

ERASMUS MUNDUE MA SPECIAL AND INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

PROGRAMME REGULATIONS

TERMINOLOGY

MODULE means one unit of assessed learning for which transferable credits are awarded. Credits are expressed as ECTS credits. Expected student commitment on a module includes, where relevant, all classes, practical work, tutorials, assignments, private study, and assessment.

PROGRAMME means a group of related modules that lead to a defined award.

PARTNER The partners are Univerzita Karlova v Praze (hereinafter Charles University), University of Oslo and Roehampton University. The awarding bodies are Charles University, University of Oslo and Roehampton University.

TRANSCRIPT means a detailed statement of the modules taken and the results obtained.

DIPLOMA SUPPLEMENT means a detailed statement concerning the programme as specified by the Bologna Agreement

AWARD CERTIFICATE means the certificate awarded to students who have successfully completed the programme.

INTRODUCTION

Study at the partner institutions is governed by the Memorandum of Agreement and Regulations for the Joint Award of the degree of Master of Arts Special and Inclusive Education/magistr (Mgr) from Univerzita Karlova v Praze, the University of Oslo and Roehampton University, London as long as the internal regulations of the participating university and / or legal regulations of the state, in which the study takes place, do not conflict.

ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS

1. Modes of Study

- (a) Students are full-time.
- (b) A proposed 'Interruption of Study' must be formally notified to the Joint Programme Board and may not normally last for more than 12 months. Absences in excess of this amount must be registered as 'Withdrawal'.
- (c) A student must initially register for modules worth at least 60 ECTS credits in the first year .
- (d) The maximum permissible duration of study leading to an award, from initial registration to completion of Programme requirements, but excluding time spent on interruption, suspension, or withdrawal, shall be three years.

2. Levels of Study

- (a) The academic standard of each module, including the standard of its assessment, shall be designated as being at Masters/magistr level.

3. Registration

- (a) It is the responsibility of each student to ensure that his/her registered Programme is in accordance with these Regulations.
- (b) All students will be admitted to an approved Programme of study leading to a target award.
- (c) All students entering in September will be required to register for the modules at the point of taking them.
- (d) The target award will be assumed to be a Masters/magistr degree.
- (e) Rules for the registration and withdrawal from a module will be those of the institution offering the module.

4. Credit Accumulation and Transfer

- (a) A successfully completed module earns a student a specified number of ECTS credits at Masters/magistr level.

5. Programme Management

(a) The Joint Programme Board

- (i) The Programme shall have a Convener from each of the Partners.
- (ii) There shall be a Joint Programme Board, which will be chaired by the Head of Department of Education at the lead institution. The Joint Programme Board shall be constituted as set out in Appendix A to these Regulations.
- (iii) The Joint Programme Board shall meet twice a year in January and June.
- (iv) The Joint Programme Board will deal with overarching administrative matters relating to the programme and also consider other specific matters as set out in these regulations including budgetary issues.
- (v) The Joint Programme Board will act as the conduit between the students and the Partners in the case of Appeals and Complaints.
- (vi) The meetings of the Joint Programme Board will have a regular agenda item for student members to represent the views of the student body.

(b) The Programme Conveners Group

- (i) There will be a Programme Conveners Group constituted as set out in Appendix A to these Regulations.
- (ii) The Group will be chaired by the three Programme Conveners on a rotation basis.
- (iii) The Group will meet four times per year.

ASSESSMENT REGULATIONS

6. Joint Programme Examinations Board

- (a) There shall be a Joint Programme Examinations Board.
- (b) The Joint Programme Examinations Board shall be constituted as set out in Appendix B to these Regulations.
- (c) The Joint Programme Examinations Board shall be responsible for the assessment arrangements of all modules sponsored by the Joint Programme Board.
- (d) The Joint Programme Examinations Board shall meet following each examination period (including any resit period).
- (e) A candidate whose assessment performance has been, or is likely to be, impaired because of ill health or other reasons, must inform the Chair of the Joint Examination Board in writing at the earliest opportunity, and provide documentary evidence in support. In the case of ill health this should be a medical certificate.
- (f) The Joint Programme Examinations Board may recommend at its own discretion the award of a mark without requiring all items of assessment to be completed, or it may require an alternative or additional form of assessment. An alternative form of assessment may be approved only where there are clearly defined mitigating circumstances preventing the normal assessment or a deferment, and where the proposed alternative assessment is capable of testing substantially the same learning outcomes as the validated assessment.

