students should refer to the BVM&S attendance policy.

Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee

19 March 2026

Postgraduate Degree Regulations 2026/27

Description of paper

1. This paper contains the draft Postgraduate Degree Regulations for 2026/27. A “Key Changes” section is included to draw the Committee’s attention to the proposed changes.

Fit with remit

Academic Policy and Regulations Committee	Y/N
Oversee the development, maintenance and implementation of an academic regulatory framework which effectively supports and underpins the University’s educational activities.	Y
Ensure that the academic regulatory framework continues to evolve in order to meet organisational needs and is responsive to changes in University strategy, and in the internal and external environments.	Y

Action requested / recommendation

2. For discussion and recommendation to Court. The Degree Regulations are approved via the Court Resolution process.

Background and context

3. The Degree and Assessment Regulations are reviewed annually to ensure that they remain fit for purpose and that enhancements can be made on a cumulative basis.
4. In December 2025, all Colleges were invited to consult Schools regarding proposals for changes to the Degree Regulations, with the intention of identifying any necessary updates due to changes in related policies or practices, and to address any errors or lack of clarity. Draft amendments to the Regulations were discussed with the Doctoral College Operations Group in February 2026.

Discussion

5. APRC is invited to discuss the draft Postgraduate Degree Regulations for academic year 2026/27. Appendix 1 includes only those regulations which include proposed changes. Following this meeting, Academic Quality and Standards will amend the draft regulations to take account of any Committee comments.
6. Degree Regulations are formally approved by University Court as a “Resolution”. Academic Quality and Standards will submit a draft Resolution to Court at its 20 April 2026 meeting. Court will consult with Senate in May 2026, before considering a final Resolution at its 15 June 2026 meeting.

Key Changes to Postgraduate Degree Regulations 2026/27

7. The table below provides information about the proposed changes to the Regulations for 2026/27. Links within the regulations to other information and changes in terminology have been updated as necessary. Other minor changes to wording are included in Appendix 1.

Regulation Updated	What has changed
<p>16 Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL)</p>	<p>Removal of RPL where an exit award is made</p> <p>RPL is limited to one-third of the total credits for the award for which a student is applying. However, where a student exits a programme with a lesser award, the RPL could constitute as much as 100% of the credit for the exit award, for example where a student is awarded 60 credits RPL for a Masters programme, but exits with a Certificate. This means that a student is being awarded a qualification largely or entirely based on credit that has already been counted towards a different award.</p> <p>The amendment states that previously-awarded RPL may be removed in order to comply with the “one-third” rule, where a student leaves with an exit award. Colleges can allow exemptions to the “one-third” rule where the RPL has been awarded for UoE credit which did not lead to an award previously, for example credit gained as part of Continuous or Postgraduate Professional Development.</p> <p>RPL for courses on a Degree Programme Table</p> <p>Students may take individual courses at the University as Postgraduate Professional Development (PPD) or Continuous Professional Development (CPD), and subsequently seek to use the credit for these courses as part of a programme of study. The amendment to the regulation states that, where a student is given RPL for a course or courses taken previously which are on the Degree Programme Table for the programme they are joining, the mark(s) for the course(s) will be used for progression and award decisions on the new programme. This is in line with the approach taken for students returning to undertake a Diploma or Masters after completing a Certificate or Diploma, under PG DRPS 60.</p>
<p>33 Authorised Interruption of Study</p>	<p>Amended to remove content duplicated from the Authorised Interruption of Study Policy and instead refer to that Policy for more information. This removes existing misalignment between the wording of the</p>

	<p>Regulation and the Policy (for example regarding retrospective approval of interruptions) and prevents this recurring.</p> <p>The Regulation retains content regarding exceptions to the rule that the total permitted period of interruption will not exceed 100% of the prescribed period of full-time study, which is referred to but not covered in the Policy.</p>
<p>45 Request for Reinstatement on Doctoral and MPhil degrees</p>	<p>Amended to extend provision for former students to request reinstatement where they have been excluded due to debt, non-matriculation, or lack of visa permission. Like students who have withdrawn voluntarily, students readmitted after exclusion for these reasons will be offered the time they had remaining on their programme at the point of exclusion to complete their thesis.</p> <p>Self-funding students in particular face increasing challenges with the affordability of study, so it will be of benefit to provide explicit reassurance that students excluded due to debt can seek readmission once their debt is settled. This benefit will be particularly relevant for students from lower-income backgrounds.</p> <p>Students requiring a visa to study can also face challenges securing or maintaining the appropriate visa through no fault of their own. Providing a route to readmission following exclusion due to lack of visa permission is therefore a significant benefit to international students.</p> <p>There are situations where students fail to matriculate at the appropriate time due to serious health or personal issues, and they do not respond to contact before the exclusion process is completed. Providing an explicit route to seek readmission in these circumstances will therefore be of significant benefit to these students.</p> <p>The regulation states that the decision as to whether to readmit a student remains at the College's discretion, and provides information regarding factors to be considered when assessing applications. This provides effective mitigation against the risk that a student may be readmitted where this would not be appropriate or feasible, and serves to manage students' expectations regarding the process of readmission.</p>

