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Introduction

This handbook provides information for external examiners for all taught programmes at the University of Leicester and has been produced to assist you in your role as external examiner for the University. It contains information about our regulations and procedures, duties of external examiners and how the University will consider your reports. It supplements other documentation which is specific to the programmes for which you are external examiner. The relevant Department / School will send this to you.

Copies of the handbook can be obtained from the Quality Office or downloaded from: www.le.ac.uk/sas/assessments/externalexamining

In addition new training materials for external examiners can be found at http://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/lli/lt/quality/external-examiners/

All Senate regulations can be found on the University’s website at http://www.le.ac.uk/sas/regulations/general-regulations-for-taught-programmes

Senate Regulations 5, 6, 7 and 11 can be found in Section 5 of this Handbook, as these are of particular relevance to your role as an external examiner.

The University’s Academic Policy Committee is responsible to Senate for the assurance and enhancement of academic quality and standards. It is also responsible for formulating and monitoring the University’s Discovery-Led and Discovery-Enabling Learning Strategy (Appendix 1).

If you have any queries about information contained in the handbook or about the University’s regulations or procedures please contact the Quality Office. Contact details are given in Section 4

If your queries are about the programme or arrangements for examination boards please contact the relevant Department/School.

Quality Office
May 2017
SECTION 1
UNIVERSITY FRAMEWORK FOR PANELS AND BOARDS OF EXAMINERS

1. Boards and Panels of Examiners are in place to evaluate and maintain academic standards, ensure adherence to the Regulations, consider the interests of individual students and ensure fairness across a cohort.

2. The University operates a two tier process of Panels and Boards of Examiners.

3. Mitigating Circumstances Panels are convened by Boards of Examiners to consider the cases of individual students.

4. Senate, as the University’s academic authority has overriding responsibility for academic standards, including the award of degrees.

5. Boards of Examiners act under delegated authority from Senate which means that they are empowered to make awards on Senate’s behalf. Once a Board of Examiners had made an award the student can be formally notified by Registry. Awards are then conferred at the next degree congregation.

6. The University requires that a Board of Examiners is convened for each taught programme or set of cognate programmes.

7. A Panel of Examiners is convened for clusters of cognate modules and reports to the Board of Examiners.

8. Mitigating Circumstances Panels are established by Boards of Examiners to consider students’ mitigating circumstances on the basis of documentary evidence. These panels operate under delegated powers from the Board of Examiners, making recommendations to Panels of Examiners.
Boards of Examiners

A Board of Examiners is the body responsible for overseeing each student’s academic performance on the relevant programmes and for making decisions on progression and award based on assessment results.

A Board ensures that students are treated consistently and fairly and appropriate academic standards are maintained.

Heads of Department are responsible for deciding how Boards of Examiners are organised for their Department and for the programmes for which a Board is responsible. For example, Boards of Examiners may encompass more than one level of a programme or more than one programme. Alternatively, separate meetings may be held to consider award and progression decisions.

Role of Boards

The role of a Board of Examiners is to:

- confirm the recommended module outcomes from one or more Panels of Examiners;
- consider the academic performance of individual students;
- agree awards and classifications, in accordance with regulations;
- consider borderline cases (see Senate Regulation 5.33 for further guidance);
- agree progression decisions, including recommendations for re-assessment or termination of studies;
- ensure the appropriateness of marking practices for the modules for which it has responsibility;
- make recommendations on prizes;
- consider comments from external examiners.

Membership

Chair – a senior member of the academic staff of the Department
Two members of each Panel of Examiners, one of whom is normally the Chair of the Panel
Other members of the academic staff, as required to ensure that informed progression and award decisions can be made
External Examiner(s), where awards are being made (external examiners are not expected to attend progression Boards).

A Secretary (a member of the Department’s administrative staff), appointed by the Head of Department

For Boards which are making awards an Academic Registrar’s Representative is also required to attend.
Principles on the Conduct of Business

- Boards of Examiners must meet at the end of assessment cycles to ensure that award decisions are made at the appropriate time to allow students to graduate or to receive progression decisions in sufficient time to allow reassessment, where required;
- At least 75% of membership must attend Boards of Examiners, and must include the Chair;
- Except in exceptional circumstances members of the Board are expected to stay for the duration of meetings to ensure consistency of decision making;
- Board meetings will follow a standard agenda;
- Boards will be provided with a standard data set from SITS by the Registry;
- Boards will confirm the recommended module outcomes from one or more Panel of Examiners;
- Boards will consider and confirm award decisions;
- Boards will consider and confirm progression decisions;
- Boards will receive and consider comments from external examiners;
- The Board of Examiners Report is the primary record of the Board’s decisions and authority and should be signed as an accurate record by the Chair at the end of each meeting;
- In cases where a decision is deferred the Board will require the Chair to take action on its behalf at a later date.

Mitigating Circumstances Panels

Boards of Examiners establish Mitigating Circumstances Panels to consider individual student cases.

Mitigating Circumstances Panels determine whether sufficient grounds for mitigation have been established and make recommendations on the appropriate course of action to Panels of Examiners. Neither Panels nor Boards of Examiners consider the mitigating circumstances of individual students.

Panels of Examiners accept the recommendations of Mitigating Circumstances Panels and determine the outcome for the module which the regulations state as follows:

- Provide a student with the opportunity to take the affected assessment(s) as if for the first time i.e. a sit or submit, allowing them to be given the full marks achieved for the examination or assessment so no cap is imposed (unless the assessment affected was already a re-sit or re-submission in which case a further re-sit or re-submission with a capped mark is permitted);
- Waive late submission penalties;
- Determine that there is sufficient evidence of the achievement of intended learning outcomes from other pieces of assessment for the module(s) for an overall mark to be derived;
- Note the accepted mitigation for the module(s) and recommend that the Board of Examiners takes this into account when considering borderline cases at the point of award and classification.
Key Roles at Boards of Examiners

Chair

The Chair of a Board of Examiners is a senior member of academic staff, this may be the head of Department or another member of staff approved to undertake this role.

If there is a vote at a meeting the Chair will only vote if there is a tie in which case he/she will have the casting vote.

The role of the Chair at meetings of Boards of Examiners is to:

- ensure that proceedings are properly conducted and managed in an efficient manner using the prescribed documentation and members are appropriately briefed;
- ensure that students are treated equitably and in accordance with programme regulations and University regulations for progression and award, guiding the Board to clear recommendations and decisions;
- ensure that where external examiners are present they are invited to comment on the proceedings and arrangements for the Board, on the academic standards of the programme and any other issues which they consider relevant;
- be responsible for taking any action on behalf of the Board where empowered to do so after the meeting;
- sign the Board Report as an accurate record of the meeting;
- approve the minutes.

Secretary

The Secretary to a Board of Examiners is a member of the administrative staff of the relevant department(s) with appropriate experience and an understanding of both the programme and Senate Regulations. She/he will usually make arrangements for meetings. The Secretary’s role also includes working with the Chair to ensure that meetings run smoothly and ensuring that Boards have all the necessary documentation, and minutes are produced in a timely fashion.

Academic Registrar’s Representative

An Academic Registrar’s Representative is a member of professional services staff of the University who attends each meeting of a Board of Examiners where awards are made to students. Their role is to advise the Board on Senate Regulations and their interpretation, taking into account any variations approved for a particular programme, and any broader regulatory matters. They are also required to intervene if they believe a Board is making a decision which is not in accordance with regulations.
Documentation for Panels and Boards of Examiners

Panels and Boards of Examiners will have the following documentation:

- An agenda;
- A standard dataset from SITS (the student records system).

In addition, the Secretary should ensure that the following are available for consultation:

- Programme Specification(s);
- Senate Regulation 5 governing undergraduate programmes of study or Senate Regulation 6 governing taught postgraduate programmes of study;
- Senate Regulation 7 governing the assessment of taught programmes of study;
- An extract from Senate Regulation 11 (student discipline) on plagiarism penalties.
SECTION 2
ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF EXTERNAL EXAMINERS

2.1 The University recognises that External Examiners play a major role in ensuring the academic standards and awards of the University. Regulations relating to the appointment and duties of external examiners are stated in Senate Regulation 7. A summary of the key responsibilities is given below.

External examining

2.2 External examiners are appointed to provide impartial and independent advice and informed comment on the University’s standards and student achievement in relation to those standards.

2.3 External Examiners are appointed for a period of four years in most cases and are required to give a period of 3 months’ notice if they wish to resign for any reason during their period of service.

2.4 For each award-bearing programme, including for the award of credit, the University appoints at least one external examiner, including for awards made with or through a partner institution. An external examiner may be appointed for several related programmes.

2.5 The University appoints sufficient examiners for a particular programme to cover the full range and complexity of the syllabus and the size of the student cohort.

2.6 For awards resulting from study both on campus and by distance learning, the University will ensure that external examining arrangements enable the Board of Examiners to make judgements about the comparability of standards across both cohorts.

Role and responsibilities

2.7 In accordance with Chapter B7 of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education you will be asked by the University to provide informative comment and recommendations upon whether or not:

- the University is maintaining the threshold academic standards for its awards in accordance with the framework for higher education qualifications and relevant subject benchmark statements;
- the assessment process measures student achievement rigorously and fairly against intended outcomes of the programme(s) and is conducted in line with the University’s policies and regulations;
- the academic standards and the achievement of students are comparable with those in other higher education institutions of which the external examiners have experience.

2.8 As an external examiner you will also:

- be asked to identify areas of good practice or opportunities to enhance the quality of the learning opportunities provided to students.
• report on standards at both the module and award level
• have the opportunity to consider samples of students’ assessed work, together with marks agreed by the internal markers. You should receive sufficient material from the Department to form a view as to whether the internal marking has properly assessed student performance against appropriate standards. You should normally receive 10% of the pieces of assessment with a sample across the range of student achievement but may request that this is varied, particularly if the number of students registered on a programme is such that you would be unable to form a judgement from a 10% sample.
• be consulted about access to non-written assessment and attendance at any live assessment events and may be required to access student performance during assessed school experience, clinical or other work-placement, irrespective of location.
• be an equal member of a Board of Examiners and participate in the transaction of the Board’s business.