7. Marking and Progression

- (a) All module assessments shall consist of one final outcome (either a grade or percentage mark depending on the university offering the module). Other module assessments shall be on a Pass/Fail basis. All work submitted for summative assessment must be in English.
- (b) When a percentage is used, the pass mark is 50%, or E where it is a grade. The programme handbook will contain a table to show equivalent marking grades used at Charles University, the University of Oslo and Roehampton University.
- (c) *Condonation* is not allowed for modules on this programme.
- (d) In cases where a candidate has failed or deferred a particular assessment, the Joint Programme Examinations Board shall stipulate the nature and timing of the assessment and/or attendance required to pass. Such resits or deferred assessments shall normally take place at the next scheduled University examinations period. Any student who has interrupted a programme of study with resits or deferrals pending, or any student who has left the Programme as a result of programme termination, must inform the Chair of the Joint Examinations Board within two weeks of the despatch of confirmed results if he/she wishes to take such assessments at the next opportunity. Students who have been suspended must ensure that all associated arrangements for resits and deferred assessments are similarly confirmed with the Chair of the Joint Programme Examinations Board.
- (e) There will be no mark reduction on retaking the assessment of a failed module. A candidate who has passed a particular module shall not be permitted to retake the assessment for that module.

- (f) A candidate who has failed a particular module but who has made a reasonable attempt to fulfill the assessment requirements for that module shall have the right to retake the assessment for that module on a maximum of two occasions only. Further retakes shall be permitted only at the discretion of the Joint Programme Examinations Board, though careful consideration will be given to offering a second resit in cases where failure on a compulsory module would result in programme termination. A candidate who fails to submit work for assessment or to attend for examination at the appointed time or who otherwise fails to make a reasonable attempt to fulfill assessment requirements shall *forfeit the right* to retake the assessment for that module. A retake in such cases shall be permitted only at the discretion of the Joint Programme Examinations Board.
- (g) Coursework may be returned to students.
- (h) Academic misconduct by students is regarded as a very serious offence. Academic misconduct in relation to assessment includes, for example: impersonation of another candidate, allowing impersonation by another candidate, copying from another person or communicating with another person (other than an invigilator) during a timed examination, introducing any unauthorised aid into a timed examination, plagiarism, unauthorised replication of a candidate's own work for different assessment tasks, a student allowing work to be plagiarised intentionally or carelessly and fabrication of results obtained from work which has or has not been carried out. Academic misconduct also includes theft, concealment or intentional damage to learning resources or facilities of any sort offered by the Partners, and all such cases shall be dealt with severely.
- (i) Cases of alleged academic misconduct of a flagrant or serious nature shall immediately be referred to the Chair of the Joint Programme Board. The candidate who is the subject of the allegation will be informed in writing of the grounds for the allegation and will be given the opportunity to make representations. The Joint Programme Board shall recommend that the case be handled in accordance with the arrangements prevalent at the partner institution where the module is being delivered and any penalty that is imposed shall be subject to approval by all three Partners.

AWARD REGULATIONS

8. Nomenclature of Awards

- (a) These Regulations apply to the *Master of Arts/magistr Degree*, which may be conferred on eligible candidates.
- (b) Eligibility for awards depends on attainment of the minimum number of 90 ECTS credits.
- (c) There is no exit award at Postgraduate Certificate or Postgraduate Diploma for this programme.

9. Classification of Awards

- (a) The degree will be unclassified, though it may be awarded with Distinction*** status in cases where the average of the marks achieved by a candidate for the 90 M level ECTS credits is 70% or more. The calculation of this average will be weighted according to the volume of credit for each module.

10. Transcripts, Diploma Supplement and Certificates

- (a) The award certificate shall carry the names of Charles, Oslo and Roehampton Universities.
- (b) The Certificate shall state the Universities at which the student studied for the award.
- (c) Following the end of each academic year, all students will receive a *transcript* which records all modules taken in accordance with the Partner, and, where appropriate, any award conferred.
- (d) On satisfactory completion of the degree, each student will receive a Diploma Supplement.
- (e) No student shall be entitled to the award unless all fees for residence and any other sums due to the relevant Partner have been paid and the rightful property of those Partners returned.