48 PhD Thesis Length – Word Count	Amended to state that image captions are not included in the word count for PhD or MPhil theses.
51 MPhil by Research	This will encourage the provision of detailed captions, where appropriate, which will be of particular benefit to blind or partially-sighted readers of a thesis.
Changes to Degree Specific Regulations	
68 PhD – Submission by Portfolio in Art, Design and Landscape Architecture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Amended to include examples of what might constitute a permanent record for the portfolio of artefacts, using existing text from Regulation 80; b. Amended to refer to Regulation 48 regarding inclusions and exclusions from the word count, for consistency with other doctoral degrees; c. New content added regarding separate submission of the portfolio and thesis for some programmes.
69 MPhil - Submission by Portfolio in Art, Design and Landscape Architecture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Amended in line with Regulation 68. b. Amended in line with Regulation 68.
72 Master of Chinese Studies	These regulations are to be removed as these programmes are closing and have no students currently taking them.
76 MSc in Middle Eastern Studies with Arabic	Subsequent regulation numbers will be amended.
78 MSc in Architectural Project Management	
79 MSc in Advanced Sustainable Design (mixed mode)	
80 PhD in Creative Music Practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Amended to refer to Regulation 48 regarding inclusions and exclusions from the word count, for consistency with other doctoral degrees.
82 PhD in Architecture by Design	Amended to provide more information and consistency of format with other ECA doctoral degrees.

Resource implications

8. Any resource implications associated with the proposed amendments are covered in the Key Changes table, above.

Risk management

9. Any risks associated with the proposed amendments are covered in the Key Changes table, above.

Responding to the Climate Emergency & Sustainable Development Goals

10. The proposed amendments do not contribute to the Climate Emergency and Sustainable Development Goals.

Equality & diversity

11. Any equality and diversity implications associated with the proposed amendments are covered in the Key Changes table, above.

Communication, implementation and evaluation of the impact of any action agreed

12. Academic Quality and Standards will communicate approved regulations in the annual email update to Schools and Colleges on regulations and policies. Academic Quality and Standards will also cover any changes to regulations in Boards of Examiners briefings and other relevant briefing events for staff in Schools and Colleges.

Author

Dr Adam Bunni
Head of Academic Policy and
Regulations
Academic Quality and Standards

Presenter

Adam Bunni

Freedom of Information Open

Degree Regulations and Programmes of Study

Postgraduate Degree Programme Regulations

2025/266/27



THE UNIVERSITY
of EDINBURGH

Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL)

16. RPL can only be recognised at the point of admission to the University. The Head of College has the authority to recognise the transfer of a student's credit previously gained either at the University or another institution and to count it towards their intended award. Before approval is granted the College must be satisfied that the learning to be recognised and transferred provides an adequate current basis for the programme or courses as set out in the appropriate Degree Programme Table. The maximum number of credits that the Colleges will grant RPL for taught programmes is one-third of the total credits for the award for which the student is applying, that is 20 credits for a postgraduate certificate; 40 credits for a postgraduate diploma; and 60 credits for a masters (or 80 credits where a masters programme is comprised of 240 credits). For research programmes, the maximum number of RPL credits that the Colleges will grant is 360 credits. These restrictions do not apply to credit transferred when a student starts an associated Diploma or Masters, in line with regulation 60. [Where a student has been awarded RPL on admission but is subsequently considered for a different exit award, a proportion of the credit previously-awarded for RPL may be removed in order to comply with the restriction that RPL constitute no more than one-third of the total credits for the award. The College may permit exceptions to this where the RPL was awarded for credit previously gained at the University, which did not lead to an award. Where a student has been awarded RPL for a course previously completed at the University which is on the Degree Programme Table for the programme they are being admitted to, the mark awarded for the course will be used for progression and award decisions relating to the new programme.](#)

17. University of Edinburgh courses which have a substantial curriculum overlap with any of the courses that contributed to RPL will not count towards the student's degree programme.

