


CHAPTER 9: ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE

This section outlines important information on academic governance structures and oversight of the King's academic regulatory framework. This includes the circumstances when exceptions or exemptions can be made to the Academic Regulations as well as the emergency regulations that may be invoked by the Vice-Chancellor in the case of a campus wide emergency.

The following committees of the University are responsible for maintaining the academic integrity of a King's award. The academic regulations are reviewed annually via following the route through the committees. [The University delegation chart is available here.](#)



[Assessment and Regulatory Oversight Sub-Committee \(AROSC\)](#): The Assessment and Regulatory Oversight Sub-Committee is responsible for advising CEC on:

- The strategic development of assessment policy and regulation.
- The level of University compliance with the assessment framework.
- The extent to which assessment policies are transparent, fair, impartial, consistent and compliant with the values of King's.

AROSC recommends amendments to the academic regulations to CEC.

[College Education Committee \(CEC\)](#): CEC is the committee of Academic Board responsible for ensuring that the academic provision for all programmes is of the highest possible standard. CEC recommends amendments to the academic regulations to Academic Board.

[Academic Board](#): The Academic Board is the committee responsible on behalf of the Council for the academic work of the University in teaching and examining and in research. Academic Board approves amendments to the academic regulations.

Every taught programme of study that leads to an award and all free-standing credit bearing modules are assigned to an assessment sub-board. Each sub-board reports to its faculty assessment board and each faculty assessment board reports to AROSC.

The [Terms of Reference for Assessment Sub-Boards and Assessment Boards](#) detail the specific authority of each Board for their delegated area of responsibility.

The Postgraduate Research Student Sub-Committee, which reports to the [College Research Committee](#), reviews the academic regulations in Chapter 6: Framework for Postgraduate Research Awards before they are submitted to AROSC.

Deviations from the Academic Regulations

Exceptions

- 9.1. Where a cohort exemption to a specific regulation has been approved and will continue to apply, it will be listed with the respective regulation as an ongoing exception. Any exceptions to policy will be detailed in the respective policy document and will include any associated conditions.

Exemptions

- 9.2. Exemptions to the regulations may be considered in exceptional circumstances. Advice should be sought from [Academics Regulations, Quality & Standards](#).

- 9.3. For exemption requests relating to pre-undergraduate, undergraduate or postgraduate taught regulations, the approving authority is the Vice President (Education and Student Success) or delegate on behalf of Academic Board. All exemption requests should be submitted via the [Exemptions Procedure](#) by the Assessment Board Chair or delegate. Requests will be processed normally within 7 working days.
- 9.4. For exemption requests relating to postgraduate research regulations, the approving authorities are the Deputy Deans for Doctoral Studies on behalf of Academic Board. All exemption requests should be submitted via the [PGR Exemption request form](#).
- 9.5. For exemptions for a cohort relating to programme specifications, it is usually a condition of approval that a programme modification form will be submitted to eliminate the need for the same exemption request in the future.
- 9.6. Any exemptions to the regulations will be reported annually to the Assessment and Regulatory Oversight Sub-Committee and to Academic Board.
- 9.7. Policies cannot be exempted. Where there is an issue with an existing academic policy, the [Academic Regulations, Quality & Standards team](#) should be notified as soon as possible.

Emergency Regulations

King's Emergency Regulations have the overarching aim to ensure that in an emergency, students are not disadvantaged, and academic standards are maintained.

- 9.8. The Vice-Chancellor and President of King's College London (or nominee) may declare a University-wide or campus-specific emergency which will authorise the Emergency Regulations to be implemented for a prescribed period.
- 9.9. Once an emergency has been declared, the Emergency Regulations provide the framework to allow progression and award where regular compliance with the Academic Regulations is significantly disrupted and/or prevented by acts or events which may be beyond the control of the University.
- 9.10. The Vice-Chancellor and President of King's College London as Chair of Academic Board may use Chair's Action to make revisions or apply additional measures to the Emergency Regulations made necessary by the emergency. Any changes will be reported to Academic Board.
- 9.11. The role of the Faculty Assessment Boards and Assessment Sub-Boards and their chairs is to ratify marks and graduate their students. All business must be conducted fairly and impartially.
- 9.12. Where an individual role is specified in these Emergency Regulations, should that individual not be available to allow these regulations to be applied, the action or decision required can be performed by an individual nominated by the Executive Dean of Faculty.
- 9.13. Where appropriate and reasonable, faculties should engage with students about the implementation of the emergency regulations.

