

University of Birmingham

Proposed Code of Practice on Taught Programme and Module Assessment

Topic and purpose of the paper

1. To submit for APRC's consideration the proposed Code of Practice on Taught Programme and Module Assessment, attached as Appendix A. This Code of Practice will replace the current two sets of Assessment Protocols for undergraduate and for postgraduate taught modules.

Proposal(s)/Recommendation(s)

2. APRC is requested to **consider and approve** the proposed Code of Practice on Taught Programme and Module Assessment to supersede the Assessment Protocols with effect from the commencement of the 2009/10 academic session.

Background to the paper

3. At its meeting on 21st October 2008, the Learning and Teaching Committee received a paper on the academic policy priorities for 2008/09 that identified a number of potential topics for policy-related areas of work for this session. One of these areas was to build upon the work undertaken by APRC in 2007/08 in respect of the review of legislation, including the current undergraduate and postgraduate taught Assessment Protocols, which had received some minor revision last year (APRC Minute No. 08/20 refers). These academic policy priorities were subsequently approved by the Senate at its meeting on 5th November 2008.
4. At its meeting on 26th February 2008, APRC had also agreed that the Assessment Protocols should be retained in 2008/09 (with some minor revision), pending the production of a unified document for 2009/10. (APRC Minute No. 08/20 refers).
5. Accordingly, work was commenced in the autumn of 2008 to develop a unified document, and the following activities have been completed to date:
 - (a) Mapping the two sets of Assessment Protocols in order to identify instances of duplication and overlap.
 - (b) The drafting of a unified document applicable to undergraduate and postgraduate modules (including those undertaken by postgraduate research students as part of their research programmes), in which the identified points of duplication and overlap, having been noted, have been removed.
 - (c) Comparison of all clauses and sections in the unified document with those contained in Regulations and other Codes of Practice, in order to remove any duplication and overlap found to exist.

- (d) Careful checking to ensure that no information has been deleted from the unified document without it having been established that this information is contained elsewhere, e.g. in another Code of Practice, or that it is now redundant, and is logged as such.
 - (e) Editing the unified document and adding cross-referencing, both internally between clauses and sections, and where reference is made to other Codes of Practice and Regulations, as required.
 - (g) The unified document has been circulated for comment to all the members of the Progress and Awards Board (PAB). Effectively this Board has been requested to act as an academic focus group, looking at the clauses in detail and drawing on the substantial experience and expertise of Board members in the assessment of students.
6. At its meeting on 3rd February 2009, APRC resolved that an extraordinary meeting should be convened to consider the proposed Code of Practice. This document has been updated to include the comments now received from the members of APRC and PAB.

By reference to the proposed Code of Practice attached as Appendix A, it should be noted that the comments received are shown in blue font, together with the initials in brackets of the person making the comments. Below the comment, and in red font, are responses made on behalf of Academic and Student Administration. Accordingly, APRC is requested to take these comments and responses into account when it considers the proposed Code of Practice.

Substantive Changes

7. The following substantive changes were identified via the above-mentioned process and have been incorporated into the unified document, the proposed Code of Practice on Taught Programme and Module Assessment:
- The revised Code of Practice on Primary Appeals Procedure was agreed by APRC at its meeting on 10th April 2008 (APRC Minute No. 08/28 refers). Therefore, having verified that the clauses relating to Primary Appeals in the Assessment Protocols duplicate those in the Code of Practice, they have been omitted from the unified document. Appropriate cross-referencing to the Code of Practice on Primary Appeals Procedure has been included in the unified document, however.
 - The Code of Practice for Reasonable Diligence is currently subject to revision and will be presented to APRC for consideration in due course. The section relating to reasonable diligence contained in the Assessment Protocols has not been included in the unified document due to the duplication of information; appropriate cross-referencing to the Code of Practice for Reasonable Diligence is included to ensure that further information on reasonable diligence can be located.
 - The terms of reference of the Progress and Awards Board (formerly the Progress and Awards Board of Senate) have been recently revised (APRC Minute No. 08/48 and PAB Minute No. 08/22 refer). The

information on the Progress and Awards Board included in the unified document has been updated so that it is consistent with that contained in the terms of reference of the Progress and Awards Board.

- New information and cross-referencing to the Code of Practice on Adjusted Regulations for Bachelors Degrees and the Code of Practice on Adjusted Regulations for Undergraduate Masters Degrees has been included in the unified document, as appropriate.
- The section on Recording Marks has been updated to reflect recent procedural and software developments, such as those derived from the implementation of BIRMS.
- The appendices that featured in both sets of Assessment Protocols have been omitted from the unified document as much of the information contained therein has now been superseded.

Arguments in Support of the Proposal

8. The current Assessment Protocols take the form of two sets of discrete standalone documents, dealing with undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes respectively. It is evident that there are a number of aspects of these Protocols that require attention:
 - (a) There is a considerable amount of duplication in terms of what is stated in the Assessment Protocols and elsewhere in the University's legislation, i.e. in Regulations and other Codes of Practice.
 - (b) The Assessment Protocols contain some information that is now out of date, or which has been replaced by recent developments, and is, therefore, in need of modification/revision, such as those arising from last year's revision of the Academic Regulations.
 - (c) The Assessment Protocols are lengthy documents that feature a significant number of common sections and clauses, i.e. what is said in the undergraduate document tends to be repeated in the postgraduate document, and there would be benefits from rationalisation and a unified document.
9. It is contended that the adoption of this proposed Code of Practice on Taught Programme and Module Assessment will rectify problems encountered due to these issues and provide a comprehensive single document for the assessment of taught programmes and modules that is applicable to the undergraduate, postgraduate taught and postgraduate research students of the University.

Paul Fantom
Policy Officer, Academic Policy
Academic & Student Administration
(p.a.fantom@bham.ac.uk/ 48471)

Code of Practice on Taught Programme and Module Assessment

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This Code of Practice applies to all undergraduate, graduate and postgraduate taught programmes, and the taught elements of postgraduate research programmes, including part-time provision, collaborative provision and distance learning.
- 1.2 This Code of Practice should be read in conjunction with the University Regulations, Sections 5, 6, 7 and 8 and the following Codes of Practice:
- Code of Practice on the Teaching and Academic Support of Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught Students by Postgraduate Teaching Assistants and Undergraduates
 - Code of Practice for Student Development and Support in Principal Academic Units
 - Code of Practice for the Conduct of Centrally Co-ordinated Formal Written Examinations
 - Code of Practice on Adjusted Regulations and Bachelors Degrees
 - Code of Practice on Adjusted Regulations and Undergraduate Masters Degrees
 - Code of Practice on the External Examiner System for Taught Programmes
 - Code of Practice for Reasonable Diligence
 - Code of Practice on Misconduct and Fitness to Practise Committees
 - Code of Practice on Primary Appeals Committees
 - Code of Practice on Assessment of Research Degree Theses
- 1.3 This Code of Practice applies to all summative assessments (i.e. those contributing to the module mark) including written examinations, coursework, projects, worksheets, oral presentations or any other form of assessment.

2. Setting of Assessments

- 2.1 Assessment should be set in accordance with the Code of Practice on the Conduct of Centrally Coordinated Formal Written Examinations.
- 2.2 The Head of principal academic unit shall have overall responsibility for the management of all assessment. The Head of principal academic unit may choose to delegate this responsibility, as appropriate.
- 2.3 A single member of academic staff shall have overall responsibility to the Head of principal academic unit, or his/her nominee, for each module and all of the assessments within the module. It shall be the responsibility of the Head of principal academic unit concerned, or his/her nominee, to ensure that examination question papers and other forms of assessment, as appropriate, are submitted to the relevant external examiner for his/her approval.
- 2.4 The contribution of all assessments to the determination of the final award should be notified in writing to Registered Students in advance of the assessment.
- 2.5 When working with a partner organisation in a collaborative arrangement, principal academic units should ensure that the partner organisation understands and follows the University's requirements for the conduct of assessment.

3. Boards of Examiners

3.1 Membership, Meeting and Documentation Requirements

- 3.1.1 Membership of Boards of Examiners will be determined by the relevant principal academic unit committee(s) and will normally be as follows:
- 3.1.1 (a) Chair - the Head of principal academic unit responsible for the programmes concerned, or his/her nominee.
- 3.1.1 (b) The principal academic unit Examinations Officer(s) for the programme(s) concerned, or his/her nominee.
- 3.1.1 (c) All internal examiners for the programme(s) concerned.
- 3.1.1 (d) All external examiners for the programme(s) concerned (as a minimum, for meetings where final awards are being considered).
- 3.1.2 Principal academic units may delegate responsibility to department level. In such cases, 'department' may be substituted for 'principal academic unit' in the list of members above and in the remainder of this Code of Practice.
- 3.1.3 Principal academic units should establish a quoracy for each Board of Examiners. All meetings of Boards of Examiners should have a quoracy (defined at the start of each academic session) in addition to at least one external examiner. Only academic members of staff (including Honorary Lecturers) may be members of a Board of Examiners, with non-academic staff attending to provide administrative support. A minimum would normally be 3 (three) members of academic staff and an external examiner (or a consulting mechanism to the external examiner if he or she is not physically present). The external examiner must be informed of any decisions that affect progress or final results.
- 3.1.3 **Comment (RJ): Amendment required as this clause states that in terms of the quoracy, there should be at least one external examiner but also refers to a consulting method if the external examiner is not physically present.**
- ASA Response: Proposed amendment shown above, underlined.**
- 3.1.4 All Boards of Examiners should establish written terms of reference, covering the following as a minimum:
- 3.1.4 (a) Membership and quoracy.
- 3.1.4 (b) Timing and frequency of meetings.
- 3.1.4 (c) The authority of the Board in relation to other Boards of Examiners (for instance, in multi-departmental Principal academic units there may be a formal Principal academic unit-level Board that receives the final decisions of Departmental Boards for information only).
- 3.1.4 (d) Role of the external examiners.
- 3.1.4 (e) A procedure for Chair's Action (if required between meetings).
- 3.1.5 The terms of reference for each Board of Examiners must be presented to a meeting of the Board once per year.

- 3.1.6 All Boards of Examiners should have a written agenda, with at least the following items:
- 3.1.6 (a) At the initial meeting of the year, approval of terms of reference and membership.
 - 3.1.6 (b) Receipt and confirmation of module marks. This should include module marks of postgraduate research students taking taught modules for credit.
 - 3.1.6 (c) Receipt of report from mitigations panel.
 - 3.1.6 (d) Report of any further special factors (e.g. procedural irregularities).
 - 3.1.6 (e) Determination and confirmation of awards and progress decisions within Regulations.
 - 3.1.6 (f) Re-consideration of cases referred back to Board by a Primary Appeals Committee.
 - 3.1.6 (g) Consideration and confirmation of awards and progress decisions made notwithstanding Regulations involving mitigations, if the criteria detailed in clause 3.2.3 below are met.
 - 3.1.6 (h) Consideration of all other cases notwithstanding Regulations, to recommend to the University Progress and Awards Board.
 - 3.1.6 (i) External Examiners' comments on examinations, assessments and programmes (include discussion of any items of interest to External Examiner that may appear in his/her report).
- 3.1.7 Full minutes should be kept of all Boards of Examiners meetings and returned to Academic Services along with the signed Chair of Board of Examiners statement and (if required) appropriate mark sheets. Failure to return full documentation to Academic Services by the deadline will be reported to the University Progress and Awards Board.
- 3.1.8 Principal academic units should ensure the provision of adequate notice of meetings of the Board of Examiners, and in particular any reconvened meetings, to all who are expected to attend.
- 3.1.9 Consideration should be given to the timing of the Board of Examiners' meetings on a programme-by-programme basis.
- 3.1.10 Members of the Board of Examiners should declare personal interest, involvement or relationship with a student either before the meeting to the Chair, or during the meeting and, if appropriate, withdraw from the meeting while that student is being considered.
- 3.1.11 When examining collaborative provision, where possible a common Board of Examiners should be used to ensure close comparability of approach. However, where this is not possible, arrangements that are put in place should take proper account of quality issues. Arrangements for Boards of Examiners should be set out in the Memoranda of Agreement covering programmes.
- 3.1.11 Questions (RJ): Should joint honours be mentioned, as well as collaborative

provision? Should there be another clause here?