18. The University can also consider prior learning for admissions purposes. [University RPL policy for admissions.](#)

Authorised Interruption of Study

33. [Students may apply for an authorised interruption of study, in line with the Authorised Interruption of Study Policy.](#)

[Authorised Interruption of Study Policy](#)

Degree Regulations and Programmes of Study

Postgraduate Degree Programme Regulations

2025/26/27



THE UNIVERSITY
of EDINBURGH

~~A student may apply for an Authorised Interruption of Study, and it may be authorised by the College if there is a good reason for approving the interruption. Students may be required to provide evidence to support their applications. Interruptions of study will not be applied retrospectively. Any one period of authorised interruption of study will not exceed one year, unless authorised by the College.~~ The total permitted period of Authorised Interruption of Study is the same for full-time and part-time continuous students and will not exceed 100% of the prescribed period of full-time study, except in the following cases:

- On doctoral programmes, the total permitted period of Authorised Interruption of Study is 36 months, with the exception of PhD with Integrated Study programmes, for which the total permitted period of interruption is 48 months;
- For part-time intermittent students, the total permitted period of Authorised Interruption of Study is calculated as half of the prescribed period of study, for example, three years for a six-year Master's programme.
- On programmes with a prescribed period of full-time study of 9 months, the total permitted period of Authorised Interruption of Study is 12 months;
- On part-time continuous Masters programmes with a prescribed period of study of 36 months, the total permitted period of Authorised Interruption of study is 24 months.

The Head of College may exceptionally authorise an Interruption of Study which would take the total period of interruption beyond 100% of the prescribed period of study, provided this does not exceed the maximum allowable study period.

[Authorised Interruption of Study Policy](#)

Also see the Study Period Table:

[Study Period Table – Postgraduate Degree Regulations](#)

Request for Reinstatement on Doctoral and MPhil degrees

45. A student who has been excluded for lapse of time, [debt, non-matriculation, or lack of visa permission](#), or [who](#) has withdrawn voluntarily before the end of their period of study may ask the College to reinstate their registration at a later date to [permit examination of a completed thesis/allow them to complete their programme](#). The College will decide whether or not a student should be reinstated, and factors such as (but not limited to) the passage of time and its implications for the topic of study and the availability of appropriate supervision will be taken into account. The student must provide good reason for the previous failure to complete. Students who require Student Visa sponsorship must contact the Student Immigration Service for advice before applying for reinstatement. If reinstatement is approved:

Degree Regulations and Programmes of Study

Postgraduate Degree Programme Regulations

2025/266/27



THE UNIVERSITY
of EDINBURGH

- Students who were previously excluded for lapse of time will be reinstated for a period of one month and required to submit their thesis for examination, in accordance with the Postgraduate Assessment Regulations for Research Degrees. Where a student does not submit their thesis for examination within the period of reinstatement, they will be excluded for lapse of time and will not be permitted to apply for further reinstatement.
- Students who previously withdrew before the end of their submission period, or were excluded due to debt, non-matriculation, or lack of visa permission, will be offered the time they had remaining on their programme to complete the thesis before submission. Students may apply for extension to study or interruption of study as normal. Their thesis once submitted will be examined in accordance with the Postgraduate Assessment Regulations for Research Degrees.

The Withdrawal and Exclusion Procedure provides more information about where students may or may not be permitted to apply for reinstatement following exclusion.

[Withdrawal and Exclusion Procedure](#)

PhD Thesis Length - Word Count

48. The thesis must not exceed a maximum word count of 100,000. There is no minimum word count. The word count of the thesis includes the main text, preface material (e.g. table of contents, acknowledgements, list of abbreviations, list of illustrations), footnotes and references but does not include material in the appendices, bibliography, [image captions](#), abstract or lay summary. In exceptional circumstances, on the recommendation of the supervisor, permission may be granted by the College to exceed the stated length on the ground that such extension is required for adequate treatment of the thesis topic.