2.9 As an external examiner you will not be involved in the assessment or examination of the work of individual students and will not be the final arbiter for the award of marks/grades either within a module or for the final award. You will be invited to comment on the standard of marking against the written criteria but may not seek, or be invited, to raise or lower the marks assigned to individual students. You may, however, ask for marks to be revisited by the internal markers against the written criteria across a full cohort if you consider that there is sufficient evidence to support under- or over-marking, or if you have concerns about the robustness of marking.
SECTION 3
REPORTING AND PAYMENT

Submission of Annual Reports

3.1 During your period of office you will be required to submit a written report to the University at the end of each assessment cycle. The University has a standard report form for this purpose (Appendix 2). The form can also be found at: www.le.ac.uk/sas/assessments/externalexamining

3.2 You will be contacted by the Quality Office before your report is due with an electronic copy of the form and details on how to submit it.

3.3 The form is designed to collect the information required to confirm the standards of University awards, the appropriateness of student achievement and the integrity of the assessment process.

3.4 Reports should be submitted to the Quality Office by the following deadlines:
   - Undergraduate Programmes: 31 July
   - Postgraduate Programmes: 31 December

3.5 If the Quality Office does not receive a report from you a reminder will be issued.

Consideration of External Examiner Reports

3.6 On receipt the Quality Office will check reports to ensure they are complete and will acknowledge receipt.

3.7 Each report will be provided to the Head of Department or School who will prepare an appropriate response to the issues raised. A copy of this should be sent to you by the Department.

3.8 The Quality Office will send copies of the report and departmental responses to the relevant Head of College and Academic Director, and in case of Postgraduate Taught programmes the Graduate Dean.

3.9 An archive of external examiners’ reports will be maintained electronically by the Quality Office and published once they have been through formal University processes.

3.10 Departments and the University will make full use of external examiners’ reports in annual and periodic developmental review.

3.11 A digest of the reports of all external examiners reports will be considered annually by the Academic Policy Committee and Senate.

Payment of Fees and Expenses

3.12 Fees payable to external examiners are notified in the letter of appointment.
3.13 The Quality Office will send you a fees and expenses claim form prior to each examination board.

3.14 Your fees payments will be processed on receipt of your annual report. You can claim expenses throughout the year as appropriate and where expenses only are being claimed an expenses form should be submitted. This can be found at [http://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/finance/atoz/expenses-claim-form-ec1](http://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/finance/atoz/expenses-claim-form-ec1)
or if you contact the Quality Office a copy will be sent to you. Please ensure that you submit receipts with expenses claims so that they can be processed promptly without any deductions.

3.15 In order to comply with the UKVI requirements the University is now required to ask external examiners for proof that they are entitled to work in the UK. Details of this are given in appointment letters. Examiners are asked to bring one of the following documents with them when they attend their first examination board meetings so that a copy can be made and retained by the University:

If you are a UK citizen:

- Your passport or
- Full birth certificate issued in the UK and an official document giving your permanent National Insurance Numbers and your name, issued by a Government agency or employer

If you are from a European Economic Area:

- Your passport or
- National Identity Card

If you are not a UK citizen or from an EEA:

- Your passport and visa/entry clearance stamp/biometric immigration card issued by the UK Border and Immigration Agency giving permission to stay in the UK
SECTION 4
CONTACT DETAILS AND WEB ADDRESSES

Contacts

Any queries about appointment, reporting processes, payment or general queries about University regulations and procedures can be addressed to the Quality Office. The e-mail address for external examiners is: extexaminers@le.ac.uk

Web Addresses

University:

- University of Leicester website: www.le.ac.uk
- Information and forms for external examiners can be found on the Student Academic Services website: http://www.le.ac.uk/sas/assessments/externalexamining
- Senate Regulations: http://www.le.ac.uk/sas/regulations/general-regulations-for-taught-programmes

Other Useful Web Addresses:

SECTION 5
SENATE REGULATIONS

1. Regulations governing undergraduate programmes of study (Senate Regulation 5)
2. Regulations governing taught postgraduate programmes of study (Senate Regulation 6)
3. Regulations governing the assessment of taught programmes (Senate Regulation 7)
4. Extract from Regulations governing student discipline (Senate Regulation 11)
Senate Regulation 5: Regulations governing undergraduate programmes of study

5.1 Variation from this scheme will normally only be permitted where there is a requirement from a professional or statutory legal body, and must be approved by the Academic Policy Committee. Any such variations shall be specified in the programme specification.

Programmes of Study

5.2 The honours degrees awarded by the University are:

- Master of Biology (M.Biol)
- Master of Chemistry (M.Chem)
- Master of Computing (M.Comp)
- Master of Engineering (M.Eng)
- Master of Geology (M.Geol)
- Master of Mathematics (M.Math)
- Master of Physics (M.Phys)
- Bachelor of Arts (B.A.)
- Bachelor of Engineering (B.Eng)
- Bachelor of Laws (LL.B.)
- Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery (M.B.Ch.B.)
- Bachelor of Medical Science (B.Med.Sci.)
- Bachelor of Science (B.Sc.)

5.3 A first degree may be awarded with honours, as a pass degree, without honours (in the case of the M.B.Ch.B. degree), as an Ordinary degree (in the case of the B.Med.Sci. degree), or as a Foundation Degree.

Composition of Degree Programmes

5.4 For all full-time undergraduate programmes of study except the degrees of M.B.Ch.B., students are required to register each year for modules totalling 120 credits. This is deemed to be the equivalent of 900 hours of study, including private study time. Programme specifications specify those modules which are core and optional for each level of each programme of study. A similar modular structure applies to Phase I of the M.B.Ch.B programmes of study and is described in the Programme Handbook for those degrees.

5.5 Modules may be examined by written examination, continuous assessment, the completion of a project or dissertation, or through a combination of assessment methods. Details are provided in module specifications which can be accessed via the module database and in departmental literature.

Consideration of Results for Non-Finalists at the First Attempt

5.6 Students are credited with a module when they have completed the requirements of that module. These requirements include the submission, by the due date, of written assignments, the completion of any field work activities, or of any study abroad requirements and the attainment of a pass mark in the assessment associated with the module.

5.7 Subject to the achievement of an overall average of 40 per cent, modules may be passed at a level sufficient for the award of credit (35 to 39 per cent) or at honours level (40% or above). Exceptionally, for the purposes of satisfying the demands of professional bodies, or for some other significant academic reason specifically approved by the Academic Policy Committee, some modules may be designated as having to be passed at Honours Level (40 per cent or above).

5.8 Students who have not satisfied the module requirements set out above will have their performance reviewed by the relevant Board of Examiners in the light of the results obtained at the end of each level of the programme. Boards of Examiners will apply the following rules relating to the determination of pass or fail in individual modules.

- a) Students with a credit-weighted average of less than 40 per cent overall across the level will be deemed to have failed all modules in which a mark of less than 40 per cent has been obtained;

- b) Students with a credit-weighted average of 40 per cent or more overall across the level will be deemed to have failed all modules in which a mark of less than 35 percent has been obtained unless the University has determined that a specific module must be passed at 40 percent (see above), in which case in that module a mark of 39 per cent or less will be deemed to be a fail mark.
5.9 In order to be credited with the modules applying to any one level and therefore to be able to progress to the next level of a programme, a student must:

a) have satisfied the relevant requirements for each module as set out above

and

b) have achieved a credit-weighted average mark of 40 per cent or more across all the modules taken in the level

and

c) have achieved a pass mark in each module complying with the designations of pass/fail set out in 5.8 above.

5.10 Students who are declared at the end of the level to have failed any modules taken during the level may be allowed to present themselves for re-assessment in any written assessments associated with those failed modules. Students who have failed or have not completed any elements of assessed course work may be provided with the opportunity of (re) submitting the work by a date specified by their department. In certain modules there may be provision for alternative methods of re-assessment. Laboratory work, however, must normally be completed within the time allotted for it in the relevant semester. In most laboratory-based subjects, the opportunity for repeating practical work cannot be provided, and any failure in practical elements of the course may lead to termination of course.

5.11 The maximum mark which can be obtained in an assessment component deemed to be a resit or resubmission is 40% overall.

5.12 Students with a module mark in the range 35 – 39 who nevertheless meet the criteria for passing the level as set out in 5.7 and 5.8 above will not be permitted to retake the assessments for the module in an attempt to improve their performance.

5.13 Where a 4 year programme is approved with a threshold mark, this should be specified in the programme specification. A student who does not achieve the threshold level will normally be required to transfer to the equivalent three-year degree. If at the end of the third year a student does not meet the threshold requirement for progression to the final year, they will be considered as a finalist for the three-year degree.

Treatment of Failures at Resit, following re-assessment opportunity

5.14 Students who have not passed all their assessments, following the application of the criteria set out in 5.7 and 5.8 above, will be considered by the relevant Board of Examiners. In the light of their overall performance, the Board may determine an outcome for such students by applying the options below in descending order:

(a) The normal expectation is that a student who, without mitigating circumstances, achieves a mark below a pass for credit in more than 40 credits at resit will have their course terminated;

(b) A student may be permitted to proceed to the next year of the course taking, in addition to the standard 120 credits for the year, new modules in place of those failed. In order to be permitted to proceed and substitute modules, students will normally have failed no more than 30 credits (i.e. with marks below 35%) and have gained a credit weighted average mark for the year of at least 40%.

(c) Where modules are involved which cannot be substituted a student may be permitted to proceed to the next year of the course repeating the assessments for the failed modules alongside the standard 120 credits for the year. In order to be permitted to proceed and resit modules, students should normally have failed no more than 30 credits, have failed marks no lower than 30% and have a credit weighted average for the year of at least 40%.
(d) A student may be permitted to have one final attempt to resit failed modules. Such students will have their studies suspended in the meantime.

(e) A student may be permitted, in exceptional circumstances, to repeat the level as if for the first time (see paragraph 5.16 below).

5.15 Normally only two attempts at a module will be permitted, a first sit and one resit, except in cases where (b), (c) or (d) above apply. The award of further attempts under these criteria is at the discretion of the Board of Examiners. In such cases three attempts at a module is the maximum that a student will be permitted.

Granting of Repeat Periods of Study on the basis of mitigating circumstances

5.16 In reaching decisions on students who have failed assessments, Boards of Examiners will comply with the definition of mitigating circumstances laid out in Senate Regulation 7.100, and will take account of medical evidence or other special circumstances. Repeat periods of study will be granted only where evidence exists which demonstrates that such special circumstances have significantly interrupted, through no fault of the student’s own, the opportunity to benefit from the teaching programme in a particular year. The scale of the interruption must be such that it would be unreasonable to expect a student to take the assessment relating to that part of the programme without repeat attendance.