ASA Response: Creation of an additional clause to deal with programmes with modules from other PAUs, as follows:

When examining programmes that feature modules from another Principal Academic Unit, where possible a common Board of Examiners should be used to ensure close comparability of approach. However, where this is not possible, arrangements that are put in place should take proper account of quality issues. Arrangements for Boards of Examiners should be set out in the Memoranda of Agreement covering programmes.

- 3.1.12 The taught component of a graduate or postgraduate programme must be considered at a meeting of the Board of Examiners. Where no dissertation is involved, the final award of a qualification must be considered at a meeting of the Board of Examiners; where a dissertation is involved, the final award of a qualification must be considered either at a meeting of the Board of Examiners, or according to alternative arrangements which must involve the external examiner.
- 3.1.12 Question (CE): For PGR with taught students, marks will go through a Board of Examiners and the final award of the qualification is normally determined when the thesis is examined. But if the student withdraws before submitting the thesis, but has sufficient credits for a PGCert/PGDip, does this need to go back through the Board of Examiners (or Chair's action) for the alternative qualification to be awarded?

ASA Response: Creation of an additional clause, as follows:

For Postgraduate Research Students undertaking taught modules, the module marks will be assessed by the Board of Examiners and the final award of the qualification is normally determined when the thesis is examined. However, when a Postgraduate Research Student withdraws without submitting their thesis, but has successfully completed taught modules that provide sufficient credits for a lower taught award, this will be considered by the Board of Examiners.

- 3.1.13 Registered Students should be notified in advance of the Board of Examiner meetings at which the results of their assessments will be considered.
- 3.2 Roles and Powers of Boards of Examiners
- 3.2.1 The Board of Examiners will make decisions on all module marks and the final award. This includes modules provided as part of the programme of study by other principal academic units. Such decisions will be made only on the basis of actual performance in those assessments, which have formally been defined as contributing to the final award. The consequences of such performance should not normally be modified by reference to the Registered Student's record of progress. In all cases, the Board of Examiners must be satisfied that the learning outcomes of the module or programme have been achieved.
- 3.2.2 Boards of Examiners may not confirm module marks or make decisions on progression and award for students owing a tuition fee debt to the University.
- 3.2.3 Boards of Examiners have the formal authority, on behalf of Senate, to make final award and progress decisions in all cases where the relevant Regulations and Codes of Practice have been followed.

3.2.4 The Boards of Examiners have the formal authority, exercised on behalf of Senate to make final progress and award decisions notwithstanding University Regulations, if there are mitigating circumstances and the following criteria are met:

3.2.4 (a) The principal academic unit provides a written copy of their mitigations procedure to the University Progress and Awards Board by the end of the Spring Term of the current academic year and can prove in subsequent documentation that this procedure has been followed.

3.2.4 (b) The principal academic unit provides an anonymised summary of all decisions to the University Progress and Awards Board taken under their mitigation procedure and approved by the relevant Board of Examiners. This should include decisions taken within Regulations and notwithstanding Regulations.

3.2.5 All recommendations made notwithstanding the Regulations where clause 3.2.3 does not apply should be passed to the University Progress and Awards Board for consideration and final decision.

3.2.6 Where, in multi-department principal academic units, there are departmental level Board of Examiners meetings, the principal academic unit's Board of Examiners or principal academic unit Committee must ratify the assessment processes and take appropriate measures to review and confirm decisions/recommendations as appropriate.

3.2.6 Question (RJ): Can departmental level Boards of Examiners challenge the decisions of the principal academic unit's Board of Examiners?

ASA Response: The PAU's Board of Examiners has seniority.

3.2.7 Where Registered Students have taken modules outside their principal academic unit or department, the Board of Examiners for the 'home' principal academic unit shall be responsible for considering the Registered Student's overall results for the programme and recommendations accordingly. Mitigation arrangements, as set out in the Mitigations Guidance for Students, remain applicable and are considered by the 'home' principal academic unit.

3.2.7 Question (RJ): Should reference be made to mitigation procedures?

ASA Response: Agreed – see above proposed amendment to clause (underlined).

3.2.8 For Joint Honours, Major/Minor or designated interdisciplinary programmes, academic staff from all of the relevant principal academic units or departments, which contribute modules to the programme, should attend the Board of Examiners as appropriate to the cases under consideration. Responsibility for convening Boards of Examiners for these programmes shall be determined prior to the start of each academic session and communicated to appropriate staff, external and internal examiners, and Registered Students.

3.2.8 Question (RJ): As joint honours, both principal academic units need to agree over the ownership of arrangements. Which one takes the lead responsibility?

Comment (KD): Unintentionally, this outlaws joint honours (especially finals) which cannot possibly operate by a Board of Examiners per JH combination. Currently the module results are determined by each of the two departments; mitigations are handled by the senior tutor; and a panel with an external adviser arrives at the classifications. These arrangements involve many hundreds of students and surely

constitute the majority of joint honours in the University.

ASA Response: The joint ownership of arrangements is covered by the last sentence of the above clause.

3.3 Internal Examiners

- 3.3.1 Heads of principal academic unit will appoint internal examiners annually. Internal examiners are responsible for the assessment of the performance of Registered Students and are automatically members of the Board of Examiners that makes recommendations on progression and decisions on module marks and final awards. Actual membership of the Board may vary according to the size of the provision and the cases being considered. All members of the academic staff of a principal academic unit are eligible to serve as internal examiners for programmes of study and modules, which are the responsibility of that principal academic unit.

3.4 Role of the External Examiners

- 3.4.1 Arrangements for external examination should be made in accordance with the Code of Practice on the External Examiner System for Taught Programmes.
- 3.4.2 No University qualification, including those made under collaborative agreements, may be awarded without participation in the assessment process by at least one examiner external to this University, who will be a full member of the relevant principal academic unit or Subject Board of Examiners. As well as attendance of meetings, participation will also include contact by correspondence, email and telephone.
- 3.4.2 Comment (RJ): Participation may also include correspondence, email and telephone, as well as physical attendance.

ASA Response: Agreed – see above proposed amendment to clause (underlined).

- 3.4.3 External examiners, as full members of the relevant principal academic unit (or programme) Board of Examiners, have the right to be present at all examiners' meetings at which significant decisions are to be taken in regard to the programme with which they have been concerned, including the setting of written examination papers and projects and dissertations. They are normally required to be present at any meeting where final awards are determined for the programme(s) in which they have been involved. In cases within Regulations, External Examiners must be informed of any changes to a result, which they have previously agreed.
- 3.4.3 Comment (KD): This outlaws the arrangements adopted in IAA to cope with an excess of external examiners. We need a category of consultant who, e.g., vets Sumerian or Egyptian language papers and scripts and writes a report, but is not required to attend the Board of Examiners. Can this be accommodated here/within Regulations?

ASA Response: This needs to be discussed by APRC.

- 3.4.4 The views of the external examiner must be particularly influential where there is disagreement on the mark to be awarded for a particular module. The views of the external examiner must also be particularly influential in considering instances of apparent examination irregularities and in considering mitigation.
- 3.4.5 If no External Examiner(s) is/are available for a Board of Examiners, the principal

academic unit should inform them of any decisions made as soon as practicable.

3.4.5 Proposed amendment (RJ):

If no External Examiner(s) is/are available for a Board of Examiners, the principal academic unit should ~~inform~~ consult them ~~of~~ regarding any decisions made as soon as practicable.

ASA response: Agree with the proposed amendment.

3.5 Consideration of mitigating or other extraneous factors by Principal Academic Unit Boards of Examiners

3.5.1 Mitigations Panels shall be established to consider the possible effects of extraneous circumstances on the qualifications to be awarded to individual candidates. The Mitigations Panels should be ~~University-level panels~~ held at principal academic unit level and their membership and procedures should be consistent with the principles of best practice contained within the University's Guidelines on Mitigations. It shall be the responsibility of the Head of College concerned to ensure that such procedures comply with basic principles of good practice including the need:

3.5.1 Comment (KD): The point of this clause originally was to get the mitigation panels up to School level. Now, ironically, this same regulation prevents mitigation panels being raised higher to be held at inter-School or College level. (In College of Arts & Law, we now have 5 smaller schools, where previously we had 3 bigger schools.)

ASA response: Agree - see above proposed amendment to clause (struck through).

- 3.5.1 (a) For the Mitigation Panel to act on behalf of the University in maintaining the greatest possible level of confidentiality concerning the personal affairs of Registered Students.
- 3.5.1 (b) To maintain a clear and permanent record of all cases.
- 3.5.1 (c) To define clearly the nature of admissible evidence (which should be provided in writing, where possible with independent third party evidence).
- 3.5.1 (d) To provide sufficient publicity for Registered Students about the mitigations process for them to be aware of the importance of raising mitigation before the meeting of the Board of Examiners.
- 3.5.2 Mitigation Panels shall consider detailed written evidence presented for mitigation and make recommendations to the main Board of Examiners. The Board of Examiners should receive a list of all Registered Students for whom a request for mitigation has been made and any action already taken on behalf of the Board of Examiners, for approval. The Board of Examiners will not have the right to receive or review any specific details of the mitigations that have been raised.
- 3.5.3 The Board of Examiners will determine marks without reference to any extraneous circumstances. The Board of Examiners will then consider individual cases where it is known that there are extraneous factors, which may have adversely affected a student's performance. In consultation with, and with the full agreement of the external examiner, the Board of Examiners may then decide to recommend a final award or progress decision which is consistent with the performance which, on the evidence available, the Board of Examiners judges the individual would have

achieved if their performance had not been affected by extraneous factors. In such cases the marks attained should not be adjusted, but a written record of the factors and the action taken by the Board of Examiners should be made available to the University Progress and Awards Board. The original, unamended mark will appear on the Registered Student's transcript.

- 3.5.4 If circumstances occur which seem to require a change to the level of an award determined by the Board of Examiners (e.g. submission of late and unexpected medical evidence), any such change should be approved by the Chair of the Board of Examiners on behalf of the Board of Examiners concerned. External examiners must be consulted on all such changes. However, if it is not possible to contact all internal examiners in the time available, it will be the responsibility of the Board of Examiners to determine whether the change can be made on the basis of whatever consultation has been possible and to report this fact to the University Progress and Awards Board. All such changes should be forwarded to Academic Services as soon as possible, and no later than one month before the beginning of the next academic session.

- 3.5.4 Comment (RJ): Amendment required to third line to make it clear who is approving changes on behalf of the Board. Should this be the Head of School?