MPhil by Research

50. The student must demonstrate by the presentation of a thesis and/or portfolio and by performance at an oral examination:

- capability of pursuing original research making a contribution to knowledge or understanding in the field of study;
- adequate knowledge of the field of study and relevant literature;

Degree Regulations and Programmes of Study

Postgraduate Degree Programme Regulations

2025/26/27



THE UNIVERSITY
of EDINBURGH

- exercise of critical judgement with regard to both the student's work and that of other scholars in the same general field, relating particular research projects to the general body of knowledge in the field; and
- the ability to present the results of the research in a critical and scholarly way.

The thesis must:

- represent a coherent body of work, and
- contain material worthy of publication or public presentation.

51. The thesis must not exceed a maximum of 60,000 words. There is no minimum word count. The word count of the thesis includes the main text, preface material, footnotes and references but does not include material in the appendices, bibliography, [image captions](#), abstract or lay summary. In exceptional circumstances, on the recommendation of the supervisor, permission may be granted by the College to exceed the stated length on the ground that such extension is required for adequate treatment of the thesis topic.

PhD- Submission by Portfolio in Art, Design and Landscape Architecture

68. The degree specific regulations, when a student is submitting for award of PhD by means of a portfolio of artefacts, artworks and other practice-based outputs, are:

- a. The portfolio of artefacts or artworks must comprise original work of a high creative level which is worthy of public exhibition and also an integral part of the contribution to knowledge made by the overall work of the candidate submitted in fulfilment of the requirements of the PhD. It must show competence in the appropriate ancillary technical skills; must contain material which presents a body of work such as could reasonably be achieved on the basis of three years postgraduate study; must be satisfactory and intelligible in its presentation. There should also be a permanent record of the work ([e.g. video, photographs, recordings, sketches, studies, web pages](#)); and
- b. The portfolio of artefacts and artworks will be accompanied by a thesis of not more than 50,000 words (~~including footnotes but excluding appendices and bibliography~~[refer to Regulation 48 for items included or excluded from the word count](#)).
- b-c. [Where specified in programme descriptors \(e.g. for PhD by Practice in Art or Design\) the portfolio should be submitted separately to the written thesis.](#)

MPhil - Submission by Portfolio in Art, Design and Landscape Architecture

Degree Regulations and Programmes of Study

Postgraduate Degree Programme Regulations

2025/26/27



THE UNIVERSITY
of EDINBURGH

69. The degree specific regulations, when a student is submitting for award of MPhil by means of a portfolio of artefacts, artworks and other practice-based outputs, are:

- a. The portfolio of artefacts or artworks must comprise original work of a high creative level worthy of public exhibition. It must show competence in the appropriate ancillary technical skills; must contain material which presents a body of work such as could reasonably be achieved on the basis of two years postgraduate study; must be satisfactory and intelligible in its presentation. There should also be a permanent record of the work ([e.g. video, photographs, recordings, sketches, studies, web pages](#)); and
- b. The portfolio of artefacts or artworks should normally be accompanied by a thesis of not more than 30,000 words ([including bibliography and footnotes but excluding appendices refer to Regulation 51 for items included or excluded from the word count](#)).

~~Master of Chinese Studies (MCS)~~

~~72. The degree specific regulations are:~~

- ~~a. **Grounds for Award.** Students will be assessed by essays, examinations, a placement report and a dissertation. An oral examination will be required in the Chinese language and may be required for other courses. Students must carry out their studies at the University of Edinburgh and in a Chinese institution approved by the Programme Director.~~
- ~~b. **Prescribed Period of Study.** The period of study is 24 months, full-time.~~

~~MSc in Middle Eastern Studies with Arabic~~

~~76. The degree specific regulations are:~~

- ~~a. **Collaboration.** The first year of study is taken at the University of Edinburgh. An intensive course is taken in an Arabic speaking country during the summer, followed by year two at the University of Edinburgh.~~
- ~~b. **Prescribed Period of Study.** The period of study will be 24 months, full-time.~~

~~MSc in Architectural Project Management~~

~~78. **Mode of Study and Prescribed Period of Study.** The programme is delivered by distance learning over a period of 48 to 84 months. Each institution will provide 60 credits of teaching material in addition to a dissertation of 60 credits.~~

~~MSc in Advanced Sustainable Design (mixed mode)~~

Degree Regulations and Programmes of Study

Postgraduate Degree Programme Regulations

2025/26/27



THE UNIVERSITY
of EDINBURGH

~~79. **Mode of Study and Prescribed Period of Study.** The programme is delivered on campus and by distance learning over a period of 24 months (mixed mode).~~

PhD in Creative Music Practice

80. **Grounds for Award.** The degree is assessed on a single output that consists of two components:

- a. A text of not more than 50,000 words ([refer to Regulation 48 for items included or excluded from the word count](#)); and
- b. A portfolio, performance(s), recording(s), and/or other musical output containing original or interpreted pre-existing works such as composition, installation, sound design, interactive music software etc. Such work would be supported by documentation of the process (e.g. video, photographs, recordings, sketches, studies, web pages) by which it was made.