Progression into the Final year with outstanding modules

5.17 Students who have outstanding level 1 modules at the end of the penultimate level of their programme of study will not be permitted to proceed into the final level.

5.18 Students at the end of their penultimate level of study who have failed modules which contribute towards the classification of their award, and who have exhausted their re-sit opportunities for these modules, may proceed to the final year of the programme carrying a maximum of 30 credits of failed modules. The Board of Examiners may prevent a student from progressing while carrying failed modules, if those modules are deemed as being essential pre-requisites for final level study. In such cases the student’s programme of study shall be terminated.

Final Assessment for undergraduate programmes of study (excluding M.B.Ch.B)

5.19 The Board of Examiners will consider the marks of each final level student in accordance with the scheme of assessment (below)

5.20 Students who fail to satisfy the examiners in the Final Examinations may be allowed to present themselves for re-examination on one subsequent occasion only, and they will be considered for the award of a classified degree. The relevant Board of Examiners will recommend whether such students are required to resit all final modules or only those failed. Where a student has failed final modules however has still met the criteria for the award of a degree as set out below, an opportunity to re-sit or re-sit those failed assessments shall normally only be offered where successful re-assessment could potentially result in the student becoming eligible for a higher classification.

5.21 Any students may, at the discretion of the examiners, be required to attend an oral examination.

Where additional general regulations apply (e.g. LL.B. degree, the degrees of M.B., Ch.B.) these will be detailed in the relevant programme specification.

Programme Regulations for each programme of study can be found in the relevant programme specification, accessible via the following web page: http://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/sas2/courses/documentation

Major Minor Honours Degree

5.22 In addition to the progression and award requirements outlined in Regulations 5.6 to 5.21 above, students undertaking a Major Minor Honours Degree must achieve a minimum mark of 40% (honours level) in at least one module of their minor subject at each level of their degree programme. A minimum of 45 credits of the minor subject must be passed at honours level across the degree...
programme as a whole with at least 30 of those credits from levels 2 and 3 which will contribute to the
degree classification.

Aegrotat Awards

5.23 An aegrotat award may be considered in certain circumstances where a student is prevented through
illness or other sufficient cause from completing the final assessment for the award. Exemption may
not be granted from completing the dissertation or research project.

Classification of Awards

5.24 The following descriptors relate to a student’s performance across all the modules which contribute to
the final degree classification. An undergraduate programme of study may be awarded first, upper
second, lower second or third class honours, or without honours (Pass) using the following descriptors:

| First Class Honours | Overall has achieved the specified learning outcomes to an excellent or very high standard; has demonstrated a very high level of command of the subject matter and of technical and analytical skills; has demonstrated a high level of achievement in the development of intellectual and personal skills. |
| Upper Second Class Honours | Overall has achieved the specified learning outcomes to a good standard; has demonstrated a high level of command of the subject matter and of technical and analytical skills; has demonstrated a good level of achievement in the development of intellectual and personal skills. |
| Lower Second Class Honours | Overall has achieved the specified learning outcomes to a competent standard; has demonstrated a moderate level of command of the subject matter and of technical and analytical skills; has demonstrated a satisfactory level of achievement in the development of intellectual and personal skills. |
| Third Class Honours | Overall has achieved the specified learning outcomes to the minimum acceptable honours level; has demonstrated an adequate level of command of the subject matter and of technical and analytical skills; has demonstrated a satisfactory level of achievement in the development of intellectual and personal skills. |
| Pass | Overall has achieved the specified learning outcomes to the minimum acceptable level; has demonstrated a limited level of command of the subject matter and of technical and analytical skills; has demonstrated some achievement in the development of intellectual and personal skills. |

5.25 There are two approved variations of the mechanism to classify honours degrees: the version given
here applies to all new students and students who entered their second year in, or after the 2010/11
academic year.

5.26 The previous version which applies to students who entered their second year before the 2010/11
academic year; is available on the Student and Academic Services website:

Calculating the credit weighted average

5.27 For three year programmes the weighted average is to be calculated on the basis of all level 2 and level
3 marks. In order to calculate the weighted average, the scheme fixes the relative weighting of the
third-year and second-year marks in all three-year programmes at 60:40. An exception to this is the
School of Biological Sciences where for all new students and students who entered their second year in
2010/11 the relative weighting will be 70:30. The second year and third year averages are calculated
first, and then combined with a weighting of 60:40 in favour of the final year average. If the modules in
a year have different credit values (e.g. some 10 and some 20) then they are weighted by their credit
value in calculating the year average. If all modules in a year have the same credit value then the
average for the year is a simple average.
5.28 For the purposes of identifying students’ best performances on a module-by-module basis in order to meet the 120 credit threshold for a particular class, all second and third year modules are equal (only differentiated by their credit value where applicable). Differential weighting is only for the purposes of calculating the average mark between the two years.

5.29 **For integrated four year programmes** the same general principles apply to the calculation of the weighted average as for three-year programmes, but the second, third and fourth years are included, with a relative weighing of 20:30:50. For the purposes of identifying students’ best performance on a module-by-module basis, all second, third and fourth year modules are equal, but the credit threshold for a particular class is 180 rather than 120 credits.

5.30 **In the case of four-year programmes in which the year out does not count towards the final classification**, the second and fourth years are used in determining the degree class, according to the standard scheme for three-year programmes.

5.31 The following rules shall be applied in descending order, starting at the Pass/Fail threshold, so that fail students are excluded from further consideration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule</th>
<th>Pass/Fail threshold for the programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rule 1</strong></td>
<td>Pass/Fail threshold for the programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Students who fail at less than 35% modules to the value of 45 credits or less may be considered for the award of a degree under the rules below, unless the department has specifically required a pass in a given module, in which case the student will fail the programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>Students who fail modules to the value of 50 credits, or have a weighted average mark of less than 35%, will fail the programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rule 2</strong></td>
<td>First Class Honours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modules to the value of at least 120 credits at 70% or better, a weighted average mark greater than or equal to 67%, and failed modules worth less than 40 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Weighted average mark greater than or equal to 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rule 3</strong></td>
<td>Upper Second Class Honours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modules to the value of at least 120 credits at 60% or better, a weighted average mark greater than or equal to 57%, and failed modules worth less than 40 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Weighted average mark greater than or equal to 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Weighted average mark greater than or equal to 67% and modules to the value of at least 120 credits at 70% or better, and modules to the value of 40 or 45 failed credits <em>(Dropped class from 1st because of failures)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rule 4</strong></td>
<td>Lower Second Class Honours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modules to the value of at least 120 credits at 50% or better, a weighted average mark greater than or equal to 47%, and failed modules worth less than 40 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Weighted average mark greater than or equal to 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Weighted average mark greater than or equal to 57%, modules to the value of at least 120 credits at 60% or better, and modules to the value of 40 or 45 failed credits <em>(Dropped class from 2.1 because of failures)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rule 5</strong></td>
<td>Third Class Honours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weighted average mark greater than or equal to 40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule 6</th>
<th>Pass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weighted average mark greater than or equal to 35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Integrated Four Year Degree programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule 1</th>
<th>Pass/Fail threshold for the programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Students who fail at less than 35% modules to the value of 45 credits or less may be considered for the award of a degree under the rules below, unless the department has specifically required a pass in a given module, in which case the student will fail the programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>Students who fail modules to the value of 50 credits, or have a weighted average mark of less than 35%, will fail the programme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule 2</th>
<th>First Class Honours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modules to the value of at least 180 credits at 70% or better, a weighted average mark greater than or equal to 67%, and failed modules worth less than 40 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Weighted average mark greater than or equal to 70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule 3</th>
<th>Upper Second Class Honours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modules to the value of at least 180 credits at 60% or better, a weighted average mark greater than or equal to 57%, and failed modules worth less than 40 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Weighted average mark greater than or equal to 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Weighted average mark greater than or equal to 67% and modules to the value of at least 180 credits at 70% or better, and modules to the value of 40 or 45 failed credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Dropped class from 1st because of failures)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule 4</th>
<th>Lower Second Class Honours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modules to the value of at least 180 credits at 50% or better, a weighted average mark greater than or equal to 47%, and failed modules worth less than 40 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Weighted average mark greater than or equal to 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Weighted average mark greater than or equal to 57%, modules to the value of at least 180 credits at 60% or better, and modules to the value of 40 or 45 failed credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Dropped class from 2.1 because of failures)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule 5</th>
<th>Third Class Honours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weighted average mark greater than or equal to 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Modules to the value of at least 180 credits at 50% or better, a weighted average mark greater than or equal to 47%, and 40 or 45 failed credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Dropped class from 2.2 because of failures)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule 6</th>
<th>Pass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weighted average mark greater than or equal to 35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Borderline Candidates

5.32 Students who fall into a borderline, as defined below, and those just below the borderline with special/mitigating circumstances will be considered by the Board of Examiners. *Viva voce* examinations may still be permitted where there is a genuine need to substantiate the information available to a Board of Examiners.

5.33 The consideration of borderline students should be undertaken with a view to arriving at a positive outcome wherever this is commensurate with the application of appropriate academic standards. In reaching a judgement, Boards of Examiners are permitted to take account of whichever of the following are applicable to the discipline or to the circumstances of the student:

a) the design of the curriculum and any special features
b) the year in which the results were achieved
c) the profile of marks, and in particular any distorting elements
d) performance in substantial pieces of work (dissertations, projects)
e) the outcome of vivas, where these are held
f) mitigating circumstances
g) the impact of marks obtained elsewhere (for example, from a year abroad).

5.34 Candidates shall be considered for promotion to the next higher degree class on the following basis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Class Honours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Three year programmes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Four year integrated programmes</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upper Second Class Honours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Three year programmes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Four year integrated programmes</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lower Second Class Honours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Three year programmes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Four year integrated programmes</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BA/BSc Top up degrees
5.35 BA or BSc Top up degrees shall consist of 120 credits at level 6 of the FHEQ.