ASA Response: Approval is by the Chair of Examiners, who may or may not be the Head of the PAU - see above proposed amendment to clause (underlined).

- 3.5.5 Once the Board of Examiners, or University Progress and Awards Board, has approved its recommendations, no changes may be made to module marks, progress decisions or awards, except with reference to Sections 3 and 4 of the Code of Practice on Primary Appeals Procedure.

- 3.5.6 Please refer to the Code of Practice on Primary Appeals Procedures for further information on these procedures.

- 3.5.6 Comment (KD): Inappropriate language. This should be abolished as a separate provision and attached to 3.5.5, by adding 'q.v.' at the end of 3.5.5

ASA Response: Agree that clause 3.5.6 is unnecessary and should be deleted.

- 3.6 Recording decisions made and discussions held at meetings of Boards of Examiners

- 3.6.1 All principal academic units will keep a formal record of the attendance at, discussions held and decisions made at the meeting of the Board of Examiners. Heads of principal academic units should ensure that adequate systems are in place in order that they are able to satisfy themselves that appropriate Regulations and Codes of Practice have been adhered to in reaching any such decisions. Such systems are subject to review under BIQAES, for example, as part of a School Quality Review, and Heads of principal academic units will be asked to confirm that the appropriate Regulations and Codes of Practice have been adhered to when submitting module marks and recommendations (where relevant) to the University Progress and Awards Board.

- 3.6.2 As a minimum, all evidence on which a decision was based should be retained until one year after the student has left the University (see also Section 7 of this Code of Practice).

- 3.6.3 For all undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes, departmental,

programme and principal academic unit Examination Boards should consider: Mean, standard deviation and failure/pass rate for each module with corresponding figures for at least 3 and preferably 5 previous years [It is recognised that the historical comparators will need to be built up over time where the history does not exist]. For each cohort mean mark and distribution of over classes (1sts, 2.1's etc.), with historical comparators, there should be:

- 3.6.3 Proposed amendment (RJ): Departmental, programme and principal academic unit Examination Boards should consider: Mean, standard deviation and failure/pass rate for each module with corresponding figures for at least 3 and preferably 5 previous years [It is recognised that the historical comparators will need to be built up over time where the history does not exist]. For each cohort mean mark and distribution of over classes (1sts, 2.1's etc.), with historical comparators, there should be:

Comment (KD): The sentence in the square brackets should be deleted. It was included when this provision was first made in order to allow for the then deficiency in records, which should have been remedied since then.

ASA Response: Agree with RJ's amendment (underlined) and believe that sentence in square brackets should be retained as it may be the case that not all PAU's have amassed sufficient historical comparators.

- 3.6.3 (a) A standard one page examination report form produced by the internal examiner/Examinations Officer, which provide the data required.
- 3.6.3 (b) A brief commentary, for the benefit of the external examiner and the audit trail, on any unusual events that were relevant (e.g. interruption to the exam by a fire evacuation as an extreme) or any unusual features in the outcome where a question was answered particularly well or badly.
- 3.6.3 (c) An endorsement or additional comment from the internal moderator/2nd marker.
- 3.6.3 Question (RJ): Does the procedure given in points (a) – (c) apply to all programmes, or just to modular programmes?

ASA Response – See amendment to first sentence of 3.6.3 (underlined).

4. University Progress and Awards Board

4.1 Cycle of Meetings

- 4.1.1 The University's University Progress and Awards Board will normally meet four times a year:
- 4.1.1 (a) In March, to review examination processing guidance and requirements to receive annual summary data on progression and award from the previous academic session.
- 4.1.1 (b) In June, to consider issues arising from the main summer examination period.
- 4.1.1 (c) In September, to consider issues arising from the supplementary examination period.
- 4.1.1 (d) In November, to consider issues arising from the examination period for taught postgraduate programmes and the taught elements of postgraduate research

programmes.

4.2 Membership of the University Progress and Awards Board

4.2.1 The University's University Progress and Awards Board is a Sub-Committee of the Academic Policy and Regulations Committee and its membership is published on the University website.

4.3 Role of the University Progress and Awards Board

4.3.1 For taught programmes, the role of the University Progress and Awards Board is:

- 4.3.1 (a) To determine recommendations made notwithstanding Regulations (where special or mitigating circumstances have not been considered by the principal academic unit) received from Boards of Examiners for taught programmes.
- 4.3.1 (b) To identify quality issues relating to examination processing, and report as appropriate to the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee.

5. Examination Invigilation Arrangements

5.1 The University provides information on the duties to be undertaken when invigilating examinations. (For further information, please refer to the Conduct of Practice on the Conduct of Centrally Co-ordinated Formal Written Examinations.)

6. Provision of Information to Students

6.1 Mark sheets shall be treated as strictly confidential, but the marks awarded to an individual candidate may be disclosed to the candidate in a way which protects the confidential nature of the marks of other candidates. Attention is drawn to the University Data Protection Policy and the implications for storage of Registered Students' information and provision of information. In particular, the Policy states 'Staff, students and other users of the University have the right to access any personal data being kept about them either on computer or in certain files. Any person who wishes to exercise this right should contact the Director of Academic Services'.

6.2 Registered Students will be entitled to ~~information about their marks~~ know their marks for both coursework and examinations as part of their tutorial support. This is within the provisions of the Act relating to the release of data. For more information, contact the University Data Protection Officer.

6.2 **Comment (KD): Clarification required in respect of '...information about their marks' – what does this mean exactly? To know their marks, or entitled to know their marks?**

ASA Response: Agree with comment – amendment to clause shown above (deletion struck through, insertion underlined).

6.3 Final lists of results, progress decisions and final awards will be published by the principal academic unit as soon as possible after the meeting of the Board of Examiners at which they are determined. In the exceptional circumstances where a recommendation is made 'notwithstanding Regulations' and mitigating circumstances are not involved (see clause 3.2.3 above), the provisional list of results should not indicate the result, but should indicate that a decision is 'pending' the meeting of the University Progress and Awards Board

- 6.4 Following the determination of marks by the Boards of Examiners, where Registered Students are continuing (i.e. they are not finalists), principal academic units will inform individual Registered Students of their module marks, where appropriate, through progress review tutorials. Finalists may be given the marks which they have achieved in final level modules, should they require this information.

6.4 Question (RJ): Are the timescales realistic?

ASA Response: Students may now access their results online, via the student portal.

- 6.5 It will be at the discretion of the principal academic unit as to whether or not they will release to Registered Students the marks that they obtain in each assessment (where available) of a module. However, Registered Students should be given timely feedback on assessments, particularly those undertaken during a module and used to inform the Registered Student's learning (e.g. coursework). Principal academic units may wish to provide this feedback in ways other than by provision of actual marks. Where marks are provided in advance of confirmation by the Board of Examiners, it should be emphasised that these marks remain provisional.

- 6.5 Comment (KD): Think that what led to it is the practice of delaying the return of marks until they have been confirmed by an examination board. Recommended amendment (struck through).

Comment (CR): Regarding the timeliness of feedback to students, with appropriate cross-referencing. Recommended amendment (underlined):

~~It will be at the discretion of the principal academic unit as to whether or not they will release to Registered Students the marks that they obtain in each assessment (where available) of a module. However,~~ Registered Students should be given timely feedback on assessments, particularly those undertaken during a module and used to inform the Registered Student's learning (e.g. coursework). In accordance with the Code of Practice for Student Development and Support in Principal Academic Units, Registered Students should be informed of the timescale for feedback arrangements, and this should normally be within four weeks of the submission date of the assignment/piece of work so that patterns of work can be adjusted before subsequent assessment opportunities. Principal academic units may wish to provide this feedback in ways other than by provision of actual marks. Where marks are provided in advance of confirmation by the Board of Examiners, it should be emphasised that these marks remain provisional.

ASA Response: Agree with the proposed amendments.

7. Retention of Scripts

- 7.1 Principal academic units shall ensure that, with the exception of dissertations, all written examination answer books and other papers shall normally remain confidential to the examiners and shall be destroyed after a period of not less than twelve months after the declaration of the results of the examinations.

- 7.2 Principal academic units may, at their discretion, allow Registered Students to view their examination scripts. This right may be applied to whole cohorts of students and not solely to any individual Registered Student. Viewing must take place in a strictly controlled environment with at least two members of academic staff present.

7.2 Proposed amendment (RJ):

Principal academic units may, at their discretion, allow Registered Students to view their examination scripts. This right may be applied to whole cohorts of students and not solely to any individual Registered Student. Viewing must take place in a strictly controlled environment with, normally, at least two members of academic staff present.

Question (KD): What is wrong with an academic and administrator, for example?

ASA Response: Agree with RJ's proposed amendment.

8. Marking

8.1 Preparation for Marking

8.1.1 It is recommended that principal academic units have in place staff development and guidance procedures for all marking processes in use within the principal academic unit. All staff involved in marking should be required to familiarise themselves with relevant material and practices and attend formal or informal briefing sessions.

8.1.2 All visiting lecturers and postgraduate students involved in assessment should normally undergo a period of training, as appropriate to the duties they are required to perform. This may include formal training provided by Academic Practice and Organisational Development for postgraduate students or training provided within principal academic units. In addition, each postgraduate student involved in undergraduate teaching should have a 'mentor', an experienced member of staff who can provide advice and support as necessary. This is in accordance with the Code of Practice on the Teaching and Academic Support of Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught Students by Postgraduate Teaching Assistants and Undergraduates.

8.1.2 Question (KD): Is it permissible for a postgraduate student to mark, for example, a finals paper? If so, ok; if not, it should say not in this clause.

ASA Response: Agree that clause needs clarification – see proposed amendment (underlined).

8.1.3 Where inexperienced internal examiners and postgraduate students undertake marking of work, which contributes towards the module mark, this should be under the guidance of an experienced internal examiner.

8.1.4 With reference to the information provided to External Examiners, Principal academic units must adhere to the Code of Practice on the External Examiner System for First Degrees and Taught Masters Programmes.

8.1.5 The Head of principal academic unit (or nominee) shall establish a formal timetable to ensure that external examiners have scripts in their possession sufficiently in advance of examiners' meetings to enable the external examiner to express an informed opinion on them and shall make this timetable known to all examiners, internal and external normally at the start of the session.

8.2 Assessment Information

8.2.1 To ensure consistency and transparency, principal academic units should publish assessment criteria appropriate to the module being assessed and the method of assessment and should make this information available to internal and external examiners and Registered Students. For some subject disciplines this may include

the provision of model answers to internal and external examiners. Criterion (not norm) referencing should be used for all assessments.

- 8.2.2 Principal academic units should refer to the Code of Practice on Plagiarism and publish guidelines on the conduct of assessment (for example on plagiarism or late submission of work) for modules and should make this information available to internal and external examiners and Registered Students. Any amendments to programme and module assessments should also be made available to all internal and external examiners and students. Where Registered Students are required to pass specific assessments within a module ('internal hurdles'), module descriptions should specify whether the assessment has to be passed to achieve overall modular credit.