Disruption of Teaching

- 9.14. When an emergency has a prolonged or significant impact on teaching and learning on some or all teaching cohorts or campuses, alternative teaching arrangements may be established. The focus will be on providing a consistent and equitable approach as far as possible.
- 9.15. Any substantial changes to teaching patterns must be approved by the Head of Department and will be reported and logged.
- 9.16. The changes to teaching will focus on the delivery of content that allows students to meet the learning outcomes of the module and/or programme affected.
- 9.17. Departments are responsible for engaging with their students and delivering alternative teaching arrangements in a timely manner in order to minimise the disruption to student learning.
- 9.18. Support will be given to students and staff delivering teaching where teaching methods or patterns have changed.

Assessment and Assessment Mitigation

- 9.19. When considering assessment and assessment mitigation during an emergency, the guiding principles are to ensure that:
- Students are not disadvantaged.
 - Students can graduate or progress on time where this is appropriate in academic terms.
 - Any degree awarded accurately reflects a students' academic achievement.
- 9.20. Any assessment mitigation must be approved by the Faculty Assessment Board Chair, who will consult the Chair of the Assessment and Regulatory Oversight Sub-Committee (AROSC) and the Director of Academic Quality (or their nominees). The Chair of the Assessment Sub-Board must record any mitigation to assessments and all changes must be reported at the Assessment Sub-Board. External Examiners are to be involved where possible to ensure that the alternatives remain rigorous. For lines of communication see also 9.11.
- 9.21. The impact of the emergency may vary from assessment to assessment, hence each assessment must be considered individually. The guiding principles are that, as far as possible, mitigation is consistent, and no student should be disadvantaged. Care must be taken to ensure that the module learning aims and outcomes have still been met. Academic standards and Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) standards need to be maintained.
- 9.22. Assessment Sub-Board Chairs, in consultation with the Internal Examiner have discretion to amend assessment deadlines where these cannot be met by students due to the impact of the emergency. External Examiners are to be involved where possible to ensure that the amendments are fair and proportionate.
- 9.23. Assessment mitigation should be applied consistently to all students of a module affected by the emergency to ensure parity of treatment for all students. If marks are available only for some students of a cohort these marks may stand as long as they are not disadvantaging the student.

Mitigation for non-finalist students

- 9.24. If no assessment has taken place for a module and/or no marks are available, the assessment needs to take place and/or must be marked as soon as possible or when the Vice-Chancellor and President has declared that the emergency has ended. See also 9.22.
- 9.25. If some but not all assessments for a module have taken place and/or not all marks are available, the missing assessment marks may be omitted from the final module mark calculation and the remaining assessment(s) will be reweighted. Assessments weighted less or equal 39% of the module mark cannot be reweighted to more than 50% and the missing assessment needs to take place and/or must be marked as soon as the emergency has ended.

Mitigation for finalist students

- 9.26. If no assessment has taken place for a module, the assessment needs to take place and must be marked as soon as possible or when the Vice-Chancellor and President has declared that the emergency has ended. See also 9.22.
- 9.27. If an assessment for finalists has taken place, marking must be prioritised and marks must be made available in time for graduation. See also 9.30.
- 9.28. If not all assessments for a module have taken place and/or not all marks are available, the missing assessment(s) may be omitted from the module mark calculation and the remaining assessment will be reweighted. Assessments weighted less or equal 39% of the module mark cannot be reweighted to more than 50%.
- 9.29. If a module mark is not available in time for graduation because the assessment has taken place but a mark is not provided, the missing module mark may be omitted from the C-score. Utilising Academic Regulations 5.8-5.14, up to 30 credits may be condoned this way as long as a student has condonement allowance remaining and provided they meet the requirements of the regulations on condonement.