5.36 The scheme of classification and award for BA or BSc Top Up degrees shall be based upon the 120 final year (level 6) credits studied at the University and classified in accordance with the proportionate thresholds listed below. The following rules should be applied in descending order, starting at the Pass/Fail threshold, to ensure that students are excluded from further consideration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule</th>
<th>Pass/Fail threshold for the programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rule 1</td>
<td>Students may be considered for an award if they meet the following criteria:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) A credit weighted average of 35% or higher from all level 6 modules AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) Failed at less than 35% modules to the value of 20 credits or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students who fail to meet the requirement above will not be eligible for an award and may be permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to re-sit failed modules or, if they have exhausted the available re-sit attempts, will fail the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 2</td>
<td>First Class Honours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modules to the value of at least 60 credits at 70% or better, a weighted average mark greater than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or equal to 67%, and failed modules worth 20 credits or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR Weighted average mark greater than or equal to 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 3</td>
<td>Upper Second Class Honours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modules to the value of at least 60 credits at 60% or better, a weighted average mark greater than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or equal to 57%, and failed modules worth 20 credits or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR Weighted average mark greater than or equal to 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 4</td>
<td>Upper Second Class Honours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modules to the value of at least 60 credits at 50% or better, a weighted average mark greater than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or equal to 57%, and failed modules worth 20 credits or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR Weighted average mark greater than or equal to 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 5</td>
<td>Third Class Honours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weighted average mark greater than or equal to 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 6</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weighted average mark greater than or equal to 35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Borderline rules for BA/BSc Top-up degrees

5.37 Students who fall into a borderline, as defined below will be considered by the Board of Examiners. Students may only be considered for promotion to a higher degree classification where they meet the criteria below from the 120 credits of level 6 modules studied at the University, and have presented evidence of mitigating circumstances which has been accepted by the relevant Mitigating Circumstances Panel.

| First Class Honours | Modules to the value of at least 60 credits at 68% or better, including modules to the value of at least 45 credits at 70% or better, a weighted average mark greater than or equal to 67%, and failed modules worth less than 20 credits. |
Upper Second Class Honours  | Modules to the value of at least 60 credits at 58% or better, including modules to the value of at least 45 credits at 60% or better, a weighted average mark greater than or equal to 57%, and failed modules worth less than 20 credits.

Lower Second Class Honours  | Modules to the value of at least 60 credits at 48% or better, including modules to the value of at least 45 credits at 50% or better, a weighted average mark greater than or equal to 47%, and failed modules worth less than 20 credits.

Foundation Degrees (FDA/FDSc)

5.38 Foundation degrees shall consist of a total of 240 credits, 120 of which shall be at level 4 of the FHEQ and 120 of which shall be at level 5 of the FHEQ.

5.39 Foundation degrees are awarded on a Pass, Merit or Distinction basis. The following rules should be applied in descending order, starting at the Pass/Fail threshold, to ensure that students are excluded from further consideration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule 1</th>
<th>Pass/Fail threshold for the programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students may be considered for an award if they meet the following criteria:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) A credit weighted average of 40% from all modules AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) A mark of 35% or higher in all modules</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students who fail to meet the requirement above will not be eligible for an award and may be permitted to re-sit failed modules or, if they have exhausted the available re-sit attempts, will fail the programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule 2</th>
<th>Distinction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Credit Weighted Average mark greater than or equal to 70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule 3</th>
<th>Merit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Credit Weighted Average mark greater than or equal to 60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule 4</th>
<th>Pass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Credit Weighted Average mark greater than or equal to 40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Borderline rules for Foundation Degrees

5.40 Students who fall into a borderline, as defined below will be considered by the Board of Examiners. Students may only be considered for promotion to a higher degree classification where they meet the criteria below and have presented evidence of mitigating circumstances which has been accepted by the relevant Mitigating Circumstances Panel.

| Distinction | A Credit Weighted Average of greater than or equal to 67% and less than 70% |
| Merit       | A Credit Weighted Average of greater than or equal to 57% and less than 60% |

Diplomas of Higher Education

5.41 Diplomas of Higher Education shall consist of a total of 240 credits, 120 of which shall be at level 4 of the FHEQ and 120 of which shall be at level 5 of the FHEQ. The specific requirements for the award and classification of Diplomas of Higher Education shall be scrutinised by the Programme Approval Panel considering the introduction of the programme and approved by the Academic Policy Committee.

Certificates of Higher Education

5.42 Certificates of Higher Education shall consist of 120 credits at level 4 of the FHEQ. The specific requirements for the award and classification of Certificates of Higher Education shall be scrutinised by
the Programme Approval Panel considering the introduction of the programme and approved by the Academic Policy Committee.
Senate Regulation 6: Regulations governing taught postgraduate programmes of study

Introduction

6.1 These regulations apply to all taught postgraduate programmes and students.

6.2 Senate may approve programmes which lead to the award of Masters degrees, Postgraduate Diplomas or Postgraduate Certificates. Such programmes may provide for intermediate awards for a student who does not complete or satisfy the examiners in the programme for which s/he is registered but otherwise satisfies the criteria for such an intermediate award.

6.3 The taught postgraduate qualifications awarded by the University are the degrees of Master of Arts (MA), Master of Science (MSc), Master of Laws (LLM), Master of Business Administration (MBA), Master of Engineering Management (MEM), Master of Research (MRes), and the awards of Postgraduate Diploma and Postgraduate Certificate.

6.4 The title and programme specification for each taught postgraduate programme, the name of the award(s) to which it leads, and all awards made to students, shall be subject to the approval of Senate.

6.5 A programme may be approved with more strict reassessment, progression, or award requirements than those set out in these regulations where there is a demonstrable requirement from a professional or statutory regulatory body. In such cases any variation from this regulation must be approved by the Academic Policy Committee following consideration by the relevant Programme Approval Panel. Any such additional requirements shall be stated in the relevant programme specification.

Programme structure

6.6 The structure of the degrees of MA, MSc, LLM, MEM or MBA shall be approved by a Programme Approval Panel and shall be one of the following:

- 150 taught credits and a 30 credit dissertation or research project
- 120 taught credits and a 60 credit dissertation or research project
- 90 taught credits and a 90 credit dissertation or research project
- 60 taught credits and a 120 credit dissertation or research project

6.7 The structure of the degree of MRes shall be approved by a Programme Approval Panel and shall comprise taught modules to the value of between 30 and 60 credits and a dissertation or research project of between 120 and 150 credits.

6.8 A Postgraduate Certificate will comprise 60 taught credits.

6.9 A Postgraduate Diploma will comprise 120 taught credits.

6.10 A Masters degree shall have at least 60 taught credits to be approved with an intermediate award of Postgraduate Certificate, and at least 120 taught credits to be approved with an intermediate award of Postgraduate Diploma.

6.11 Any formal progression points for an individual programme will be approved by the relevant Programme Approval Panel and specified in the programme specification. A progression point defines the number of modules and level of attainment which a student must achieve in a specified period to progress to the next stage of their studies.

6.12 A student’s progress will be reviewed at each progression point to determine whether s/he has met the requirements to progress to the next stage of the programme. In each case, where a student has failed to meet the requirements to progress it will be determined whether s/he shall be referred to the Board of Examiners with a recommendation that s/he be withdrawn from the programme. The Board of
Examiners shall consider whether any intermediate award may be made based on the student’s academic achievement.

6.13 The submission date for the final piece of assessment for a full-time programme with a normal period of registration of one year, and with a start date at the beginning of the academic year, shall be 30 September in each year.

6.14 For a programme approved with a different normal period of registration, or with a start date at a different time of the year, the relevant Programme Approval Panel shall agree the submission date for the final piece of assessment and this shall be set out in the programme specification.

Modules

6.15 A taught module shall normally be not less than 15 credits and not more than 30 credits in volume.

6.16 Each module specification shall state how the components of a module shall be combined to form a module mark and whether a particular mark must be gained in an individual component for the module to be passed.

6.17 Each assessment for a module shall be marked or graded in accordance with the generic grade descriptors issued by the Academic Policy Committee for postgraduate programmes.

6.18 The pass mark shall be 50% or a grade of ‘C’ for all assessments and modules. Where a module is passed at 50% credit shall be given for that module, subject to the satisfaction of any additional criteria required under paragraph 6.16.

The following outcomes are permitted for an individual assessment component and a module:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment or Module Mark</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≥70%</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 – 69%</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 – 59%</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 – 49%</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 40%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.19 Each assessment component and module mark shall be expressed as an integer, or a grade, and components shall be combined using the rounding conventions of the University’s student record system.

Re-assessment

6.20 Where a student fails to achieve the 50% pass mark in a module s/he shall, subject to the requirements of paragraphs 6.21, 6.23 and 6.25 below, be entitled to re-sit or re-submit any of the failed components of assessment associated with the module in which they scored less than 50%, on one occasion only. A student will not be re-assessed in a module or module component where the 50% pass mark has already been obtained, except where a module mark of 50% or more has been obtained but a pass in the failed component is a requirement for a pass in the module as a whole. In such cases, the student shall be entitled to resit the failed component for the purposes of passing the module but the original module mark will not be amended.

6.21 The nature of a piece of coursework, for example work done in the laboratory or during fieldwork, may mean that the coursework cannot be reassessed in the same form. If the coursework is necessary to assess the learning outcomes for the module, no suitable alternative assessment is possible, and failure in that component means that the module is failed overall, then the module will be deemed to have been failed without the possibility of reassessment.
6.22 The maximum mark awarded for a re-assessed component of assessment will be 50%. Where a student completes a reassessment in a component, the higher of the original mark or the capped reassessment mark will be used to calculate the module outcome.

6.23 The number of credits of taught modules that a student shall be entitled to re-sit or re-submit is half of the credit value of the taught component of the programme, up to a maximum value of 60 credits.

6.24 A student may, at the discretion of the Panel of Examiners, be permitted to undertake an alternative piece of re-assessment in place of a failed assessment component in a taught module. Alternative re-assessment methods shall be stated in the relevant module specification. In exceptional circumstances, further alternative arrangements may be approved by the Panel of Examiners for the programme.

6.25 One resubmission of the dissertation or research project will normally be allowed. However, where practical or laboratory work is involved, see paragraph 6.26 below.

6.26 Where a student has completed a dissertation or research project which must be done in residence, for example, one based on laboratory or field work, and has failed the module, a Panel of Examiners will either

- provide an opportunity for a resubmission, where the failure relates to the quality of the written submission for the module; or
- provide an alternative reassessment, where it is possible to do so to allow the student an appropriate opportunity to demonstrate achievement of the learning outcomes for the module; or
- deem the student to have failed the module without an opportunity for reassessment, where the failure relates to laboratory or field work which cannot be repeated.