8.3 Marking Practices

- 8.3.1 Principal academic units should ensure that all written examinations that contribute to the final award are marked anonymously, with anonymity extending to the second marker stage and to the stage at which the scripts are considered by the external examiner.
- 8.3.2 Where possible, anonymous marking of assessed work should be undertaken for course work, with the exception of practical assessments and projects.
- 8.3.3 Principal academic units should ensure that a technical check of assessment marks is carried out (i.e., to ensure that simple arithmetic errors or omissions have not been made).
- 8.3.4 All assessment that contributes to a module mark must be moderated, where moderation is defined as some form of independent academic checking in addition to the technical check of marks. Moderation may involve looking at pieces of assessed work (e.g. double marking) or it may involve analysis of marks for the cohort for that assessment. The amount of moderation may vary dependent upon the nature of the assessment, the contribution made to the module mark and the overall contribution of the assessment to the degree classification or to the achievement of the award. It is expected that there will be more rigorous moderation of the later stages of programmes.

8.3.4 Recommended amendment (RJ):

All assessment that contributes to a module mark must be moderated, where moderation is defined as some form of independent academic checking in addition to the technical check of marks. Moderation may involve looking at pieces of assessed work (e.g. double marking) or it may involve statistical sampling or analysis of marks for the cohort for that assessment. The amount of moderation may vary dependent upon the nature of the assessment, the contribution made to the module mark and the overall contribution of the assessment to the degree classification or to the achievement of the award. It is expected that there will be more rigorous moderation of the later stages of programmes.

Comment (KD): The use of the term 'moderation' is very misleading. There are three things which should, in this and succeeding paragraphs be kept quite distinct:

1. Checking – a clerical activity.
2. First marking.

3. Second marking, the function of which is to challenge (2) and arrive at a robust and validated conclusion. It takes two forms:

a. Blind double marking – where there is the expertise and time to do so. The philosophy is that two independent views lead to an impartial, correct result (personally I think this is false). The process for reconciling of marks in 8.3.7 is quite unjustifiable, even reprehensible: splitting the difference is particularly pernicious and routinely denounced by external examiners.

b. Moderation, where a second marker examines the basis on which the first marker awarded the marks to a cohort, with the use of statistical tools, where appropriate, and in dialectic with that marking establishes a robust view of a correct mark. Don't think 8.3.8 adequately describes the process. The mark of the first marker most certainly does not generally stand – that is symptom of failure in the process.

Suggested: Statement that double marking may be either blind or a system of moderation – not too much description. Emphasis that all scripts should be considered by the second marker under either system.

ASA Response – Agree with RJ's proposed amendment. Also, clauses 8.3.6 – 8.3.9 address double marking (blind and non-blind).

- 8.3.5 Moderation may be undertaken either on a random sampling basis, or by targeting of individual cases following previous moderation or identification of a potential problem (for example, where there is significant disparity between the different elements of assessment for an individual Registered Student or within a module or where there is significant disparity between the marks of different markers for a particular assessment or within a module).
- 8.3.6 Double Marking is the term used for the assessment of Registered Students' work by more than one marker. This may be done 'blind' or 'non-blind'.
- 8.3.7 In blind double marking, the marks and comments of the first marker are not available to the second marker. A final mark is either agreed by the two markers in collaboration with the module leader or equivalent or the Examinations Officer, or produced by averaging of the two marks.
- 8.3.8 In non-blind double marking the marks and annotations of the first marker are available to the second marker. This latter method is usually used where the role of the second marker is seen as more one of checking the marks given by the first marker, such as where first markers are less experienced, or where there are several first markers and consistency may be an issue. The mark of the first marker usually stands, unless there are significant discrepancies between the marks of the two markers. Principal academic units should determine their own policies in this area, including a clear definition of what would constitute a significant discrepancy, as appropriate to the marking practices in the principal academic unit.
- 8.3.9 Double marking is recognised good practice for all assessments that contribute significantly to the final award. Principal academic units may determine which assessments to double mark but, for undergraduate programmes, it is likely that these will include as a minimum stage 2 and 3 modules with only one piece of assessment. Double marking for all Registered Students is recognised as good practice for all projects, dissertations and other substantial pieces of work.

8.3.9 Question (RJ): Can this be achieved in time, particularly for second and third year undergraduates?

Comment (KD): The scope of double marking needs to be more tightly drawn than this.

ASA Response: Recommended that clause remains as it is.

8.3.10 Principal academic units should ensure that the methods that are used are agreed within the principal academic unit and that clear procedures are in place for moderation and the resolution of discrepancies or disagreements between markers.

8.3.11 For undergraduate programmes, the rounding of marks for classification purposes is as follows:

8.3.11 (a) For degree classification purposes the average mean mark should be rounded to one decimal point.

8.3.11 (b) In determining class on the basis of weighted arithmetic mean, marks between 39.5-40.0, 49.5-50.0, 59.5-60.0 and 69.5-70.0 will be rounded to 40, 50, 60 and 70, respectively.

8.3.11 (b) Comment (RJ): Suggested that the average mean is initially set to two decimal places and then rounded (e.g. 41.44 rounds to 41.4, whereas 41.45 rounds to 41.5).

ASA Response: Agree with comment.

8.3.11 (c) Average marks for use with the Distribution of Module Class (DMC) Scheme should remain corrected to one decimal point. (Thus, for example 37.9, 47.9, 57.9 and 65.9 are insufficient average mean marks to allow a student to be considered for the Distribution of Module Class Scheme).

8.3.11 Comment (RJ): The term 'Profiling' is well known throughout the University. Why not use that instead of (or alongside) Distribution of Module Class (DMC).

ASA Response: Agree with comment.

9. Progression

9.1 Submission

9.1.1 The principal academic unit should have clear submission procedures for assignments that form part of the assessment for a module. These procedures should be made clear to Registered Students, in writing, at the beginning of the academic year and again at the beginning of each module.

9.1.2 Each Registered Student should be issued with a receipt for submitted coursework that either indicates clearly that the work was submitted before the deadline, or shows the time and date of submission for any work submitted after the deadline. Receipts should be signed by a designated member of principal academic unit staff.

9.1.3 If principal academic units believe they have justifiable reasons for not issuing receipts to Registered Students they should liaise with the relevant Head of College to devise an alternative. If electronic or postal submission of coursework is permitted,

principal academic units should have a receipt mechanism in place that ensures that the student has positive evidence that the assignment has been received. Registered Students should be made aware of what they can expect to receive. If Registered Students submit work by post they should ensure that they obtain proof that the assignment has been posted. Electronic submission should be supplemented as soon as possible, preferably on the same day, either by post or in person, by a paper copy of the assignment. Registered Students should declare on the paper copy that no changes have been made since electronic submission.

9.2 Deadlines

9.2.1 Registered Students should be made aware, in writing, at the beginning of a module, how the module is to be assessed ~~what the assessments for the module are~~, the deadlines, where and to whom assignments should be submitted, and the penalties for late submission (see below).

9.2.1 Question (KD): ‘...what the assessments for the module are...’? Does this mean how the module is assessed? Or, does it mean that we should be issuing the continuous assessment essay titles at the outset of the course?

ASA Response: Agree that clause needs clarification – see proposed amendment (insertion underlined, deletion struck through).

9.2.2 Deadlines should be set taking into account, where possible, revision and examination periods and student workload, for example submission dates for other assignments in Joint Honours programmes.

9.3 Extensions

9.3.1 The principal academic unit should have a clear procedure for granting extensions including guidance on circumstances that will and will not be considered acceptable. Each case should be considered on its merits and below are examples of acceptable and unacceptable circumstances.

9.3.1 (a) Examples of acceptable circumstances include: Major computer problems (e.g. failure of university IT systems, such as network or server failure), significant medical problems, personal problems and compassionate matters (for example, family bereavement).

9.3.1 (b) Examples of unacceptable circumstances include: Minor computer problems (e.g. lost or damaged disks, printer breakdown), lost assignments, desired books not in library, unverifiable travel difficulties and not realising deadline imminent.

9.3.2 Registered Students should be required to apply in writing for an extension (this could be on a standard Principal academic unit form) explaining the reasons why they require an extension. Appropriate evidence should be attached.

9.3.2 Question (RJ): Students often make verbal (rather than written) requests for an extension. As Schools keep a written record of such requests, could this record be accepted as evidence where the student has not applied in writing for an extension?

Comment (TM): So long as a written record is kept, and possibly signed by the student, it seems unnecessary to require the student to provide this in writing.

ASA Response: Recommended that clause remains as it is.

- 9.3.3 To ensure equity of treatment for all Registered Students, only one person should grant extensions. This would normally be the Head of principal academic unit (or Department) that owns the module, or authorised nominee.
- 9.3.4 The Head of principal academic unit (or nominee) should be responsible for ensuring that appropriate staff are informed of extensions that have been granted.

9.4 Late Submission of Work

- 9.4.1 Where Registered Students are required to submit coursework (e.g. essays, practical reports, projects, problem sheets) that contributes to the module mark, principal academic units should have in place published arrangements for the applying of penalties for the late submission of such work. Coursework that is not submitted by the initial deadline given, shall be subject to a penalty applied to the mark achieved for that piece of work.
- 9.4.2 The following are standard University procedures, which should normally be used for the submission of assessed work that will count towards a final programme mark. It may be necessary, in circumstances where there are good academic reasons, to adopt other procedures, for example, where assessed work is to be discussed in class shortly after the deadline. In such cases the Chair of the Board of Examiners ~~relevant Head of College~~ should be notified.

9.4.2 Question (RJ): Is the Head of College the most appropriate person here?

ASA Response: Agree that clause needs clarification – see proposed amendment (insertion underlined, deletion struck through).

9.5 Penalties for Late Submission of Work

- 9.5.1 It is recommended that, if no extension has been granted, or there is not sufficiently good cause for work being submitted late, then a penalty of 5 marks on the mark actually achieved should be imposed for each day the assignment is late until 0 is reached, for example, a mark of 67 would become 62 marks on day one, 57 marks on day two, and so on. Penalties should not include weekends, public and University closed days. When setting deadlines, weekends and closed days should be borne in mind to minimise student manipulation of penalties. Principal academic units who wish to adopt a different penalty should liaise with the relevant Head of College. In certain circumstances, for example, where assignments or the content are to be discussed in class shortly after the deadline, other penalties will need to be applied.

9.5.1 Recommended amendment (RB and supported by TM):

It is recommended that, if no extension has been granted, or there is not sufficiently good cause for work being submitted late, then a penalty of 5 marks on the mark actually achieved should be imposed for each day the assignment is late until 0 is reached, for example, a mark of 67 would become 62 marks on day one, 57 marks on day two, and so on. ~~Penalties~~ The days counted should not include weekends, public and University closed days. When setting deadlines, weekends and closed days should be borne in mind to minimise student manipulation of penalties. Principal academic units who wish to adopt a different penalty should liaise with the relevant Head of College. In certain circumstances, for example, where assignments or the

content are to be discussed in class shortly after the deadline, other penalties will need to be applied.

Comment (RJ): Preference for penalty to take the form of a 5% reduction rather than a 5 mark deduction, as the latter approach has a disproportionate impact on weaker students who may be on the borderline between being awarded an honours degree or an ordinary/pass degree.

Suggestion: Need to ensure that students are made fully aware from the outset of the penalties to be incurred for late submission of work.

ASA Response: Agree with RB's proposed amendment.