PhD in Architecture by Design

82. [The submission for the PhD in Architecture by Design should include:](#)

- a. [A text of not more than 50,000 words \(refer to regulation 48 for items included or excluded from the word count\); and](#)
- a-b. [a body of design work, fully integrated with the text and presented in a format which can be archived. The design work should comprise original work of a high creative level worthy of public exhibition and form an integral part of the contribution to knowledge made by the overall work of the candidate submitted in fulfilment of the requirements of the PhD. It must show competence in the appropriate ancillary technical skills, and the use of design-research methods appropriate to the thesis. This may include a record of the work in development \(e.g. video, photographs, recordings, sketches, studies\) and should include a record of temporary events or exhibitions relevant to the completed thesis. The thesis for the PhD in Architecture by Design must not exceed 50,000 words. In addition to the thesis the student will be required to submit a body of design work including studies, sketches and maquettes, which will be in addition to and fully integrated with the text and presented in a format which can be archived.](#)

Diploma in Professional Legal Practice

85. The degree specific regulations are:

- a. **Grounds for Award.** Students must pass all of the core courses and three elective courses to be awarded the Diploma in Professional Legal Practice. [The pass mark for courses on the Diploma is 50%.](#)

Degree Regulations and Programmes of Study

Postgraduate Degree Programme Regulations

2025/266/27



THE UNIVERSITY
of EDINBURGH

- b. **Assessment Type.** Students will be assessed in writing in each course of the curriculum. Where the assessment for a course includes an examination, students may only present themselves for examination in a course if they have been certified as having given regular attendance and having successfully completed the requisite work of the class in that course. Students may be permitted two re-sit assessments or examinations for each course of the curriculum in which they have failed.

Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee

19th March 2026

Taught Assessment Regulations Resit Proposal

Description of paper

1. This paper outlines a proposal for marks at pre-Honours resits, unless those undertaken as a first attempt through approved Exceptional Circumstances (EC), should incur a maximum mark of 40. Specifically, the proposal is to amend Taught Assessment Regulation 27: Resit Assessment.
2. This paper does not directly contribute to the Strategy 2030 outcomes. It is aimed at aligning practice with other institutions across the HE sector and addressing issues of parity for students who pass a course at the first attempt compared to those who have further opportunities to pass at a later point, with no consequence.

Fit with remit

Academic Policy and Regulations Committee	Y/N
Oversee the development, maintenance and implementation of an academic regulatory framework which effectively supports and underpins the University's educational activities.	Y
Ensure that the academic regulatory framework continues to evolve in order to meet organisational needs and is responsive to changes in University strategy, and in the internal and external environments.	Y
Scrutinise and approve proposals for new or revised academic policy or regulation, ensuring that policy and regulation is only introduced where it is necessary, and that all policy and regulation is suitably accessible to its intended audience.	Y

Action requested / recommendation

3. For discussion and approval.

Background and context

4. Schools in CAHSS were consulted in March 2025 about capping resits, in response to a request through the Assessment and Feedback Strategy Group, and in preparation for discussion at APRC. Although the proposal was not passed at APRC at the time, the proposal re-emerged during the routine updating of the TAR this year. This was brought to the CAHSS College Education Committee in February 2026 and a revised proposal approved for consideration by APRC.

The rationale for this proposal is as follows:

5. It is common practice throughout the HE sector, and in particular the Russell Group Universities, that students taking a resit have their mark capped at the pass mark (40% for UG). Some have a distinction between Honours and non-Honours (University of Oxford), but the majority cap resits. Edinburgh is an exception.
6. The current resit system, at pre-Honours level, is unsatisfactory, with very high levels of non-attendance. Time invested by both academic and professional services staff is incredibly high, and yet often students do not attend/complete a resit attempt, or perform poorly.
7. The current system means that resitting students can obtain marks higher than their peers who completed at the first attempt, which may be perceived as unfair and can provide an advantage in academic ranking for study abroad opportunities.
8. Capping resit marks might encourage students to pass at the first attempt and therefore reduce the number of alternative assessments required during the resit diet.
9. With the removal of elevated hurdles, there would be less concern that students would not be able to progress on their chosen degree with only a minimum pass mark.
10. The cap would remove the inherent unfairness of students with a marginal pass being unable to improve their mark, whilst students with a marginal fail can improve it substantially.
11. Students can get caught in a cycle of multiple resits impacting on achieving on current courses. Removing the pressure of getting a 'good' mark on a resit might help alleviate pressure and support students to move forward with their studies.