Progression requirements

6.27 The progress of each student shall be considered by a Board of Examiners at the end of the taught component of the programme. The Board of Examiners shall determine whether a student is permitted to progress to the dissertation or research project. Where the structure of a programme is such that a student has already begun work on his/her dissertation or research project, the Board of Examiners shall determine whether the student may continue with this work.

6.28 In making progression decisions for students on MA, MSc, LLM, MEM, and MBA programmes, a Board of Examiners shall adopt the following progression requirements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taught Module Credits Failed at First Attempt</th>
<th>Progression Rule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 30 credits</td>
<td>A student will proceed to, or continue with, the dissertation or research project and is entitled to re-sit failed modules up to the maximum credit value set out in paragraph 6.23 above, at the earliest opportunity. If, after reassessment, a student has any module mark of &lt; 40%, Grade ‘F’, s/he will not be allowed to continue work on the dissertation or research project and shall be considered at the next meeting of the Board of Examiners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 45 credits</td>
<td>A student will proceed to or continue with, the dissertation or research project and is entitled to re-sit failed modules up to the maximum credit value set out in paragraph 6.23 above, at the earliest opportunity. If, after reassessment, a student has more than 30 credits of failed modules, or any module mark of &lt; 40%, Grade ‘F’, s/he will not be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
allowed to continue work on the dissertation or research project and shall be considered at the next meeting of the Board of Examiners.

| 46 – 60 credits | A student will not proceed to, or continue with, the dissertation or research project but is entitled to re-sit failed modules, up to the maximum credit value set out in paragraph 6.23 above at the earliest opportunity. If, after reassessment, a student has 30 credits or fewer of failed modules, and no module mark < 40%, s/he will be allowed to progress to, or continue with, the dissertation research project. If, after reassessment, a student has more than 30 credits of failed modules, or any module mark of < 40%, Grade ‘F’, s/he will not be allowed to continue work on the dissertation or research project and shall be considered at the next meeting of the Board of Examiners. |
| More than 60 credits | A student will not proceed to, or continue with, the dissertation or research project, but is entitled to re-sit failed modules up to the maximum credit value set out in paragraph 6.23 above in order to meet the requirements for intermediate award, where the relevant programme specification makes provision for such an award. Where there is no provision for an intermediate award, or where the number of credits failed is such that the student cannot redeem a sufficient number to meet the requirements for an intermediate award, a board of examiners shall terminate his/her course for academic failure. |

6.29 In making progression decisions for students on MRes programmes, a Board of Examiners shall adopt the progression requirements set out in paragraph 6.28 above, but shall not permit a student to progress to, or continue with, a dissertation or research project unless it would be possible for the student to meet the requirements for award following successful reassessment.

**Criteria for and classification of awards**

6.30 A Postgraduate Certificate, a Postgraduate Diploma and a Masters degree may be awarded with pass, merit, or distinction. In all cases classification is determined either on the basis of an overall credit weighted average or preponderance of credits, whichever leads to the better result for a student. The following descriptors apply:

| Pass | To be awarded a pass a student will have demonstrated achievement of the specified learning outcomes of the programme to a satisfactory standard, demonstrating a critical and substantial understanding of the topic. They will have demonstrated the ability to develop an independent, systematic and logical or insightful argument or evaluation. They will also have demonstrated a significant degree of competence in the appropriate use of the relevant literature, theory, methodologies, practices, and tools and shown evidence of clarity, focus and cogency in communication. |
| Merit | To be awarded a merit a student will have demonstrated achievement of the specified learning outcomes of the programme to a very good standard, demonstrating a well-developed, critical and comprehensive understanding of the topic. They will have demonstrated the ability to develop an independent, systematic and logical or insightful argument or evaluation. They will also have demonstrated a high degree of competence in the appropriate use of the relevant literature, theory, methodologies, practices, and tools, and shown a high level of clarity, focus and cogency in communication. |
| Distinction | To be awarded a distinction a student will have demonstrated achievement of the specified learning outcomes of the programme to an excellent standard, demonstrating a |
sophisticated, critical and thorough understanding of the topic. They will have demonstrated evidence of originality of thought and the ability to develop an independent, highly systematic and logical or insightful argument or evaluation. They will also have demonstrated excellence in the appropriate use of the relevant literature, theory, methodologies, practices, and tools, and shown excellent clarity, focus and cogency in communication.

6.31 For a Postgraduate Certificate, a student must have attempted every assessment component for each of the taught modules, unless mitigating circumstances have been accepted, and have achieved the following thresholds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Taught modules</th>
<th>Failed credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate</td>
<td>A credit-weighted average mark of at least 50%, or at least 45 credits at 50%, grade ‘C’, or above</td>
<td>No more than 15 credits with a mark of less than 50%, grade ‘D’, and no module mark &lt; 40%, grade ‘F’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate with Merit</td>
<td>A credit-weighted average mark of at least 60%, or at least 45 credits at 60%, grade ‘B’ or above</td>
<td>No credits with a mark of less than 50%, grade ‘D’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate with Distinction</td>
<td>A credit-weighted average mark of at least 70%, or at least 45 credits at 70%, grade ‘A’ or above</td>
<td>No credits with a mark of less than 50%, grade ‘D’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.32 Where a Postgraduate Certificate is to be awarded as an intermediate award and a student has attempted taught modules to a value greater than 60 credits, the thresholds set out in 6.31 above shall be applied to the 60 credits identified to meet the criteria for the award of a Postgraduate Certificate.

6.33 For a Postgraduate Diploma, a student must have attempted every assessment component for each of the modules of the taught modules, unless mitigating circumstances have been accepted, and have achieved the following thresholds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Taught Modules</th>
<th>Failed credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma</td>
<td>A credit-weighted average mark of at least 50%, or at least 90 credits at 50%, grade ‘C’, or above</td>
<td>No more than 30 credits with a mark of less than 50%, grade ‘D’, and no module mark &lt; 40%, grade ‘F’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma with Merit</td>
<td>A credit-weighted average mark of at least 60%, or at least 90 credits at 60%, grade ‘B’ or above</td>
<td>No more than 15 credits with a mark of less than 50%, grade ‘D’ and no mark &lt; 40%, grade ‘F’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma with Distinction</td>
<td>A credit-weighted average mark of at least 70%, or at least 90 credits at 70%, grade ‘A’ or above</td>
<td>No credits with a mark of less than 50%, grades ‘D’ or ‘F’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.34 Where a Postgraduate Diploma is to be awarded as an intermediate award and a student has attempted taught modules to a value greater than 120 credits, the thresholds set out in 6.32 above shall be applied to the 120 credits identified to meet the criteria for the award of a Postgraduate Diploma.

6.35 For a Masters programme with a structure of 150 credits of taught modules and a dissertation/research project of 30 credits, a student must have attempted every assessment component for each of the taught modules, unless mitigating circumstances have been accepted, and have achieved the following thresholds:
### Regulations governing taught postgraduate programmes of study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Failed credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degree</td>
<td>A dissertation/project mark of at least 50% (grade C) <strong>and</strong></td>
<td>No more than 30 credits with a mark of less than 50%, grade ‘D’, and no module mark &lt; 40%, grade ‘F’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Either:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) an overall credit-weighted average mark of at least 50% <strong>or</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) at least 120 credits at 50% or above from the taught modules, (grade C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degree with Merit</td>
<td>A dissertation/project mark of at least 60% (grade B) <strong>and</strong></td>
<td>No more than 15 credits with a mark of less than 50%, grade ‘D’ and no mark &lt; 40%, grade ‘F’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Either:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) an overall credit-weighted average mark of at least 60% <strong>or</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) at least 75 credits at 60% or above from the taught modules, (grade B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degree with Distinction</td>
<td>A dissertation/project mark of at least 70% (grade A) <strong>and</strong></td>
<td>No credits with a mark of less than 50%, grades ‘D’ or ‘F’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Either:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) an overall credit-weighted average mark of at least 70% <strong>or</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) at least 75 credits at 70% or above from the taught modules, (grade A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.36 For a Masters programme with a structure of 120 credits of taught modules and a dissertation/research project of 60 credits, a student must have attempted every assessment component for each of the taught modules, unless mitigating circumstances have been accepted, and have achieved the following thresholds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Failed credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degree</td>
<td>A dissertation/project mark of at least 50% (grade C) <strong>and</strong></td>
<td>No more than 30 credits with a mark of less than 50%, grade ‘D’, and no module mark &lt; 40%, grade ‘F’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Either:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) an overall credit-weighted average mark of at least 50% <strong>or</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) at least 90 credits at 50% or above from the taught modules, (grade C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Masters Degree with Merit

A dissertation/project mark of at least 60% (grade B) and

Either:

- a) an overall credit-weighted average mark of at least 60% or
- b) at least 60 credits at 60% or above from the taught modules, (grade B)

No more than 15 credits with a mark of less than 50%, grade ‘D’ and no mark < 40%, grade ‘F’

### Masters Degree with Distinction

A dissertation/project mark of at least 70% (grade A) and

Either:

- a) an overall credit-weighted average mark of at least 70% or
- b) at least 60 credits at 70% or above from the taught modules, (grade A)

No credits with a mark of less than 50%, grades ‘D’ or ‘F’

---

### 6.37

For a Masters programme with a structure of 90 credits of taught modules and a dissertation/research project of 90 credits, a student must have attempted every assessment component for each of the taught modules, unless mitigating circumstances have been accepted, and have achieved the following thresholds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Failed credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degree</td>
<td>A dissertation/project mark of at least 50% (grade C) and</td>
<td>No more than 30 credits with a mark of less than 50%, grade ‘D’, and no module mark &lt; 40%, grade ‘F’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Either:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) an overall credit-weighted average mark of at least 50% or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) at least 60 credits at 50% or above from the taught modules, (grade C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degree with Merit</td>
<td>A dissertation/project mark of at least 60% (grade B) and</td>
<td>No more than 15 credits with a mark of less than 50%, grade ‘D’ and no mark &lt; 40%, grade ‘F’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Either:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) an overall credit-weighted average mark of at least 60% or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) at least 45 credits at 60% or above from the taught modules, (grade B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Masters Degree with Distinction  | A dissertation/project mark of at least 70% (grade A) and Either:  
| | a) an overall credit-weighted average mark of at least 70% or 
| | b) at least 45 credits at 70% or above from the taught modules, (grade A) | No credits with a mark of less than 50%, grades ‘D’ or ‘F’