- 9.5.2 Assignments should be marked in the normal way and penalties applied afterwards.
- 9.5.3 The original mark and the penalty should be clearly indicated in documentation submitted to Boards of Examiners. In exceptional circumstances, Boards of Examiners may modify decisions that have been implemented in accordance with standard procedures, but which seem excessively harsh.
- 9.6 Marking and Feedback
- 9.6.1 Principal academic unit staff should ensure that assignments are marked and feedback given to Registered Students in accordance with Section 3.2 of the Code of Practice on Student Development and Support in Principal Academic Units.
- 9.7 Recording of Marks
- 9.7.1 A module is a coherent and identifiable unit of learning and teaching with defined learning outcomes. A module is passed if its specified learning outcomes have been achieved. The assessment of each module shall be designed so as to assess the achievement of the learning outcomes of the module. The assessment of each module shall generate a single mark between 0 and 100. A number of different assessments may be combined within a module to generate the single mark.
- 9.7.2 Where there is more than one assessment contributing to the module mark, principal academic units may specify that particular assessments must be passed in order to pass the module (known as 'internal hurdles'). The weighting of each assessment, or the requirement to pass a particular assessment, must be clearly stated as a percentage of the module mark in the approved module descriptions, as published on the Academic Services website. The website is updated to take into account approved late changes to module content or assessment. Within a single module or pair of linked modules, principal academic units may permit poor performance in one assessment to be compensated by strong performance in another assessment. Where this is applied, a set of guidelines should be agreed by the Board of Examiners, and the guidelines applied to all Registered Students taking the module. There is no compensation between unlinked modules.
- 9.7.3 The pass mark for all postgraduate and undergraduate masters modules is 50 and the pass mark for undergraduate modules is 40. Pass marks may alter according to specific programme requirements.
- 9.7.3 Comment (RJ): The pass mark for undergraduate masters degrees is 50%. Where the same module is taken by students on the UG masters programme and those on the PG masters programme, a translation table is used to convert the marks

appropriately. Therefore, this needs to be reflected in the clause.

ASA Response: Agree – see proposed amendment (insertion underlined)

- 9.7.4 Marks should be entered into the Banner Interface Records Management System (BIRMS) by the date specified each year in guidance issued by Academic Services. All module marks and progression and award decisions must be entered by BIRMS. Principal academic units not using BIRMS will be reported to the University Progress and Awards Board.

9.8 Absence from Teaching Sessions and Assignments

- 9.8.1 A Registered Student who does not attend teaching and assessment, as required by the principal academic unit or Department, will be investigated in accordance with the Code of Practice for Reasonable Diligence. Reasonable Diligence is defined by Regulations 7.8.1 and 7.8.2

- 9.8.2 Where there is unexplained absence from all assessments that contribute to the module mark the Registered Student will be awarded a mark of 0 for the module and will not achieve credit. Where the unexplained absence is for an assessment that contributes less than 100 to the module mark, the mark of 0 for the assessment will be combined with the marks for the other assessments as for all other Registered Students. This may result in the Registered Student not achieving the pass mark for the module and failing the module.

- 9.8.3 Registered Students may apply for leave from assessments or part of their programme exceptionally, and for good reason, as outlined below.

- 9.8.4 Guidelines for provision of single (1-14 days) absence:

- 9.8.4 (a) In the first instance, the relative importance of the event in question should be determined. The member of staff involved (this would usually be the Personal Tutor) should establish this either through internal consultation – ~~UoB Sport would have a good idea about athletics events~~ – or through direct contact with the organisers or other relevant bodies. As a general rule, events should be national in character as an absolute minimum. Another related keynote would be the level of prestige involved in participation: this should be significant.

- 9.8.4 (a) Comment (RJ): Suggested that the reference to UoB Sport be removed as there are other, for example, arts-related activities.

ASA Response: Agree with comment – see amendment above.

- 9.8.4 (b) It should not be seen as essential that there is any direct relevance to the student's course of study, although any link would clearly strengthen the case.

- 9.8.4 (c) If the member of staff considers that the application merits further consideration, the matter should be referred either to the Head of Department/principal academic unit or the relevant Programme Director and (if any examinations are involved) to the relevant Examinations Officer for a joint decision as to whether the application should be granted in full or in part. As part of this process, the Personal Tutor should, in consultation with the student, submit with the application an indication of how missed teaching would be covered through additional study or by other means.

9.8.4 (c) Recommended amendment (RJ):

If the member of staff considers that the application merits further consideration, the matter should be referred either to the Head of Department/principal academic unit or the relevant Programme Director or nominee and (if any examinations are involved) to the relevant Examinations Officer for a joint decision as to whether the application should be granted in full or in part. As part of this process, the Personal Tutor should, in consultation with the student, submit with the application an indication of how missed teaching would be covered through additional study or by other means.

ASA Response: Agree with proposed amendment.

9.8.4 (d) If the proposed absence clashes with scheduled examinations, it would not normally be possible to allow the Registered Student to undertake the paper(s) in question at alternative times within the series in question, unless the principal academic unit/ Department can arrange full chaperone cover covering the entire period of potential examination security risk. The use of 'honour letters' where students undertake not to communicate the contents of papers does not provide a sufficient level of assurance. Where it is not possible to arrange for the Registered Student to sit examinations within a time scale, which makes inclusive chaperoning viable, the Registered Student should be permitted to sit the missing examination(s) during the Supplementary Assessments held in late August/early September each year. In such cases:

9.8.4 (d) (i) The sitting should be deemed a first sit and the possible mark not capped.

9.8.4 (d) (ii) If the examination is subsequently failed, the ~~standard course regulations~~ programme requirements should apply in respect of reassessment. Regulations should apply in respect of progression and, therefore, progression may not be possible.

9.8.4 (d) (ii) Comment (RJ): Suggested that it should be mentioned that progression may not be possible.

ASA Response: Agree with comment – proposed amendment shown above (insertions underlined, deletions struck through).

9.8.4 (d) (iii) Where an examination has been re-scheduled because of exceptional leave absence, this method of assessment must be retained throughout the process. Replacement of formal examining by alternative means of assessment (such as projects or additional coursework) is not permissible under these circumstances.

9.8.4 (d) (iv) In all cases, the Registered Student must be reminded that their primary commitment must be to their University studies and that it is their responsibility to weigh with extreme care the implications in terms of study and progression of any exceptional leave allowance that the University may be able to offer. In particular, it must be made clear that any exceptional arrangement granted by the University cannot subsequently constitute the basis of a student appeal.

9.9 Extended Leave of Absence

9.9 Comment (KD): I miss a statement of the procedure for granting leave of absence, or

who is competent to do so.

ASA Response: The process should be communicated by principal academic units to students at the start of each academic session, via the student handbook.

- 9.9.1 In situations where absence of longer than 14 days is being considered, the following points should be noted:
- 9.9.1 (a) Part-time registration may be an option. This might be useful if one or two days per week have to be given over to training or other commitments. Part-time status may be for a single year only or may be extended to cover all three levels if necessary. Requests to study part-time must be supported by the Principal academic unit and be subject to approval by the University Progress and Awards Board.
- 9.9.1 (b) The taking of a year out once the First Year has been completed may be appropriate for some Registered Students. The existence of clear rules for progression from level to level should assist flexibility in this area.
- 9.9.2 Registered Students who are absent from assessments or part of their programmes for medical reasons should comply with the procedures and policy regarding provision and completion of medical certificates.
- 9.10 Reasonable Diligence
- 9.10.1 The Reasonable Diligence Procedure is contained within the Code of Practice for Reasonable Diligence.
- 9.11 Opportunities for Re-assessment
- 9.11.1 A student who provides adequate reason or mitigation for failure to complete an assessment or attend an examination may be permitted to 'sit' the module again as if for the first time, or 'sit' the assessment(s) again as if for the first time. The decision on whether a Registered Student should be allowed to 'sit' should be made by the Board of Examiners.
- 9.11.2 In accordance with Regulation 7.2.6 (a), all Registered Students who fail a module (other than, subject to Regulations, modules taken in the final stage of a programme) shall have one opportunity to retrieve the failure, either by re-assessment or by repeating. The decision on whether a Registered Student should be allowed to be reassessed or repeat should be made by the Board of Examiners. The normal expectation is that Registered Students will retrieve the failure by re-assessment.
- 9.11.3 In accordance with Regulation 7.2.6 (b), for re-assessment a Registered Student is required to complete such further assessments as specified by the Board of Examiners as being necessary to demonstrate achievement of the stated learning outcomes. This re-assessment may take the form of additional or re-submitted coursework or an examination. For full-time students the re-assessment should normally be by or at the time of the August/September supplementary examinations.
- 9.11.4 In accordance with Regulation 7.2.6 (c), with the support of the principal academic unit, Registered Students may apply to take their reassessment at the next available opportunity (normally the next main summer examination period).
- 9.11.4 Question (RJ): Should this mention RESIT opportunities rather than just the next

available opportunity?

ASA Response: Recommended that clause remains as it is since other forms of assessment may occur at this point.

- 9.11.5 Registered Students should be notified of their performance in the taught component of the programme and whether they are required to be re-assessed. In the case of students whose programme is spread across several academic sessions, the recommendation relating to re-assessment can normally only be made once all the assessment of the taught elements are completed. Where it is known that the module needs to be reassessed, reassessment should take place at the first opportunity. Registered Students on part-time programmes may be given the chance to retrieve the failure at the first opportunity at the discretion of the Board of Examiners. Boards of Examiners should inform Academic Services through BIRMS which modules it has decided are to be re-assessed.
- 9.11.6 Registered Students who have already achieved the requisite number of credits to progress to the next stage may progress 'carrying' the outstanding reassessment. For example, a student who achieves 100 credits in stage 1 at the first attempt, and who is permitted to re-sit the failed 20 credits at the next available opportunity rather than in August/ September, may proceed 'carrying' the 20 credits. Registered Students who have not achieved the requisite number of credits to progress to the next stage may not progress and will be required to achieve the requisite number of credits before being permitted to progress. For example, a Registered Student who achieves 80 credits in stage 1 at the first attempt, and is permitted to re-sit the failed 40 credits at the next available opportunity rather than in August/September, cannot proceed to stage 2 until the re-sits have been passed. In effect they will take an additional year to complete stage 1.
- 9.11.7 Registered Students whose programme are spread across several academic sessions and who fail a module can exercise the right for one reassessment at an appropriate time up to the final opportunity specified by the Board of Examiners.
- 9.11.7 Comment (RJ): Suggested that this clause should be redrafted in light of the comment on clause 9.11.4 above.
- ASA Response: Recommended that clause remains as it is, as per 9.11.4.
- 9.11.8 For full-time student re-assessment should normally be by, or at the time of, the August/ September supplementary examinations. The results should be considered by the September Board of Examiners. For part-time Registered Students the re-assessment should normally be within one calendar year. The nature of the re-assessment should be made clear in the approved module description as published on Academic Services website.
- 9.11.9 A Registered Student who is required to repeat a module is required to attend teaching sessions as specified by the principal academic unit or Department and to complete all the assessment requirements associated with the module in order to achieve the stated learning outcomes. Repeat Registered Students should normally complete the repeat of the module within one calendar year of the initial failure. If a Registered Student does not attend teaching sessions as specified by the principal academic unit or Department, they may be debarred from the assessment of the module. Students may repeat some or all modules from a stage of a programme as determined by the Board of Examiners

- 9.11.10 In some modules the nature of the module will be such that retrieval of failure can only be by means of repeat (e.g. laboratory-based modules). Such modules should be designated as repeat only in module descriptions.
- 9.11.11 With the agreement of the Head of principal academic unit, a Registered Student required to sit or be re-assessed in or repeat a module may be allowed to choose a substitute module, subject to programme requirements and availability. In such cases, the Registered Student shall normally be required to attend the teaching sessions and to complete all the assessments.
- 9.11.11 Question (RJ/TM): If the student has been allowed to change to a substitute module for reassessment, they should be allowed to take it as a SIT not a RESIT?