Discussion

12. The proposal is that marks must be capped at a component and not a course level. This means that students' marks achieved in a first sitting are protected, thus avoiding demotivating students. For courses where a fail in one component leads to a resit that accounts for all components would have difficulties in this case. Proposal: The cap should only apply to the percentage of the course mark that originally failed.
13. The importance of feedback was noted so that the student still gets the benefit or learning what they did well and what can be improved upon. In this case the mark would explicitly not match the feedback.
14. Pass/fail was proposed as an alternative to giving a mark of 40, on the basis students may think that 40% is a judgement on the quality of work rather than recognising that it is the maximum grade allowed. This highlights the importance of making the cap explicit. Pass/fail was preferred by the student representatives on the committee. However, concerns were raised about whether this was practically possible. Further investigation has found that within the Assessment Progression Tool (APT), either a 0-100 marks or pass/fail marking scheme can be applied across a course but a different approach at first sit and resit cannot be used. Even if this was possible through APT multiple components at resit and carrying any passed marks

from the first sit would be lost because only a one component Pass/Fail resit structure for all courses would be possible. This would disadvantage students who have passed components at the first sit, wiping recognition of previous achievement with the resit Pass/Fail that would remain on their record.

15. A concern was raised about resits that becomes null sits due to late EC. Markers risk having to mark an assessment twice. Proposal: Awarding an original mark that is later capped at 40 may be most appropriate, equivalent to how late and AM affected assessments are managed.
16. For students who have failed purely as a result of late penalties, their mark would be revised to a pass without the need for a re-submission. This would still be documented as a resit, but would reduce administrative burden and duplicative marking.
17. Students on programmes with elevated progression hurdles would be disadvantaged by the capping of marks. Schools continue to be encouraged to remove elevated progression hurdles. For programmes that have elevated hurdles resulting from external accreditation requirements, an adjustment or exception to the cap may be required.
18. A question was raised about the impact of capped resits on student's eligibility to go abroad or successfully evidence their skills for internships. Failed first sits already impact a student's eligibility for SWAY. The UG DRPS 27 states "Students must have achieved 240 credits before participating in Optional Study Abroad in year 3. All year 2 courses must be passed at the first attempt; resits during the summer diet are not permitted." This concern could therefore only apply to year 1 courses, and students who plan to study abroad would need to be reminded of the risks associated with failing a year 1 course. It could be argued that imposing the cap on resit marks would make the initial study abroad eligibility ranking fairer, as under the current system students who fail a course but get a good resit mark will be ranked higher than students who passed first time with a lower mark.
19. A concern was raised that students from widening participation backgrounds may be more likely to use the resit diet a way to manage workload in the context of complex lives and capping resits may result in widening the awarding gap. This has anecdotal evidence but supporting data was not available at the time of writing. Students from WP backgrounds are supported to make EC applications as needed, which should mitigate this risk. Reducing the appeal of resits as a workload management strategy may benefit (all) students if they become less likely to accumulate outstanding assessments and therefore fall behind with work.
20. A concern was raised regarding the possible impact on BA degree outcomes, students on the BA have often struggled and taking the opportunity to improve results via resit would impact outcome if 40% cap in place. The award of BA Ordinary or General degrees with Merit or Distinction is only calculated on the basis of first sit marks. Improving a mark from a failing mark at first sit to a pass mark of 40% in the resit diet would still ensure students were eligible for the award of a BA degree, but it would not affect classification.

21. For pre-UG courses delivered through COL, the marks directly impact offer-making and awarding of English language competency. COL ask that capping is not applied at the pre-UG level or for English-language competency.

Resource implications

22. If introduced into policy, it will require manual manipulation of grades equivalent to for Academic Misconduct (AM) and late submission penalties and application of Exceptional Circumstances (EC). This will introduce a further time cost. However, it is anticipated that it will lead to a reduction in the incidence of resits and this will bring more significant savings.