6.38 For a Masters programme with a structure of 60 credits of taught modules and a dissertation/research project of 120 credits, a student must have attempted every assessment component for each of the taught modules, unless mitigating circumstances have been accepted, and have achieved the following thresholds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Failed credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Masters Degree | A dissertation/project mark of at least 50% (grade C) and Either:  
| | a) an overall credit-weighted average mark of at least 50% or 
| | b) at least 30 credits at 50% or above from the taught modules, (grade C) | No more than 30 credits with a mark of less than 50%, grade ‘D’, and no module mark < 40%, grade ‘F’

| Masters Degree with Merit | A dissertation/project mark of at least 60% (grade B) and Either:  
| | a) an overall credit-weighted average mark of at least 60% or 
| | b) at least 30 credits at 60% or above from the taught modules, (grade B) | No more than 15 credits with a mark of less than 50%, grade ‘D’ and no mark < 40%, grade ‘F’

| Masters Degree with Distinction | A dissertation/project mark of at least 70% (grade A) and Either:  
| | a) an overall credit-weighted average mark of at least 70% or 
| | b) at least 30 credits at 70% or above from the taught modules, (grade A) | No credits with a mark of less than 50%, grades ‘D’ or ‘F’
For an MRes programme, a student must have attempted every assessment component for each of the taught modules, unless mitigating circumstances have been accepted, and have achieved the following thresholds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Taught modules</th>
<th>Dissertation/research project</th>
<th>Failure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master of Research degree</td>
<td>A mark of 50% or a grade of 'C' in all modules</td>
<td>A mark of 50% or a grade 'C' or above</td>
<td>No credits with a mark of less than 50% grade 'D' or 'F'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Research degree with merit</td>
<td>A mark of 50% or a grade of 'C' in all modules</td>
<td>A mark of 60% or a grade 'B' or above</td>
<td>No credits with a mark of less than 50%, grade 'D' or 'F'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Research degree with distinction</td>
<td>A mark of 50% or a grade of 'C' in all modules</td>
<td>A mark of 70% or a grade 'A' or above</td>
<td>No credits with a mark of less than 50%, grade 'D' or 'F'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Aegrotat Awards**

An aegrotat award may be considered in certain circumstances where a student is prevented through illness or other sufficient cause from completing the final assessment for the taught component of the award. Exemption may not be granted from completing the dissertation or research project.
Senate Regulation 7: Regulations governing the assessment of taught programmes

7.1 These regulations apply to all taught programmes.

Internal examining

7.2 For each programme of study there will be a Head of School/Department responsible for the secure operation of assessment procedures and practices.

7.3 The internal examiners of the University are the members of the academic staff of the University. Other individuals may be approved for this purpose in relation to programmes delivered with collaborative partners on the authority of Senate under Ordinance 29.

7.4 Internal markers may include associate tutors, honorary lecturers, and postgraduate research students.

7.5 Marking shall be undertaken in accordance with agreed written criteria. All marking schemes and processes, regardless of format, should secure reliability and transparency through the use of assessment criteria, rubrics or marking grids to which all markers and students have access.

7.6 Outcomes for students shall be measured against the written criteria and not adjusted against a statistical distribution.

7.7 All summative assessment shall be subject to the same regulatory principles and procedures.

7.8 Student anonymity shall be preserved during the marking of all formal examinations. Summative coursework will be marked anonymously unless in the view of the department there are sound educational reasons for not doing so, for example to provide developmental feedback, or the type of assessment makes anonymous marking impractical. The marking processes for programmes of study will be reviewed through the annual and periodic review processes.

7.9 Boards of Examiners will have responsibility for the appropriateness of marking practices for the modules for which they carry responsibility and shall put in place explicit arrangements for the internal reconciliation of differences between internal markers against the written criteria.

7.10 All summative work which contributes towards the calculation of a student’s degree classification shall be subject to a system of moderation by an internal examiner in one of the formats set out under (b) to (e) below. The University has adopted these definitions of marking practices:

(a) **Single marking**: Work is marked by a single marker. This practice may only be adopted for work which does not contribute to a student’s overall degree classification.

(b) **Double marking**: two markers work to the same mark scheme. They may either (a) mark blind in parallel, or (b) the second marker reviews the reliability of the first marker’s comments and gradings (rather than directly evaluating the students’ work). An agreed mark must be reached for each piece of assessment. Double marking increases marking and feedback turnaround times, and should therefore only be used where close scrutiny of individual work is required; sampling or moderation should normally be sufficient. If there is an unresolved disagreement between the two markers, then another individual marker should be involved.

(c) **Sampling**: work is marked by the first marker and a sample of work is seen by a second marker who blind marks (samples can be a random selection, a stratified random sample from different grade boundaries, borderline cases between grade boundaries, or other samples as appropriate). If there is an unresolved disagreement between the two markers, then another individual marker should be involved.

(d) **Moderation**: work is marked by a first marker. A second marker receives a full set of marks of the work and a sample of work (samples selected as described above in sampling) against which to test the robustness of the marking. They do not directly evaluate the students’ work.
(e) **Blind marking:** work is provided to second markers or moderators as original copies without any grades or comments from the first marker.

(f) **Peer marking:** where summatively assessed, students who mark other students' work within a cohort should follow the same guidelines for first markers as described above. Second marking, sampling or moderation by internal examiners should be applied to ensure fairness and reliability.

(g) **Automated marking:** Work is marked automatically by electronic or other means (either through Blackboard or through some other approved system).

7.11 As part of its responsibility for ensuring the appropriateness of marking for modules for which it is responsible, a Board of Examiners shall take particular care to ensure that marking practices produce reliable outcomes in modules, such as a project or dissertation, where marking is divided between multiple markers.

7.12 Any first marking not undertaken by an internal examiner, such as first marking undertaken by an associate tutor, shall be subject to a system of moderation by an internal examiner.

7.13 Postgraduate research students, including Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTA) and Graduate Research Assistants (GRA) may assist with teaching and assessment on programmes with the following restrictions:

(a) they may not serve as members of Panels or Boards of Examiners;

(b) they may not act as sole markers of any piece of work which contributes to a final degree classification;

(c) responsibility for valid assessment outcomes rests entirely with the internal examiners.

7.14 Evidence must exist (and be retained for review purposes) which demonstrates that scrutiny of marking standards has taken place.

7.15 The full range of the marking scale and all marks on the scale may be used.

7.16 The marks of modules and their component assessments, as approved in the module specification, will be expressed to two decimal places, according to the rounding conventions of the University’s central student record system. Credit Weighted Average (CWA) marks calculated from these marks will be published as integers, according to the rounding conventions of the University’s central student record system, and progression and award classification decisions will be based on these published marks.

7.17 The University’s Policy for the return of assessed work sets out the requirements for providing feedback to students.

**External examining**

7.18 External examiners are appointed to provide impartial and independent advice and informed comment on the University’s standards and student achievement in relation to those standards.

7.19 There shall be at least one external examiner for each award-bearing programme, including for the award of credit. This shall include awards made with or through a partner institution. An external examiner may be appointed for several related programmes.

7.20 The number of external examiners for any particular programme shall be sufficient to cover the full range and complexity of the syllabus and the size of the student cohort.

7.21 For awards resulting from study both on campus and by distance learning, the external examining arrangements should be such to ensure that the Board of Examiners is able to make judgements about the comparability of standards across both cohorts.
Criteria for appointment

7.22 The University will apply the national criteria for the appointment of external examiners as set out in the relevant section of the QAA Quality Code; these are reproduced below in regulations 7.23-7.28.

7.23 Nominations for external examiners will demonstrate appropriate evidence of the following:

(a) knowledge and understanding of UK sector agreed reference points for the maintenance of academic standards and assurance and enhancement of quality;

(b) competence and experience in the fields covered by the programme of study, or parts thereof;

(c) relevant academic and/or professional qualifications to at least the level of the qualification being externally examined, and/or extensive practitioner experience where appropriate;

(d) competence and experience relating to designing and operating a variety of assessment tasks appropriate to the subject and operating assessment procedures;

(e) sufficient standing, credibility and breadth of experience within the discipline to be able to command the respect of academic peers and, where appropriate, professional peers;

(f) familiarity with the standard to be expected of students to achieve the award that is to be assessed;

(g) fluency in English, and where programmes are delivered and assessed in languages other than English, fluency in the relevant language(s) (unless other secure arrangements are in place to ensure that external examiners are provided with the information to make their judgements);

(h) meeting applicable criteria set by professional, statutory or regulatory bodies;

(i) awareness of current developments in the design and delivery of relevant curricula;

(j) competence and experience relating to the enhancement of the student learning experience.

7.24 Individuals in the following categories or circumstances will not be appointed as external examiners:

(a) a member of the University’s Council or of the governing body of a partner institution, or a current employee of the University or one of its collaborative partners;

(b) anyone with a close professional, contractual or personal relationship with a member of staff or student involved with the programme of study;

(c) anyone required to assess colleagues who are recruited as students to the programme of study;

(d) anyone who is, or knows they will be, in a position to influence significantly the future of students on the programme of study;

(e) anyone significantly involved in recent or current substantive collaborative research activities with a member of staff closely involved in the delivery, management or assessment of the programme(s) or modules in question;

(f) former staff or students of the institution unless a period of five years has elapsed and all students taught by or with the external examiner have completed their programme(s);

(g) a reciprocal arrangement involving cognate programmes at another institution;

(h) the succession of an external examiner by a colleague from the examiner’s home department and institution;

(i) the appointment of more than one external examiner from the same department of the same institution.
The duration of an external examiner's appointment will normally be for four years, with an exceptional extension of one year to ensure continuity.

An external examiner may be reappointed in exceptional circumstances but only after a period of five years or more has elapsed since the end of their last appointment.

External examiners normally hold no more than two external examiner appointments for taught programmes/modules at any point in time.

Retired staff can be considered if they provide sufficient evidence of continuing involvement in the academic area in question, and with current developments in higher education teaching, learning and assessment.

Appointment and briefing

External examiners shall be appointed by Senate following nomination by the Head of School/Department and a process of detailed scrutiny.

Each external examiner shall receive a letter of appointment setting out the period of appointment and the specific programmes/modules/awards for which s/he is responsible.