Comment (KD): Will the student be allowed a resit of this substitute module? If not, say so.

ASA Response: Recommended that clause remains as it is.

- 9.11.12 Registered Students who have not submitted coursework or been examined for a module due to illness or other reason accepted by the Board of Examiners may be permitted to repeat a module or be re-assessed in a module or a number of modules as though they were taking the module for the first time. They will retain the right to an opportunity for re-assessment should they fail the module/modules. If repeating the module as if for the first time, the Registered Student is required to attend teaching sessions as specified by the principal academic unit or Department and to complete all the assessment requirements associated with the module in order to achieve the stated learning outcomes. If being re-assessed as if for the first time, the Registered Student is required to complete such further assessments specified by the Progress Board as necessary to demonstrate achievement of the stated learning outcomes. The re-assessment should normally be by or at the time of the August/ September supplementary examinations.
- 9.12 Recording of Marks Following Re-assessment or Repeat
- 9.12.1 Following successful re-assessment or repeat of a failed module, the mark used for the purpose of arriving at decisions on progress or the final award will be the pass mark for the module. The mark actually achieved in any re-assessment or repeat will however be recorded in the BIRMS, the student records system and on the Registered Student's transcript with an indication of the number of sits taken.
- 9.12.2 Following unsuccessful re-assessment or repeat of a failed module, the mark used for arriving at decisions on progress or the final award shall be the higher of the two fail marks achieved, at initial assessment and at reassessment.
- 9.12.3 Where a Registered Student has failed to attend a re-examination or not submitted re-assessed work, without adequate cause, the mark recorded for the module will be 0.
- 9.12.4 Where the Registered Student has been permitted to substitute a module the mark achieved will be recorded and used on the transcript. The mark used for the purpose of arriving at decisions on the final award will be the pass mark.
- 9.13 Standardisation or Adjustment of Marks

- 9.13.1 Where the marks for a module fall outside of the normal range (on the basis of historical data) or where concerns or issues have been raised about the module or its assessment before or during moderation, an investigation should be made into the reasons why this might have happened. Where the reasons are identified as being due to an error in the assessment process (i.e. the format/content of the assessment, marking or assessment criteria) or to some factor, which would have affected Registered Students (such as unavailability of essential research equipment), the marks for all Registered Students may be adjusted. The extent of adjustment should be agreed with the external examiner.
- 9.13.2 Where marks are adjusted, the rank order of affected Registered Students for the assessment must be maintained and the mark distributions should normally be preserved. The normal method of mark adjustment might be a simple addition or subtraction of an agreed percentage; however, principal academic units may use more sophisticated methods within the above constraints.
- 9.13.3 There should be no adjustment to marks if they accurately reflect the achievement or otherwise of the learning outcomes and have not resulted from an error in the assessment process or some other factor which would have affected students.
- 9.13.4 All adjustments to marks must be recorded in the minutes of the principal academic unit Board of Examiners and reported to the University Progress and Awards Board.
- 9.13.5 Principal academic unit quality assurance mechanisms should ensure that any concerns identified in the assessment process or other aspects of the module result in a review of that module.
- 9.13.6 Scaling of marks within a single (or linked pair of) module(s) to a previously agreed distribution is not permitted. The marks for one module should not be normalised against the marks for other modules.
- 9.14 Aggregation of Marks
- 9.14.1 Marks should be aggregated for the purposes of determining the final award according to the credit weighting of the module and in accordance with the relevant University Regulation. For example, a mark for a 20 credit module would be weighted one sixth of the overall mark for the 120 credit taught component of the programme. Marks for the taught and research components of a programme must be aggregated separately.
- 9.15 Academic Failure and Withdrawal
- 9.15.1 Registered Students who do not achieve the required number of credits to proceed to the next stage of their programme, as set out in the Academic Regulations, or in programme requirements, following re-assessment or repeat shall be required to withdraw. Such Registered Students will be informed of their right of appeal (see the Code of Practice on Primary Appeals Procedures). Registered Students who have achieved the requisite number of credits may be eligible for the award of an alternative qualification, e.g. a Certificate of Higher Education or a Diploma of Higher Education, a Graduate Certificate or Graduate Diploma, or a Postgraduate Certificate or Postgraduate Diploma.
- 9.15.1 [Comment \(RJ\): Suggested that this clause should include a cross-reference/link to the list of University qualifications set out in the Ordinances.](#)

ASA Response: Recommended that clause remains as it is.

9.16 Transfer of a Student to a Different Programme

- 9.16.1 Registered Students may transfer to a different programme of study within the principal academic unit or in another principal academic unit, subject to procedures and deadlines available from Academic and Student Administration. Principal academic units are required to support the application by the Registered Student and to identify clearly, within the Academic Regulations, which modules (if any) Registered Students may be exempted from in the new programme of study.

- 9.16.1 Comment (RJ): Suggested that the power should lie with the principal academic unit involved.

ASA Response: Recommended that clause remains as it is, as agreement from both PAUs is required for a transfer.

- 9.16.2 Registered Students may transfer to a part-time version of a full-time programme with the support of the principal academic unit. Attention is drawn to the financial implications of transfer for Registered Students and for the principal academic unit. It is expected that Registered Students will follow the same programme of study as full-time Registered Students, but on a part time basis. Where provision for part-time Registered Students may be different, or where a principal academic unit wishes to admit Registered Students on a part-time basis, approval must be sought from the University Progress and Awards Board.

10. Awards

10.1 Undergraduate Awards: Classified Degrees

- 10.1.1 The class of degree of each Registered Student shall be determined in accordance with the agreed University classification scheme.
- 10.1.2 In order to be awarded a classified honours degree, Registered Students are required to:
- 10.1.2 (a) Achieve the minimum number of credits at each level; and
- 10.1.2 (b) To have achieved an overall mark of at least 40 from a combination of module marks in the proportions as specified in the Academic Regulations.
- 10.1.3 There is provision for Registered Students on Undergraduate Masters programmes to be awarded a Bachelors (Honours) degree.
- 10.1.4 Registered Students in identified Principal academic units may be subject to Adjusted Regulations. The classification system for Adjusted Regulations is detailed in the Code of Practice on Adjusted Regulations and Bachelors Degrees and the Code of Practice on Adjusted Regulations and Undergraduate Masters Degrees. Principal academic units operating Adjusted Regulations must obtain permission to do so from the Academic Policy and Regulations Committee and ensure that all affected Registered Students are informed.
- 10.1.5 Where a year of study abroad or in industry between stages 2 and 3 is included as a requirement of the programme of study to which a Registered Student has been admitted, it must the achievement of the learning outcomes shall be assessed and

used, in a proportion stated in the programme requirements, towards the overall stage 2 contribution to the degree classification.

10.1.5 Recommended amendment (VP):

Where a year of study abroad or in industry between stages 2 and 3 is included as a requirement of the programme of study to which a Registered Student has been admitted, ~~it must~~ the achievement of the learning outcomes shall be assessed and used, in a proportion stated in the programme requirements, towards the overall stage 2 contribution to the degree classification.

ASA Response: Agree with VP's proposed amendment, as above.

10.1.6 Where a year of study abroad is an equivalent alternative to study that would otherwise have been taken within the University, it must be assessed and contribute to the classification in the same way as the equivalent study undertaken within the University.

10.1.7 Where a Registered Student was previously registered on an Honours degree programme, the Certificate or Diploma awarded will normally have the same title as that programme. The title of the award should reflect the content. In some circumstances (particularly where specialisms reflected in the programme title are not taught until the final stage) it may be more appropriate to award a Certificate or Diploma with the name of the principal academic unit or Department. In all other cases, and except where special provision has been made and approved by or on behalf of the Academic Policy and Regulations Committee, the title of the award will be the name of the principal academic unit or (where relevant) Department.

10.2 Graduate and postgraduate Awards

10.2.1 The class of award of each Registered Student shall be determined in accordance with the Academic Regulations.

10.2.2 In order to be achieve the award of Postgraduate Certificate, Postgraduate Diploma or Masters Degree, students are required to:

10.2.2 (a) achieve the minimum number of credits as specified in Regulation 7.3.2 (a); and

10.2.2 (b) have gained the weighted mean marks as specified in Regulation 7.3.2 (a); and

10.2.2 (c) have achieved a mark of at least 40 in the specified number of credits

To pass with Merit, a Registered Student must

(a) achieve the mark stated in Regulation 7.3.2 (a)

(b) pass all modules taken as part of the programme achieve the weighted mean marks as stated in Regulation 7.3.2 (a)

To pass with Distinction, a Registered Student must achieve the first attempt and achieve the weighted mean marks as stated in Academic Regulation 7.3.2 (b)

10.2.2 Recommended amendment (VP):

To pass with Distinction, a Registered Student must ~~achieve the first attempt~~ pass all

modules taken as part of the programme and achieve the weighted mean marks as stated in Academic Regulation 7.3.2 (b)

Comment (CE): It would be helpful to have something here for PGR with taught students, where the student has taken taught modules they must attain a satisfactory standard (i.e. achieve credit) in each module before being recommended for the award of the degree.

ASA Response: Agree with VP's proposed amendment

Further to CE's comment, suggested new clause:

For postgraduate research students taking taught modules as part of their research programme, the satisfactory completion and achievement of credit in those modules before being recommended for the award of the qualification for which they are registered.

10.3 Other Awards

10.3.1 Where a Registered Student does not fulfil the requirements for the Postgraduate Diploma or Masters degree; the modules the Registered Student has undertaken may be ~~reassessed~~ reviewed against the module learning outcomes for a Graduate Diploma or Graduate Certificate to ascertain whether it meets the requirements of these awards. If a Registered Student does not fulfil the requirements for a Postgraduate Certificate, the modules may be ~~reassessed~~ reviewed against the learning outcomes for a Graduate Certificate. These provisions will require that learning outcomes and assessment requirements for a related Graduate Diploma and/or Graduate Certificate have been specified in programme specifications and approved by Senate or delegated authority.

10.3.1 Comment (KD): I cannot think that 'reassessed' (twice in this paragraph) is literally meant, though I see why the word is used. Maybe better just to say 'reviewed'?

ASA Response: Agree with comment – clause amended, as above (insertion underlined, deletion struck through).

10.3.2 Where a Registered Student was previously registered on a Masters programme, the Postgraduate/Graduate Certificate or Postgraduate/Graduate Diploma awarded will normally have the same title as that programme. The title of the award should reflect the content. In some circumstances particularly where specialisms reflected in the programme title are not taught until the final stage) it may be more appropriate to award a Certificate or Diploma with the name of the principal academic unit or Department. In all other cases and except where special provision has been made and approved by or on behalf of Senate or delegated authority, the title of the award will be the name of the principal academic unit or (where relevant) Department.

