Appendix 3

Legislation exemption requested from	**Replacement Process identified**
Regulations	
7.2.1 (i) The pass mark for level F, C, I and H modules is 40. There may be exceptions to this where it is required by external bodies. Such exceptions shall be agreed by the Senate or a delegated authority.	The pass mark for all modules will be 50.
7.3.1 (a) (vi) To be eligible to proceed to stage 3 of an undergraduate masters programme, Registered Students must have accumulated 220 credits by the end of stage 2 and the weighted mean mark for stage 2 must normally be 55 or better. Where required for professional accreditation or other academic purposes, Principal Academic Units or Colleges may introduce additional requirements for progression to an undergraduate masters programme, subject to the approval of the Senate or under delegated authority. Any such additional requirements will be clearly indicated in programme requirements and in information provided to registered Students. Registered Students who do not meet the requirements to proceed to the undergraduate masters programme will proceed to an appropriate bachelor's programme.	The pass mark for all modules will be 50.
7.3.1 (a) (i) Registered Students are required to pass 100 credits at a given stage of a programme in order to progress to the subsequent stage. Where programmes have different requirements in terms of credits passed, this shall be agreed by the Senate or under delegated authority and shall be specified in the programme requirements.	A requirement to pass all modules in order to progress.
7.2.6 (a) Subject to sub-clause 7.2.6 (b) below, all Registered Students who fail a module, other than modules taken in the final stage of a classified honours degree programme not exempted from this clause by decision of the Senate, shall have one opportunity to retrieve the failure, either by re-assessment (i.e. re-sitting the examination and/or resubmitting coursework) or repetition. Such opportunity shall be normally provided and taken within one year of the initial failure except when, for reasons of frequency of module delivery, the Senate or a delegated authority has agreed otherwise.	Opportunity for a third attempt at up to 20 credits in the first year, as an external re-sit.

Regulation 6.1.2 p (iii): "*For single honours degree programmes credits shall be predominantly in the main subject discipline but, unless the Senate or delegated authority agrees otherwise, all such programmes must include the opportunity for Registered Students to take at least 20 credits from outside the main subject*"	None.
6.1.2 p (vi) which defines stage 3 of an undergraduate masters programme as 2 years / 240 credits and should, instead be allowed to consider year 3 and year 4 (or in the 5 year programme year 3 and years 4/5) as two separate 120 credit stages with a formal progress point between them (as specified in the programme documentation submitted to PARC)	Each programme year shall be considered to be a separate stage.
Code of Practice on Taught Programme and Module Assessment	
11.13 .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.	That instead, the MBChB is allowed to employ or adapt as appropriate, standard setting approaches currently used within the medical education sector. Whatever pass mark is arrived at through standard setting, marks will be scaled back to a standardised pass mark of 50%.
Appendix 1: Moderation	Recognition that clinical exams cannot meet criteria for blind marking / moderation; as assessment is a live process, there is no evidence of student performance for a moderator to consider (other than the examiner's written assessment and feedback to the student). That being the case, an independent review / moderation is not possible. It is worth remembering that part of the reason for the Objective Structured Clinical Examination (which includes multiple stations, each with a different examiner) is that to a significant extent it smoothes out the individual examiner variation which, in other assessment types, moderation processes are designed to overcome.