11. APPEALS and COMPLAINTS

- (a) A candidate who believes that he/she has been incorrectly marked in a particular module, or incorrectly failed, or incorrectly programme-terminated, has in certain circumstances the right of appeal. An appeal must be about an academic decision. Details of the grounds on which candidates may appeal and of the initial procedures to be followed are set out in Appendix C to these regulations.
- (b) Pursuance of other possible grievances should follow the complaints procedure. Details of the initial procedures for complaints are set out in Appendix D.

APPENDIX A – MEMBERSHIP OF THE JOINT PROGRAMME BOARD AND THE PROGRAMME CONVENERS GROUP

1. Joint Programme Board

- The Head of Department of Education at the Lead Partner who will act as Chair
- The Programme Conveners from each of the Partners The designated programme administrators from each of the Partners
- When asked to deal with a case of academic misconduct, there will be in addition a senior member of staff from the relevant Partner, not personally connected with the Programme.
- At least three Students representing those currently taking modules within the Programme. There should be Student representation for each of the Partners.

2. Programme Conveners Group

- The Programme Conveners from each of the Partners (One of these will act as Chair on a rotating basis)
- All teachers of modules comprising the Programme

APPENDIX B – TERMS OF REFERENCE, MEMBERSHIP AND PROCEDURES FOR PROGRAMME EXAMINATION BOARDS

3. JOINT PROGRAMME EXAMINATIONS BOARD

(a) Terms of Reference

- (i) to be responsible for the assessment of all modules sponsored by its Joint Programme Board;
- (ii) to receive mark lists for all candidates who have been assessed in the sponsored modules;
- (iii) to approve the marks and recommendations recorded in the mark lists, and to make recommendations for consideration by the next appropriate awards approval process at Charles, Oslo and Roehampton Universities;
- (iv) to recommend candidates for 'programme termination' in respect of compulsory programme requirements or for other appropriate reasons;
- (v) to send to candidates a 'Letter of Warning' in respect of compulsory programme requirements;
- (vi) to ensure that an official version of the agreed mark sheet is completed and signed in accordance with the approved guidance notes;
- (vii) to conduct its proceedings in accordance with the Joint Academic Regulations for the award of the MA Special Education Needs/magistr.

(b) Membership

Full Members:

- The Programme Convener from each of the Partners. Programme Conveners may delegate their role to a Programme Convener from a partner institution
- All teachers of the modules specific to the programme, as indicated by the module code, for which marks have been submitted
- The External Examiner(s) for the programme appointed by Charles, Oslo and Roehampton Universities.

Rights of Attendance:

- A senior member of each of the Partners with specialist expertise in quality assurance
- The Heads of the Education or Special Education Departments from each of the Partners (or their nominated alternates)

(c) Procedures

- (i) The Joint Programme Examinations Board will meet at least twice a year.
- (ii) The Joint Programme Examinations Board will be chaired by one of the Programme Conveners.
- (iii) Provision of secretarial support and the production of papers are the responsibility of the Partner, which is hosting the board at that time.
- (iv) After it has been signed by the Chair of the Board and the External Examiner(s), the official mark sheet and an electronic version will be sent to the appropriate offices within Charles and Roehampton Universities.