10.4 Oral Examinations and Final Awards

10.4.1 Decisions on degree classification or on the achievement of an award are based on credit accumulation and aggregation of individual module marks according to the University scheme. All assessment is related to the learning outcomes of a specific module. Consequently all assessment that may affect degree classification or the achievement of an award must be related to a specific module and the mark included in the module mark. This is described in more detail in the University Regulations which are available to staff and Registered Students.

10.4.1 Question (RJ): What about masters degrees by research, which still feature some taught elements?

ASA Response: Recommended that clause remains as it is, as research degrees are covered by the Code of Practice on Assessment of Research Degree Theses.

10.4.2 Oral examinations are permitted as one of a range of assessment methods available within modules. Where such oral examinations are used, they should be used where the competences/ achievements of the stated learning outcomes for the module may only be demonstrated through these means, or where the oral examination is an integral part of the assessment of a module (e.g. in relation to the project or dissertation, or language skills). All Registered Students taking a module should be subject to the same form of assessment.

10.4.3 Generic additional oral examinations as previously used in some sections of the University for a subsection of Registered Students when determining the final degree classification or the achievement of an award are not permitted. Examples of where this type of additional examination has previously been used include:

10.4.3 (a) As a means of calibrating the overall performance of Registered Students or the standard of a cohort of Registered Students.

10.4.3 (b) Assessing Registered Students' competence across a range of modules.

10.4.3 (c) In determining the degree classification of a borderline candidate.

10.4.4 Exceptionally, an additional oral examination may be used to check the authorship of assessed work in case of doubt, provided that this does not conflict with any formal investigation of examination irregularity or alleged plagiarism, or where there are mitigating circumstances for poor performance.

10.4.5 Exceptionally, where there are professional validation reasons, or as a 'reasonable adjustment' for Registered Students with a disability, other forms of oral examination may be permitted subject to the approval of the University Progress and Awards Board. The criteria against which the Registered Students' performance at the oral examination will be judged should be made available to the Registered Students and examiners in advance of the oral examination. Registered Students should also be provided with written information and guidance should be provided in advance to students.

10.5 Absence from Assessment and Final Awards

10.5.1 Registered Students who are ill for a significant period during the academic session (i.e. have missed key elements of their learning experience), or are otherwise prevented from following their programme of study may apply for leave of absence, returning to study once circumstances allow. The period of leave of absence is included in the maximum time limit for the programme but Registered Students should be made aware that when they return to study, the principal academic unit might not be able to guarantee exactly the same programme of study. Applications to the University Progress and Awards Board would normally be for only one academic session at a time and must be endorsed by the principal academic unit

10.5.2 All Registered Students, including those in their final stage of their programme, who miss assessments on individual modules through illness, or for other good reason as

determined by the Board of Examiners/ Mitigation Panel, should take the assessment at the earliest reasonable time (normally at the next available opportunity).

10.5.3 In cases where Registered Students miss only part of the assessment for a module for reasons of illness, or other good reason, as determined by the Board of Examiners/Mitigation Panel, the Board of Examiners should consider whether there is enough material evidence to show that the Registered Students has satisfied the learning outcomes of the module. The mark awarded should be based on the completed work, e.g. if one of three equally weighted assessments was missed, then the mark awarded would be based on the two completed assessments equally weighted.

10.5.4 Where a Registered Student is prevented by illness or other cause from attending all or part of the final assessments for an award, and sufficient evidence of achievement (normally consisting of the majority of assessed work and evidence that the main learning outcomes of the programme have been achieved) exists, the Board of Examiners may either:

10.5.4 Question (RJ): What do we mean by *the majority of assessed work*?

ASA Response: Recommended that clause remains as it is, as this is a matter of academic judgement.

10.5.5 (a) For undergraduate programmes, recommend the award of the degree (classified or unclassified/aegrotat), Diploma of Higher Education or Certificate of Higher Education.

10.5.5 (b) For graduate programmes, recommend the award of the Graduate Diploma or Graduate Certificate.

10.5.5 (c) For postgraduate programmes, recommend the award of the degree, Postgraduate Diploma or Postgraduate Certificate.

10.5.6 Where a Registered Student is prevented by illness or other cause from attending all or part of the final assessments for an award, and insufficient evidence exists, the Board of Examiners may recommend that the Registered Student be provided with a further opportunity to complete the requirements of the qualification concerned.

11. **Bachelors Degree Classification: 'Profiling' – The Distribution of Module Classes (DMC) Procedure**

11 Comment (KD): I do not see what is gained by using the DMC jargon. Could we eliminate it and just say 'profiling'?

ASA Response: For consistency, it is suggested that the terms 'profiling' and DMC are retained.

11.1 Basic Principles

11.1.1 The system of DMC operates under the following conditions:

11.1.1 Suggested amendment (KD): delete the above paragraph 11.1.1.

ASA Response: For consistency, it is suggested that the terms 'profiling' and DMC are retained.

- 11.1.1 (a) The starting point is the calculation of the arithmetic mean mark, rounded to one decimal point;

- 11.1.1 (a) Comment (KD): The system starts from the credit-weighted arithmetic mean mark for each relevant stage (year) of study, averaged with the same mark for other relevant stages of study in a prescribed proportion.

ASA Response: Agree with KD's comment and propose amendment:

The starting point of the system is the credit-weighted arithmetic mean mark for each relevant stage of study, averaged with the same mark for other relevant stages of study in a prescribed proportion, and rounded to one decimal point.

- 11.1.1 (b) When the averaging system has already calculated a result and when that result is within a certain band below a borderline. (This principle ensures that consideration can only be given to the median when the less successful module outcomes do not fall below an acceptable level.)

- 11.1.1 (b) Comment (KD): When the final average falls within a prescribed band below the minimum for achieving a given classification on average alone (the 'borderline'), attention is given to the profile of the relevant marks.

Recommended amendment (RB):

When the averaging system has already calculated a result and when that result is within a certain band below a borderline. (This principle ensures that consideration can ~~only~~ be given to the median only when the less successful module outcomes do not fall below an acceptable level.)

ASA Response: Agree with KD's comment and propose amendment:

When the final average falls within a prescribed band below the minimum for achieving a given classification on average alone (the 'borderline'), attention is given to the profile of the relevant marks. (This principle ensures that consideration can only be given to the median when the less successful module outcomes do not fall below an acceptable level.)

- 11.1.1 (c) Where there are marks available for all modules required to be attempted under the programme requirements.

- 11.1.1 (c) Comments (KD): Profiling is not applied where any relevant module marks are missing.

ASA Response: Recommended that clause remains as it is.

- 11.1.1 (d) Where there is a preponderance, after credit-weighting, of marks in the class above the relevant borderline. (The purpose of the DMC system is to recognise the prevailing character of a candidate's performance on the basis of judgements of the class to which each module outcome belongs. In this way, recognition is given to the fact that a Registered Student may have more module marks, which lie above the degree classification indicated by the arithmetic mean.)

- 11.1.1 (d) Comment (KD): The mark profile is examined for a preponderance of credits in

the class above the borderline, after the credits for each relevant year have been weighted according to the stage of study and totalled.

Recommended amendment (RJ):

Where there is a preponderance, after credit-weighting, of marks in the class above the relevant borderline. (The purpose of the DMC system is to recognise the prevailing character of a candidate's performance on the basis of judgements of the class to which each module outcome belongs. In this way, recognition is given to the fact that a Registered Student may have more weighted module marks, which lie above the degree classification indicated by the arithmetic mean.)

ASA Response: Recommended that clause remains is amended as per RJ's proposal.

- 11.1.1 (e) Where there are no fails or limited failure is outweighed by additional units in or above the higher class. (The median emphasises achievement and recognises classes. Correspondingly it deals more firmly with failure.)

- 11.1.1 (e) Comment (KD): A limited measure of failure to gain credit is allowable subject to achieving additional credits in or above the higher class.

ASA Response: Accept KD's alternative wording.

11.2 Step One: The Arithmetic Mean

- 11.2 Comment (KD): The final credit-weighted arithmetic mean mark determines the prima facie classification for candidates who are eligible for the award of a classified first degree.

ASA Response: Recommended that clause remains as it is.

- 11.2.1 In accordance with Regulation 7.3.1 (d), where candidates are eligible for the award of a classified first degree, the class will be determined initially on the basis of the weighted arithmetic mean (to take account of the credit rating of a module) using the weighting between stages:

70+ = 1st;
60-69 = 2i;
50-59 = 2ii;
40-49 = 3rd.

- 11.2.1 Comment (KD): It is arrived at by combining the credit-weighted average percentage mark for one stage with another in these proportions:

Proportions for each stage	3-year programme	4-year programme with Year Abroad, e.g. Modern Languages	4-year UG Master's programme
Stage 2	25%	12.5%	20%
Stage 2 abroad		12.5%	
Stage 3	75%	75%	40%
Stage 4			40%

ASA Response: Recommended that clause be amended to refer to the appropriate Regulation (insertion underlined).

- 11.2.2 For the purposes of determining the degree classification obtained, the mean should be calculated to one decimal place. In determining class on the basis of weighted arithmetic mean, numbers of .5 and above will be rounded up to the nearest integer. ~~For example, 59.5 would become 60, whereas 59.4 would be subject to consideration under the DMC – distribution of module class scheme.~~

- 11.2.2 Comment (KD): Rounding – The final mean is rounded to 1 decimal place, thus 59.45 is rounded to 59.5. [Contrast with RJ's comments at 8.3.11 (b)]

The final mean, after further rounding, gains a prima facie classification, as follows:

70-100	Class I
60-69	Class II.1
50-59	Class II.2
40-49	Class III
0-39	no degree

ASA Response: Recommended that clause be amended as above (insertion underlined, deletion struck through).

11.3 Step Two: Identifying Borderline Cases

- 11.3.1 Those candidates with weighted arithmetic means that are within predetermined margins less than the degree classification hurdle values provided above, will be borderline cases and eligible for classification on the DMC basis as set out below. This profiling system makes use of the class band in which each module mark falls. In order to obtain a relative weighting of final year to second year, credits are transformed into units, as follows:

11.3.2

	3 yr programme credits = units	4 yr Mod Langs programme credits = units	4 yr Undergraduate Masters programme credits = units
Proportions between years/ stages	25:75	12.5:12.5:75	20:40:40
	Credits ⇔ Units	Credits ⇔ Units	Credits ⇔ Units
Year 2	120 = 120	120 = 60	120 = 120
Year 3	120 = 360	120 = 60	120 = 240
Year 4		120 = 360	120 = 240
Total of units	480	480	600

- 11.3.3 ~~Example:~~ So, for instance, in the case of a Modern Languages degree, the second and third year credits are half weighted and the 120 credits in each year are divided by 2 to give 60 units, whereas the final year is triple weighted and the 120 credits are multiplied by 3 to 360 units. A 20 credit module in this programme will therefore count 10 units in years 2 and 3, but 60 units in year 4.

ASA Recommendation to delete this clause.

- 11.3.4 A candidate will be eligible for classification according to the DMC system only if all the following conditions are met:
- 11.3.5 (a) The candidate has attempted all credits on which the classification is based.
- 11.3.5 (b) The candidate has failed not more than 60 units for a classified honours degree and 70 units for an Undergraduate Masters degree
- 11.3.5 (c) The candidate has a weighted arithmetic mean in the ranges as follows:
> 66.0 and < 69.5 - for consideration for a 1st
> 57.0 and < 59.5 - for consideration for a 2i
> 48.0 and < 49.5 - for consideration for a 2ii

11.3.5 Recommended amendment (VP):

The candidate has a weighted arithmetic mean in the ranges as follows:
> 66.0 and < 69.5 - for consideration for a 1st
> 57.0 and < 59.5 - for consideration for a 2i
> 48.0 and < 49.5 - for consideration for a 2ii
> 38.0 and < 39.5 - for consideration for a 3rd

Comment (RJ): The inequalities are incorrect – they should read greater than or equal to (\geq) and less than or equal to (\leq), not greater than ($>$) and less than ($<$). As currently written, the first value is excluded.