Risk management

23. The risks associated with this proposal would be human error where manual changes to capping resit marks are required.

Responding to the Climate Emergency & Sustainable Development Goals

24. This proposal does not directly impact the SDGs or Climate Emergency but these actions may influence student behaviour and therefore see a decrease in travel required for resit assessment and reduced strain on the University Estate over the August resit diet.

Equality & diversity

25. Specific impacts on certain groups of students and how these might be addressed are outlined in the discussion section of this paper.

Communication, implementation and evaluation of the impact of any action agreed

26. Explicit communication with existing and incoming students essential to ensure understanding of capping marks and the potential outcomes for students with, e.g. plans to study abroad.
27. Programmes with elevated hurdles would need to review their progression rules, decide the ongoing necessity of such hurdles and either make programme changes or apply for an exception or adjustment to capping.
28. When marking a resit, markers would be advised to follow a consistent practice of providing good quality feedback, explicitly stating the mark is capped, and a common approach to sharing of what an uncapped mark or mark range may have been.
29. Capping should be applied from 1st year UG only, and not to foundation or access courses or, at any level, English language competency.

Author

Dr Lawrence Dritsas – CAHSS Dean of Students

Catriona Morley – CAHSS Head of Taught Student Administration and Support

Dr Emily Taylor – CAHSS Dean of Quality Assurance and Curriculum Approval

Dr Lisa Kendall – CAHSS Director of Academic and Student Administration

H/02/27/02

APRC 25/26 3D

28/01/2026

Presenter

Dr Lawrence Dritsas – CAHSS Dean of Students

Freedom of Information

Open

If you require this document in an alternative format, such as large print or a coloured background, please contact academicpolicy@ed.ac.uk or Academic Quality and Standards, Old College, South Bridge, Edinburgh, EH8 9YL.

Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee**19 March 2026****Late Exceptional Circumstances – handling of accepted cases****Description of paper**

1. The paper seeks discussion and agreement on a common approach to the handling of Exceptional Circumstances (EC) cases which have been accepted by the EC service and passed to Schools for outcome decisions.

Fit with remit

Academic Policy and Regulations Committee	Y/N
Oversee the development, maintenance and implementation of an academic regulatory framework which effectively supports and underpins the University's educational activities.	Y
Ensure that the academic regulatory framework continues to evolve in order to meet organisational needs and is responsive to changes in University strategy, and in the internal and external environments.	Y
In taking forward its remit, the Committee will seek consistency and common approaches while supporting and encouraging variation where this is beneficial, particularly if it is in the best interests of students.	Y

Action requested / recommendation

2. APRC is asked to consider the options regarding the approach to the handling of accepted Late EC cases within Schools, and to approve the preferred approach, option (b), enabling consistent implementation within Schools from May 2026.

Background and context

3. At its January 2026 meeting, APRC considered and endorsed proposals for a revised approach to the handling of Late EC cases (see [APRC 2526 2B](#)). The proposed approach has since been approved by Senate at its March 2026 meeting, for implementation from May 2026.

Discussion

4. Under the revised approach, there will be a University deadline for on-time EC cases, which will be followed by a two-week period for late cases. During the late period, students applying for ECs must provide additional information and supporting evidence specifically explaining the reason for the lateness of their application. Where cases are accepted by the EC service, these will be passed to Schools for outcome decisions, as normal. For cases submitted late, students will

be informed that outcomes will not be provided by the standard publication dates for course and programme results.

5. The relevant dates for Semester 2, 2025/26 are provided below:

On-time EC deadline	25 May 2026, 12pm
Final deadline for late ECs	8 June 2026, 12pm
Deadline for ratified Honours results in EUCLID	5 June 2026, 12pm
Deadline for publication of awards for graduating students	15 June 2026, 12pm
Deadline for publication of course results and progression decisions for continuing students	30 June 2026, 12pm

6. Since the final deadline for late ECs falls after the date for ratified results for Honours courses, it will not be possible for Schools to process late ECs by this date. Cases being submitted towards the end of the late window are also unlikely to be possible to process within Schools before the publication date for awards, bearing in mind the time required for processing by the EC service.