Briefing material in the following areas will be provided:

(a) relevant institutional and programme regulations;
(b) the University’s external examining and assessment regulations;
(c) school/department information such as student programme handbooks, examination papers, marking and classification criteria;
(d) a copy of the previous year’s external examiner’s report and the departmental response.

Additional briefing material will be provided to external examiners when changes to the University’s regulations are approved by Senate.

The division of labour between departments and the Quality Office in providing briefing material to external examiners shall be clearly set out.

An external examiner may resign at any time but is required to give three months’ notice in writing to the Quality Office.

An external examiner may be removed from office should s/he fail to meet the requirements of the role.

The name, position and institution of external examiners shall be provided in programme information to students. Students are not permitted to initiate direct contact with External Examiners.

Role and responsibilities

The University expects its external examiners to provide informative comment and recommendations upon whether or not:

(a) the University is maintaining the threshold academic standards for its awards in accordance with the framework for higher education qualifications and relevant subject benchmark statements;
(b) the assessment process measures student achievement rigorously and fairly against intended outcomes of the programme(s) and is conducted in line with the University’s policies and regulations;
(c) the academic standards and the achievement of students are comparable with those in other higher education institutions of which the external examiners have experience.

7.38 An external examiner will also be asked to identify areas of good practice or opportunities to enhance the quality of the learning opportunities provided to students.

7.39 An external examiner will report on standards at both the module and award level.

7.40 The role of an external examiner is set out in paragraphs 7.37 and 7.38 above. They are, however, not involved in the assessment or examination of the work of individual students and are not therefore the final arbiter for the award of marks/grades either within a module or for the final award.

7.41 External examiners are invited to comment on the standard of marking against the written criteria but may not seek, or be invited, to raise or lower the marks assigned to individual students. They may, however, ask for marks to be revisited by the internal markers against the written criteria across a full cohort if they consider that there is sufficient evidence to support under- or over-marking, or if they have concerns about the robustness of marking.

7.42 External examiners shall be provided with sufficient evidence of intended assessment patterns and instruments to agree the appropriateness of the assessment strategy for the module.

7.43 External examiners shall consider samples of students’ assessed work, together with the marks agreed by the internal markers.

7.44 An external examiner shall receive sufficient material to form a view as to whether the internal marking has properly assessed student performance against appropriate standards. Samples of work made available to the external examiner for a module should be sufficient to provide confidence in the standard of marking and the achievement of students, and should normally be 10% of the pieces of assessment and provide samples across the range of student achievement.

7.45 External examiners should be consulted about access to non-written assessment and attendance at any live assessment events.

7.46 An external examiner may be required to access student performance during assessed school experience, clinical or other work-placement, irrespective of location.

7.47 An external examiner shall be an equal member of a Board of Examiners and shall participate in the transaction of the Board’s business.

7.48 An external examiner shall endorse, or not, the decisions of the Board of Examiners to indicate that s/he is satisfied with the conduct of the assessment process, rather than to signal agreement with every individual assessment decision.

Reporting and payment

7.49 Each external examiner shall provide an annual formal written report to the Quality Office at the end of each assessment cycle.

7.50 The format and content of external examiners’ reports shall be determined by the University to ensure that reports are consistent with the core responsibilities of the external examiner.

7.51 Reports shall:

(a) confirm whether the University is maintaining the threshold academic standards for its awards in accordance with the framework for higher education qualifications and relevant subject benchmark statements;

(b) confirm whether the assessment process measures student achievement rigorously and fairly against intended outcomes of the programme(s) and is conducted in line with the University’s policies and regulations;
confirm whether the academic standards and the achievement of students are comparable with those in other higher education institutions of which the external examiners have experience;

confirm whether sufficient evidence was received to enable the role to be fulfilled;

state whether issues raised in previous reports have been appropriately addressed;

address any issues specifically required by any relevant professional body;

provide an overview at the end of the term of office.

7.52 External examiners’ reports shall be made available in full to students, with the sole exception of any confidential report made directly to the Vice-Chancellor.

7.53 A school/department shall provide a detailed written response to each external examiner’s report and make full use of the reports during annual monitoring activities.

7.54 Senate will receive from the Academic Policy Committee an annual digest of the comments made by external examiners for all taught programmes and will identify any areas for further action.

7.55 The University has the right to reject the view of an external examiner, but should only do so after careful consideration of the issues raised.

7.56 An external examiner has the right to raise matters of serious concern with the Vice-Chancellor in a confidential report.

7.57 Where an external examiner has a serious concern relating to the academic standards of a programme and has exhausted all published applicable internal procedures, including the submission of a confidential report to the Vice-Chancellor, s/he may invoke the Quality Assurance Agency’s (QAA) Concerns Scheme.

7.58 Senate shall periodically agree a schedule of fees for external examiner responsibilities and this shall be applicable to all external examiners.

7.59 The annual fee will be paid on receipt of the written report from an external examiner.

7.60 The University shall reimburse the expenses incurred by an external examiner during the course of their duties.

PANELS AND BOARDS OF EXAMINERS

7.61 There shall be a standard formal agenda for meetings of Panels and Boards of Examiners. The business of Panels and Boards remains confidential to the membership.

7.62 Panels and Boards shall make decisions on the basis of evidence of student achievement.

7.63 Each Panel and each Board will normally be provided with a standard data set drawn from the SITS record. The data will include the outcomes of each module being considered by the Panel; and the profile of each student for whom a progression or award decision is to be made by the Board.

7.64 A Panel or a Board may defer a decision in relation to an individual student if insufficient information about the performance of the student is available. The Panel or Board may authorise the Chair to make a decision on its behalf, as soon as practically possible, once the relevant information becomes available. For Boards, this will include making recommendations for intermediate awards, where appropriate.

Panels of Examiners: Function

7.65 The function of a Panel of Examiners is to:
(a) consider patterns of achievement for individual modules, and confirm that appropriate marking processes have taken place in line with the definitions given in para 7.10 above;
(b) approve the award of re-assessment opportunities;
(c) approve module outcomes for report to one or more Board of Examiners;
(d) agree the release of provisional module outcomes to students, with the exception of midsummer marks on campus-based programmes, which shall only be released following the meeting of the Board of Examiners.

7.66 Panels of Examiners are directly responsible to the Boards of Examiners to which they contribute marks for the conduct of their business.

7.67 Module and component marks presented to a Panel of Examiners will have been carefully considered by the markers who will have made informed academic judgments such that the overall module outcomes fairly reflect the levels of attainment of the students. This should be done by carefully assessing the students’ work against written criteria.

7.68 Scaling, or norm referencing, of module outcomes may take place only in exceptional circumstances or where this has previously been agreed by a Programme Approval Panel for the purposes of professional accreditation. Scaling should not be used, for example to adjust for variations in student achievement across modules or academic years. Any scaling shall be justified to the Panel of the Examiners and subsequently to the Board of Examiners.

Panels of Examiners: Composition

7.69 The Chair of a Panel of Examiners shall be appointed by the Head of School/Department.

7.70 The composition of a Panel of Examiners shall consist of the module convenor, or exceptionally a named deputy, for each of the modules included in the remit of the Panel.

7.71 The minimum requirement for attendance at the Panel of Examiners shall be the Chair and the convenor, or exceptionally a named deputy, for each of the modules under consideration. The Chair of the Panel is responsible for ensuring that each module is appropriately represented at the meeting.

Panels of Examiners: Schedule of meetings

7.72 A Panel of Examiners shall be convened for one or more modules. The frequency of Panel of Examiners’ meetings will depend on the nature of the provision under consideration, but will be at least twice during the year in order to fit with the patterns of meetings of Boards of Examiners.

7.73 For campus-based modules the Panel will meet at the end of each semester block of teaching and assessment. For distance learning modules and, where appropriate, some taught postgraduate provision, the timing of the Panel meetings will take into account the patterns of teaching across the programme. Where programmes operate linear progression criteria the number of required meetings of a Panel of Examiners may be reduced by authorising the Chair of the Panel to undertake the function of the Panel to approve the award of re-assessment opportunities, on the recommendation of the programme leader.

7.74 A separate Panel of Examiners shall not be convened in the September re-assessment period unless, in the judgement of the Chair of the Board of Examiners, there is a significant number of re-assessment outcomes under consideration, for which a separate analysis of patterns of student achievement could be usefully undertaken. Where a Panel is not held, the consideration of marking and moderation practice shall be undertaken by the Board of Examiners.

7.75 Once module marks have been confirmed by a Panel of Examiners they may not be adjusted for individual students.
Boards of Examiners: Function

7.76 A Board of Examiners shall be convened for each programme, or set of programmes, to consider the performance of students which contributes to an award of the University, including the award of credit.

7.77 Boards of Examiners are directly responsible to Senate for the conduct of their business.

7.78 The function of a Board of Examiners is to:

(a) confirm the module outcomes received from one or more Panels of Examiners;
(b) consider the academic performance of individual students as it relates to progression or award decisions;
(c) agree progression from one stage of a programme to another;
(d) agree awards and their classification.

7.79 All members of the Board are equal; no particular weight shall be given to the views of the external examiner(s). An external examiner has no veto in relation to decisions in relation to individual students. If a vote in any particular case is necessary, the Chair shall have the casting vote.

7.80 Boards of Examiners shall not adjust marks.

7.81 A Board of Examiners shall convene a Mitigating Circumstances Panel which will be responsible for the consideration of mitigating circumstances for individual students (see para 7.98 onwards).

7.82 The Board may determine the winners of departmental prizes, and nominate students for consideration for the award of College or University prizes.

Boards of Examiners: Composition

7.83 A Board of Examiners shall consist of the following members:

(a) the Chair, which shall be a senior member of the academic staff of the department, appointed by the Head of School/Department, who is on the University’s Register of Approved Chairs having completed University Examination Board chair training within the last three years;
(b) normally two members of each Panel of Examiners contributing module outcomes to the Board, one of whom shall normally be the Chair of the Panel;
(c) the Programme Leader or Chair of the Board of Study or equivalent for each programme to be considered by the Board;
(d) for boards where awards are being made, external examiners for each of the subjects or groups of subjects included in the remit of the Board;
(e) such other members of the academic staff nominated by the Head of School/Department, as are necessary to make informed progression and award decisions.