APPENDIX C – GROUNDS & PROCEDURES FOR APPEAL

1. An appeal must be about an academic decision.
2. An appeal must state the ground on which it is presented. The only legitimate grounds for appeal shall be one or more of the following:
 - (a) that marks have been incorrectly recorded or incorrectly aggregated, or that the procedure for collation of marks has been incorrectly followed;
 - (b) that there has been an irregularity in the conduct of examinations or other forms of assessment, of such a nature as to cause reasonable doubts as to whether the Joint Programme Examinations Board would have reached the same conclusion if the alleged irregularity had not occurred;
 - (c) that there have been circumstances which affected the candidate's performance which he/she could not or did not, for valid reasons, divulge prior to the meeting of the Joint Programme Examinations Board.
 - (d) that the candidate has demonstrable reason to believe that one or more of the examiners was prejudiced or unreasonably biased.
3. A candidate wishing to appeal must give notice in writing to the Chair of the Joint Programme Board as soon as possible, but not before publication of the confirmed results, and not later than three weeks after the dispatch of the confirmed results by the Universities. However, appeals received for good reason outside this time limit may be considered, up to a maximum of three months. In the Czech Republic appeals and complaints will be determined by the Dean or Rector on the advice of the Joint Programme Board Group and the Disciplinary Commission at the Faculty of Education.
4. A decision on the appeal will be made as speedily as is consistent with the complexity of the issue and the availability of relevant staff to comment. It is normal for the procedure from appeal to decision to take no longer than two months. In cases where an appeal against a full-time programme termination is being considered, a student is permitted to continue in attendance at modules for which he/she is already registered, pending the result of the appeal.
5. Appeals are treated (i) in accordance with the Equal Opportunities Policy of the Partners, and (ii) with due regard to confidentiality, so that consideration is restricted to a small number of staff. An intending appellant is encouraged to seek informal advice from the Chair of the Joint Programme Board before lodging a formal appeal.
6. The student will have the right to ask for the appeal to be considered according to the procedures of Charles, Oslo or Roehampton Universities. These particular procedures will be advised to any student wishing to pursue an appeal by the Chair of the Joint Programme Board and further advice on this will be found in the Joint Programme Handbook.
7. The results of an appeal will be notified to all the Partners. All Partners agree to accept the result of an appeal having been heard by either Charles, Oslo or Roehampton Universities.

APPENDIX D - COMPLAINTS

1. The Partners endeavour to provide quality in all of their various enterprises. However there are times when things go wrong and students fail to receive the **level of service**, which might reasonably be expected. In those circumstances, a student is entitled to complain. There are four categories of student complaints.
 - (a) Academic Programmes
 - (b) Services
 - (c) Students
 - (d) Staff
2. A complaint will be most relevant to the level of service provided by only one of the Partners. In the first instance a student wishing to make a complaint should notify the Chair of the Joint Programme Board. The Chair will then advise the student about how to follow the complaint procedures of the Partner concerned. Students will be advised of the existence of these procedures in the Joint Programme Handbook.
3. The progress of a particular complaint will be notified to the Joint Programme Board by Charles, Oslo, or Roehampton Universities. All Partners agree to accept the result of a complaint having been heard by any of the Partners.

APPENDIX E – INTEGRATED GRADE CONVERSION TABLE AND MAKING CRITERIA

Charles University	Roehampton University	University of Oslo	Criteria
1 (excellent)	70% +	A	<p>Evidence of critical evaluation in work that uses practice to critique existing theory and through theory reflects upon practice in a general and specific sense. Arguments justified and implications for future practice identified. The assignment is correctly presented in standard English. A sophisticated engagement with the course aims and substantial attainment and expansion of learning outcomes.</p> <p>An excellent performance, clearly outstanding. The candidate demonstrates excellent judgement and a high degree of independent thinking.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Work of a distinctive standard.</p>
2 (very good)	60 – 69%	B (65-69) C (60-64)	<p>Evidence of critical evaluation of practice by the application of theory. An appropriate range of references cited beyond the indicative bibliography. The assignment is correctly presented in standard English. A clear engagement with course aims and substantial attainment of learning outcomes.</p> <p>A very good performance where the candidate demonstrates sound judgement and a very good degree of independent thinking.</p> <p>A good performance in most areas where the candidate demonstrates a reasonable degree of judgement and independent thinking in the most important areas.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Work of merit.</p>
3 (good)	50 -59%	D (55-59) E (50-54)	<p>Evidence of a clear analysis and evaluation of course material. A sound understanding of relevant literature and key concepts. A clear writing style and organisation. Appropriate and pertinent references cited. The assignment is correctly presented in standard English. An acceptable engagement with course aims and attainment of learning outcomes.</p> <p>A satisfactory performance, but with significant shortcomings where the candidate demonstrates a limited degree of judgement and independent thinking.</p> <p>A performance that meets the minimum criteria, but no more where the candidate demonstrates a very limited degree of judgement and independent thinking.</p>

			Pass.
4 (fail)	0 - 49%	F	<p>The work is descriptive with poor coverage of literature, limited relevance to the problem and is lacking critique and analysis. Limited engagement with course aims and attainment of learning outcomes.</p> <p>A performance that does not meet the minimum academic criteria. The candidate demonstrates an absence of both judgement and independent thinking.</p> <p>Fail</p>

NOTE: that should your coursework fail, when you re-submit there will be NO penalty in the form of a mark reduction.