7. As was discussed in the paper presented to APRC in January 2026, there are different options with regard to what instruction or advice is given to Schools about when to process accepted Late EC cases, following their receipt within Schools. These options were discussed with colleagues from Schools and Colleges at two consultation sessions in February 2026, with further feedback received via email. Opinions among colleagues were starkly divided between the two options. The options and the feedback received about each are summarised below.

a) Schools can process Late EC cases as they arise, subject to capacity

8. Some colleagues expressed a preference for allowing Schools discretion to process Late EC cases as they arise, including doing so before the final publication date for awards, where this is possible. The main comments in support of this approach were:

- Allows for students to receive an earlier outcome, where possible, including allowing them to graduate with their final award, where relevant, or more time to prepare for resits;
- Allows Schools discretion to manage their workload;
- Avoids in some cases the need to make changes to published outcomes and awards, which can be administratively burdensome and require intervention by Student Records team;
- Avoids pushing workload back into the period following Boards, when many staff may take annual leave.

9. Other comments raised concerns about this approach, including:

- Handling cases on a drip-feed basis leads to frequent re-running of Board reports, which increases the risk of errors in results;
- Some Schools would be able to process cases more quickly than others, leading to an inconsistent experience for students with regard to when they receive their outcome; this undermines the overall benefits of the Late EC process;
- Poses particular problems for joint programmes, when one School may process an outcome well before another.

10. APRC is asked to note the recent [Quality Assurance Agency \(QAA\) report](#) regarding assessment processes at the University of Glasgow, and the forthcoming National Review of Assessment commissioned by the Scottish Funding Council, which places considerable focus on the risk of errors arising within assessment processes.

11. With regard to staff taking annual leave after the Board of Examiners period, it should be noted that the final deadline for the publication of course results and progression decisions for continuing students is 30 June, i.e. a little more than three weeks after the deadline for late ECs. It is expected, therefore, that the largest volume of annual leave in Schools is taken from the beginning of July.

b) Schools must not process late EC outcomes until after the publication date for awards

12. Some colleagues expressed a preference for requiring Schools not to process or publish outcomes for late EC cases until after the publication deadline for awards has passed. The main comments in support of this approach were:

- Promotes consistency of experience for students, with students receiving outcomes at similar times;
- Allows Schools to process EC cases in two tranches: i) on time; ii) late; this mitigates some of the risks of error associated with frequent re-running of Board reports;
- Sets a clear expectation for staff in Schools, and avoids professional services staff being placed under pressure to turn around late cases at speed;
- The EC process is designed to mitigate the impact of adverse circumstances upon students' academic outcomes – it is reasonable to expect that this will lead to a delay in providing those outcomes.

13. As noted above, the comments which raised concerns about this approach focused on the following:
- Pushes workload into the period following Honours Boards, which may be when staff are taking annual leave;
 - Prevents students from receiving an earlier outcome, where this may be possible, including where it may affect graduation, or preparation for resits;
 - May lead to more changes to published awards, which can be administratively burdensome and require intervention by Student Records team.

14. We recommend option (b) as the preferred option in order to provide a consistent experience for students, and to mitigate risks regarding errors in outcomes. APRC is asked to approve the recommended approach for implementation from May 2026.

Resource implications

15. The resource implications are considered in the Discussion section.

Risk management

16. The Discussion section considers issues relating to the risk of errors in awards. The forthcoming National Review of Assessment being led by the QAA is likely to place considerable focus on universities' processes relating to assessment, and where they may pose an increased risk of leading to errors.

Responding to the Climate Emergency & Sustainable Development Goals

17. The options proposed do not have any implications regarding responding to the climate emergency or Sustainable Development Goals.

Equality & diversity

18. The new Late EC process is expected to offer benefits to all students, but especially those from marginalised groups, or with protected characteristics by providing a transparent and consistent route for handling late ECs. The implications for students of the two options are presented in the Discussion section, above.

Communication, implementation and evaluation of the impact of any action agreed

19. Registry Services will communicate the agreed approach for the handling of late EC cases to Schools and Colleges via email, once a decision has been reached.

The agreed approach will also inform communications to students regarding expected timelines should their Late EC application be accepted.

Author

Adam Bunni

Head of Academic Policy and Regulations

Academic Quality and Standards

Lisa Dawson

Academic Registrar

Registry Services

Katy McPhail

Head of Student Record Operations

Registry Services

Ellie Parker

Senior Change Manager

Strategic Change Service

Presenter

Katy McPhail and Adam Bunni

Freedom of Information

Open

If you require this document in an alternative format, such as large print or a coloured background, please contact academicpolicy@ed.ac.uk or Academic Quality and Standards, Old College, South Bridge, Edinburgh, EH8 9YL.