Therefore, recommended amendment:

The candidate has a weighted arithmetic mean in the ranges as follows:
 ≥ 66.0 and ≤ 69.5 - for consideration for a 1st
 ≥ 57.0 and ≤ 59.5 - for consideration for a 2i
 ≥ 48.0 and ≤ 49.5 - for consideration for a 2ii
 ≥ 38.0 and ≤ 39.5 - for consideration for a 3rd

ASA Response: Recommend acceptance of amendments by VP and RJ.

11.4 Step Three: Determination of the Degree Class for Borderline Cases

- 11.4.1 As explained above, the Distribution of module classes (DMC) system makes use of the class band in which each module mark falls. The candidate will achieve a higher class, than indicated by the arithmetic mean, if the following conditions are met:

11.4.1 Recommended amendment (RJ):

As explained above, the Distribution of module classes (DMC) system makes use of the class band in which each module mark falls. The candidate will achieve ~~a higher class,~~ one class higher than indicated by the arithmetic mean, if the following conditions are met:

ASA Response: Recommend acceptance of RJ's proposed amendment.

- 11.4.2 Classified Bachelors Degree, with more than 240 units in the classification band above the degree class indicated by the calculation of the arithmetic mean:

- 11.4.2 (a) Where a Registered Student has achieved more than 240 units above the degree classification indicated by the calculation of the arithmetic mean and has no fails.
- 11.4.2 (b) Where a Registered Student has achieved more than 240 units above the degree classification indicated by the calculation of the arithmetic mean, but there are failed units up to a maximum of 60 units. The failed units should be compensated by an equal number of additional units in the degree classes above that indicated by the arithmetic mean (e.g. if 20 units are failed, then more than 260 units are required in the degree classes above that which is achieved).
- 11.4.3 Classified Bachelors Degree, with exactly 240 units in the classification band above the degree class indicated by the calculation of the arithmetic mean and no fails:
- 11.4.3 (a) A Registered Student whose arithmetic mean mark lies in the range of 66.0 and 69.4, inclusive should be awarded a 1st class degree if they have achieved 240 units in class I, with not less than 80 units in class 2i and they have no fails.
- 11.4.3 (a) Recommended amendment (RB):
- A Registered Student whose arithmetic mean mark lies ~~in the range~~ between 66.00 and 69.45, inclusive should be awarded a 1st class degree if they have achieved 240 units in class I, with not less than 80 units in class 2i and they have no fails.
- ASA Response: Recommend that accept RB's proposed amendments.
- 11.4.3 (b) A Registered Student whose arithmetic mean mark falls between the following ranges should be awarded a higher class of degree if they meet the following requirements:
- 11.4.3 (b) Recommended amendment (RB):
- A Registered Student whose arithmetic mean mark falls ~~between~~ in the following ranges should be awarded a higher class of degree if they meet the following requirements:
- ASA Response: Recommend that accept RB's proposed amendments.
- 11.4.3 (b) (i) A Registered Student whose arithmetic mean mark lies in the range of at least 57.0 and less than 59.5, should be awarded a 2i class degree if they have achieved 240 units in the 2i class or above, but have at least 40 units in 1st class.
- 11.4.3 (b) (i) Recommended amendment (RB):
- A Registered Student whose arithmetic mean mark lies ~~in the range of at least between~~ 57.00 and less than 59.45 inclusive, should be awarded a 2i class degree if they have achieved 240 units in the 2i class or above, but have at least 40 units in 1st class.

ASA Response: Recommend that accept RB's proposed amendments.

- 11.4.3 (b) (ii) A Registered Student whose arithmetic mean mark lies in the range of at least 48.0 and less than 49.5, should be awarded a 2ii class degree if they have achieved 240 units in the 2ii class or above, but have at least 40 units in the 2i class or above.

- 11.4.3 (b) (ii) Recommended amendment (RB):

A Registered Student whose arithmetic mean mark lies ~~in the range of at least~~ between 48.00 and ~~less than~~ 49.45 inclusive, should be awarded a 2ii class degree if they have achieved 240 units in the 2ii class or above, but have at least 40 units in the 2i class or above.

ASA Response: Recommend that accept RB's proposed amendments.

- 11.4.3 Recommended amendment (PF):

To be consistent with the amendment at 11.3.5, a new sub-clause 11.4.3 (b)(iii) is required, to read as follows:

A Registered Student whose arithmetic mean mark lies between 38.00 and 39.45 inclusive, should be awarded a 3rd class degree if they have achieved 240 units in the 3rd class or above, but have at least 40 units in the 2ii class or above.

ASA Response: Recommend that accept PF's proposed amendments.

- 11.4.4 Undergraduate Masters Degree, with more than 300 units in the classification band above the degree class indicated by the calculation of the arithmetic mean.

- 11.4.4 (a) Where a Registered Student has achieved more than 300 units above the degree classification indicated by the calculation of the arithmetic mean and has no fails.

- 11.4.4 (b) Where a Registered Student has achieved more than 300 units above the degree classification indicated by the calculation of the arithmetic mean, but there are failed units, up to a maximum of 70 failed units. The failed units should be compensated by an equal number of additional units in the degree classes above that indicated by the arithmetic mean (e.g. if 20 units are failed, then more than 320 units are required in the degree classes above that which is achieved).

- 11.4.5 Undergraduate Masters Degree, with exactly 300 units in the classification band above the degree class indicated by the calculation of the arithmetic mean and no fails

- 11.4.5 (a) A Registered Student whose arithmetic mean mark lies in the range of 66.0 and 69.4, inclusive, should be awarded a 1st class degree if they have achieved 300 units in class I, with not less than 100 units in class 2i and have no fails.

- 11.4.5 (a) Recommended amendment (RB):

A Registered Student whose arithmetic mean mark lies ~~in the range of~~ between 66.00 and 69.45, inclusive, should be awarded a 1st class degree if they have achieved 300 units in class I, with not less than 100 units in class 2i and have no fails.

ASA Response: Recommend that accept RB's proposed amendments.

- 11.4.5 (b) A Registered Student whose arithmetic mean mark lies between the following ranges should be awarded a higher class of degree if they meet the following requirements: A student whose arithmetic mean mark lies in the range of at least 57.0 and less than 59.5, should be awarded a 2i class degree if they have achieved 300 units in the 2i range, but have at least 50 units in 1st class.

- 11.4.5 (b) Recommended amendment (RB):

A Registered Student whose arithmetic mean mark lies ~~between~~ in the following ranges should be awarded a higher class of degree if they meet the following requirements: A student whose arithmetic mean mark lies ~~in the range of at least~~ between 57.0 and 59.45 ~~less than~~ inclusive, should be awarded a 2i class degree if they have achieved 300 units in the 2i range, but have at least 50 units in 1st class.

ASA Response: Recommend that accept RB's proposed amendments.

- 11.4.5 (c) A Registered Student whose arithmetic mean mark lies in the range of at least 48.0 and less than 49.5, should be awarded a 2ii class degree if they have achieved 300 units in the 2ii range, but have at least 50 units in the 2i class or above.

- 11.4.5 (c) Recommended amendment (RB):

A Registered Student whose arithmetic mean mark lies ~~in the range of at least~~ between 48.0 and ~~less than~~ 49.45, inclusive should be awarded a 2ii class degree if they have achieved 300 units in the 2ii range, but have at least 50 units in the 2i class or above.

ASA Response: Recommend that accept RB's proposed amendments.

- 11.4.5 Recommended amendment (PF):

To be consistent with the amendment at 11.3.5, a new sub-clause 11.4.5 (d) is required, to read as follows:

A Registered Student whose arithmetic mean mark lies between 38.00 and 39.45 inclusive, should be awarded a 3rd class degree if they have achieved 300 units in the 3rd class or above, but have at least 50 units in the 2ii class or above.

ASA Response: Recommend that accept PF's proposed amendments.

12. AP(E)L

- 12.1 Credit should be awarded only for achievement of designated learning outcomes. Therefore AP(E)L should be awarded only against specific modules where through prior qualification or experience it can be confirmed that Registered Students have achieved equivalent learning outcomes. Where this is not academically possible due to differing curriculum or (in particular) accreditation of prior experiential learning, principal academic units should identify which modules the students are not required to complete by studying at Birmingham. AP(E)L will be awarded against these modules. Registered Students will be registered for these modules so that their total credit load is as for other Registered Students, as appropriate to the programme and

award.

- 12.2 Transcripts should only reflect credit achieved at the University of Birmingham. Consequently 'direct entry' students (i.e. those who join the University at a later stage of the programme) would receive transcripts containing only marks achieved while at the University. For Registered Students who receive AP(E)L, all modules should be reflected on the transcript, so that the total number of credits matched that required for the award. In such cases, the AP(E)L module should be clearly marked.

- 12.3 Progression should be determined as for other students, and AP(E)L modules should be considered as equivalent to other modules. For example, an undergraduate student who received AP(E)L for 20 credits would be required to achieve 100 credits for progression (Registered Students take 120 credits and need 100 credits to proceed). An undergraduate Registered Student who received AP(E)L for 40 credits would be required to achieve an additional 60 credits for progression.

12.3 Proposed amendment (VP):

Progression should be determined as for other students, and AP(E)L modules should be considered as equivalent to other modules. For example, an undergraduate student who received AP(E)L for 20 credits would be required to achieve an additional 80 credits for progression. (Registered Students take 120 credits and need 100 credits to proceed.) An undergraduate Registered Student who received AP(E)L for 40 credits would be required to achieve an additional 60 credits for progression.

ASA Response: Recommend that accept VP's proposed amendments.

- 12.4 Degree classification should be determined pro rata. Only credit gained through study at the University of Birmingham should be included in the calculation.
- 12.5 Registered Students who apply for AP(E)L once they are already registered for a programme should be required to complete the AP(E)L procedures, and pay the appropriate fee(s).

13. Contribution of Year Abroad/in Industry

- 13.1 Where the year abroad/in industry is either an integral part of the programme to which the student has been admitted, or recognised in the title of the degree awarded it must be assessed and produce a mark or marks which contribute to the stage 2 contribution to the degree classification. It must be passed (at least 100 credits) for the purpose of progression within that programme. The proportion of the contribution to the overall stage 2 contribution to the classification shall be subject to approval by the Programme Approval and Review Committee on the basis of a recommendation from the principal academic unit concerned.
- 13.2 Where the year abroad is an equivalent alternative to study that would otherwise have been taken within the University, it must be assessed and contribute to the classification in the same way as equivalent study undertaken within the University in accordance with the agreed University-wide classification scheme.
- 13.3 Where the year abroad/in industry is assessed and contributes to the final classification, principal academic units shall recommend for approval by the Programme Approval and Review Committee assessment arrangements (which must be carried out either by this University or the 'host' institution) that will produce a mark or marks which can be used with confidence in degree classification.