Markers and Marking

- 9.30. If an assessment is not marked by the assigned marker and/or marks are not submitted, the Head of Department in consultation with the Education Lead or Internal Examiner will assign a different marker to the assessment. The final responsibility to assure the University that the new marker has the relevant subject matter expertise lies with the Vice Dean of Education.
- 9.31. Once assigned, substitute markers may remain anonymous on request.
- 9.32. Marks submitted by substitute markers may be disclosed ahead of the board only at the discretion of the board ratifying the marks.
- 9.33. The Head of Department must ensure marking remains consistent and that regular marking processes are applied as far as possible.
- 9.34. If marking cannot be completed in accordance with the marking model assigned to the assessment, the Chair of the Faculty Assessment Board may, with the approval of the Chair of the Assessment and Regulatory Oversight Sub-Committee (AROSC), relax some of the rules contained within the marking model or assign a different marking model.

Mark Ratification

- 9.35. If marks are not ratified by the appropriate Assessment Sub-Board, the Vice Dean (Education) may revoke the authority of the Assessment Sub-Board and reallocate the board business to the Faculty Assessment Board.
- 9.36. If an Internal Examiner or marker assigned to mark an assessment is not submitting these marks, the Chair of the Assessment Sub-Board ratifying these marks will determine whether they need to attend the board. See also 9.35.

Progression

- 9.37. If students cannot be assessed in any format and/or results are unavailable for some or all students, Faculty Assessment Boards may relax the rules for progression and progress students pending assessment and/or ratification at a later date, unless prohibited by a Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB). Approval must be sought from the Chair of the Assessment and Regulatory Oversight Sub-Committee (AROSC) and the Director of Academic Quality (or their nominees).

Awards

- 9.38. There are no exceptions to the award rules and Regulations 5.43 and 6.13 will continue to apply. Boundaries cannot be lowered and exceptions cannot be made. The method of assessment for research degrees is by oral examination.

External Examiners

- 9.39. If an External Examiner is not available, their duties may be given to another External Examiner if qualified and available or to the Faculty Chief External Examiner (FCEE). The assessment process may proceed without external scrutiny, with the approval of the Chair of the Assessment and Regulatory Oversight Sub-Committee (AROSC).
- 9.40. External Examiners resigning from their role need to follow regular University Regulations to re-apply.

Assessment Sub-Boards

- 9.41. If an Assessment Sub-Board is not quorate, an Executive Board may be held.
- 9.42. If an Assessment Sub-Board is not fulfilling its role, the Vice-Dean (Education) may revoke the authority of the Assessment Sub-Board and reallocate it to the Faculty Assessment Board.
- 9.43. A decision made by the Assessment Sub-Board using the information available at the time of the emergency may be reviewed if new information becomes available at a later stage which demonstrates that students were disadvantaged.

Faculty Assessment Boards

- 9.44. If the Faculty Assessment Board Chair or Deputy Chair are not fulfilling their role, the Executive Dean may revoke their authority and chair the board.
- 9.45. If a Faculty Assessment Board is not fulfilling its role, the Executive Dean may revoke the authority of the Faculty Assessment Board and reallocate all board matters to the Vice-President (Education and Student Success) who will authorise approval of results on behalf of Academic Board to a faculty-specific Board to report to the Assessment and

Regulatory Oversight Sub-Committee (AROSC). For membership of this board see [Assessment Boards, External Examiners and Committee Procedures](#) in the University Regulations.

- 9.46. A decision made by the Faculty Assessment Board using the information available at the time of the emergency may be reviewed if new information becomes available at a later stage which demonstrates that students were disadvantaged.

Academic Misconduct and Academic Appeals

- 9.47. Assessment Sub-Boards and Faculty Assessment Boards consider any academic misconduct, mitigating circumstances and academic appeals through relevant processes such as Academic Integrity Meetings (AIMs), panels and board meetings. If this is not possible during an emergency, the Vice-Dean Education will nominate appropriately qualified colleagues to do so.

Policies and Contractual Documents

[Terms and Conditions for Students](#)

[Student Protection Plan](#)

[Programme Closure & Suspension Policy](#)

Useful links

[Exemptions process for undergraduate and postgraduate taught](#)

[Exemptions process for postgraduate research](#)

[Governance, policies and procedures](#)

[Committees Terms of Reference and Membership](#)

[Glossary](#)