The following shall also be in attendance at a meeting of the Board of Examiners:

(f) A representative of the Academic Registrar, normally a senior member of the administrative staff of the University, shall attend each meeting of a Board of Examiners where awards to students are under consideration to ensure that the proceedings of the Board are carried out in accordance with the regulations. The business of the Board may not be transacted in the absence of the Academic Registrar’s Representative (ARR);
(g) a Secretary to the Board, provided by the department, who shall take notes which shall include an account of any discussion in relation to difficult cases.
7.84 The minimum requirement for attendance at Board of Examiners shall be 75% of the members named under (a), (b), (c) and (d) above and must include the Chair. Where a board is meeting to consider progression only external examiners described under (d) are excluded from this requirement.

7.85 The members of a Board of Examiners shall be agreed annually.

7.86 The University expects that all relevant External Examiners for the programmes under consideration shall be present at a meeting of a Board of Examiners, either in person or via a means of electronic conferencing (e.g. Skype), where awards are being made to students. On occasions when the Board of Examiners is expecting to consider progression decisions only, external examiners are not required to attend.

7.87 Exceptionally, when unable to attend a meeting of the Board of Examiners, an individual external examiner shall be required to submit written comments on the outcomes of modules, and the performance of candidates so that these views may be taken into account during the meeting.

**Boards of Examiners: Schedule of meetings**

7.88 A Board of Examiners shall normally meet at the end of each level of the programme. For undergraduate campus-based students this will be at the end of the academic year in June and again following the re-assessment period in September; for taught postgraduate students this will be at the end of the taught component and again at the end of the programme; for distance learning programmes, this will be twice a year, in June and November, to ensure that students are able to attend graduation ceremonies.

7.89 All recommendations for an award shall be recorded by the Secretary to the Board; this shall constitute the definitive record against which results are entered into the SITS student record and notified to students, and shall be held by the Registry, according to the University’s retention schedule.

7.90 The Secretary to the Board shall ensure that the lists of recommended awards are signed by the Chair and those external examiners present at the meeting.

**Late submission of coursework**

7.91 Students are expected to submit work by published deadlines, with the exception of where there is accepted evidence of mitigating circumstances.

7.92 Where a student experiences a sudden illness or other serious and unforeseen event or set of circumstances which causes them to miss a deadline for assessed work they should report this to their department using the Mitigating Circumstances Form. Where the effect of the mitigating circumstances is such that it is unclear when the student might be able to submit the course work s/he should be advised to submit the work as soon as possible and that the regulations concerning mitigating circumstances as set out from paragraph 7.97 below will be applied to ensure that there is no penalty for the late submission.

7.93 Mitigating Circumstances Panels are allowed to set a revised submission date where it is possible to do so on the basis of the evidence provided. Where there are exceptional and urgent circumstances the Chair of the Mitigating Circumstances Panel is authorised to set this revised submission date. This will be reported to the Mitigating Circumstances Panel at its next meeting. If a student fails to submit by the revised date then penalties for late submission shall be applied in line with para 7.95, unless further accepted mitigation has been submitted.

7.94 Departments should consider late submissions of coursework on an ongoing basis so that where mitigation is submitted after the deadline students can receive prompt decisions as to whether their mitigating circumstances have merited no penalty for the late submission. Similarly, if mitigating circumstances cause an assessment to be missed entirely, students should receive prompt decisions as to whether the non-participation in that assessment can be excused or an alternative assessment provided.
In cases where there are no accepted mitigating circumstances, late submission of coursework shall lead automatically to the imposition of a penalty. Penalties shall be applied as soon as the deadline is reached. The University’s penalty scheme is as follows:

(a) a deduction of 10% of the maximum mark available from the actual mark achieved by the student shall be imposed upon expiry of the deadline;

(b) a further deduction of 5% of the maximum mark available from the actual mark achieved by the student shall then be imposed on each of the next subsequent working days;

(c) The subsequent 24 hour periods described under (b) above shall apply from the expiry of the initial deadline. For example, where a deadline is 14:00 on Wednesday, a 10% penalty shall be deducted at 14:01 on Wednesday, and a subsequent 5% shall be deducted at 14:01 on Thursday;

(d) Under (a) and (b) above penalties shall be applied until the pass mark for the assessment has been reached (40% for undergraduate work and 50% for postgraduate work), after which point no further penalties shall be applied unless the work is deemed to be a non-submission (see (e) and (f) below);

(e) for undergraduate programmes: any piece of work submitted 11 or more working days after the expiry of the deadline will not be marked but will be assigned a mark of zero and deemed to be a non submission;

(f) for postgraduate programmes: any piece of work submitted 9 or more working days after the expiry of the deadline will not be marked but will be assigned a mark of zero and deemed to be a non submission;

(g) ‘available marks’ in this context means the maximum marks available for the piece of work (for example, 100 would be the available mark in a percentage marking scheme);

(h) ‘working day’ in this context means a period of twenty four hours or part thereof from Monday to Friday inclusive, excluding public holidays and University closure days.

Where required for practical reasons the range and timing of penalties for the non-completion of certain forms of assessment such as presentations may be determined by departments in the light of local circumstances, but should be applied according to agreed procedures. In cases where the turnaround time for marking is less than ten days, departments are also authorised to introduce appropriate variations to the scheme set out above.

Mitigating circumstances

The University recognises that students may suffer from a sudden illness or other serious and unforeseen event or set of circumstances which adversely affects their ability to complete an assessment or the results they obtain for an assessment. In such cases the mitigating circumstances regulations and procedures may be applied. These regulations are designed to ensure the fair and consistent treatment of all students.

The University defines mitigating circumstances as follows. A mitigating circumstance is a serious or significant event which is unforeseen and/or unpreventable and could have significantly impaired the academic performance of a student in one or more assessed activities, possibly over a period of time. Mitigating circumstances may include medical matters or events directly affecting someone other than the student.

Departments must ensure that the University’s regulations on mitigating circumstances procedures are published in course handbooks along with relevant deadlines for the submission of documentary evidence in advance of Boards of Examiners. The deadline will be normally not later than five working days after the assessment deadline to which it relates.
The University requires that students keep their department(s) informed at all times of any personal circumstances that may impact upon their ability to study or undertake assessments. Students are responsible for ensuring that their department(s) are notified of any mitigating circumstances at the time they occur and for supplying supporting documentation as soon as possible, and no later than any published deadline.

If students are unable to attend an examination or other assessment event because of mitigating circumstances they must inform their department through completion of a mitigating circumstances form, including evidence, within five working days or by the published deadline, whichever is sooner. If a student is initially unable to provide evidence they are required to submit the mitigating circumstances form within the abovementioned time period. The Department will then set a deadline for receipt of the required evidence.

Where a programme utilises multiple small scale assessments such as laboratories or regular class tests, departments may allow students to self-certify for absence or non-submission of such assessments on a limited basis, before application of the process outlined under para 7.101. Multiple absences or non-submission on the basis of mitigating circumstances will however be considered under the processes outlined above and require the submission of evidence.

Evidence submitted in support of a claim for mitigating circumstances should be in English. Where the original is in another language students are responsible for ensuring that it is submitted with a verified translation. Medical evidence submitted in support of a claim for mitigating circumstances should be provided by a qualified medical practitioner.

The University reserves the right to verify the authenticity of any evidence submitted.

Boards of Examiners will establish a Mitigating Circumstances Panel to consider submissions. Membership of Panels will be determined by Heads of Department and will be drawn from the internal examiners. Up to five members of the internal examining staff may be members of the Mitigating Circumstances Panel, from which three members shall be required to be present for a Panel meeting to take place. Panel meetings may take place virtually or by correspondence where there is a need for swift decision making. The membership will normally include the Chair of the Panel of Examiners and the person responsible for processing mitigating circumstances claims.

Mitigating circumstances panels will meet throughout the academic year. The frequency of meetings shall be determined according to the provision within each individual department, with a view to ensuring that students will receive the outcome of their mitigating circumstances submission in a timely fashion. Mitigating Circumstances Panels will consider cases on the basis of documentary evidence and will operate under delegated powers from the Board of Examiners.

Mitigating circumstances panels will be responsible for determining whether sufficient grounds have been established and for making recommendations to Panels of Examiners on whether mitigation should be applied to the outcomes of specific pieces of students’ assessment. Mitigating Circumstances Panels will do so without evidence of the student’s performance at module level.

Departments shall keep a formal record of the discussions and recommendations of Mitigating Circumstances Panels.

Panels of Examiners will accept the recommendations of Mitigating Circumstances Panels but will not be expected to receive evidence. Panels of Examiners will determine the outcome of a module for an individual student in the light of the Mitigating Circumstances Panel’s recommendation.

Where mitigating circumstances are accepted by a Mitigating Circumstances Panel, it shall not make a judgement about the extent to which accepted mitigating circumstances have affected a student’s
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performance; marks will not be adjusted and there will be no tariff. Mitigating Circumstances Panels make one of the following recommendations to the Panel of Examiners for each individual assessment:

(a) In the event an assessment has not been undertaken or has been failed, provide a student with the opportunity to take the affected assessment(s) as if the first time i.e. a ‘sit’ or ‘submit’, allowing them to be given the full marks achieved for the examination or assessment, rather than imposing a cap;

(b) waive late submission penalties;

(c) in the event an assessment is outstanding or failed, determine that there is sufficient evidence of the achievement of the intended learning outcomes from other pieces of assessment in the module(s) for an overall mark to be derived;

(d) note the accepted mitigation for the module(s) and recommend that the Board of Examiners takes this into account when considering borderline or near borderline cases at the point of award and classification.

Where it is not possible to replicate the original assessment, exercise discretion and flexibility to make the reassessment different from the original assessment type whilst ensuring that all intended learning outcomes of the module are still achieved.

Disability and long-term conditions

The University will make reasonable adjustments to assessment arrangements for students who have notified it of long-term medical conditions or disability. Where there is a marked deterioration in a pre-existing condition that a student believes has or will have an impact on a piece of assessment, this should be notified using the mitigating circumstances procedures set out above.

Students with long-term medical conditions, specific learning difficulties and disabilities should seek support from the AccessAbility Centre to ensure that any reasonable adjustments may be made to assessment arrangements, which may include agreement of a personalised work schedule. Recommendations for adjustments will be informed by a report from an external assessor, such as an Educational Psychologist.

Any such reasonable adjustments will be subject to the overall requirement that academic standards must be maintained.

For time-constrained summative assessment one or more of the following examples of adjustments may be appropriate:

(a) additional time, usually an additional 15 minutes per hour;

(b) breaks during the examination;

(c) provision of an amanuensis;

(d) provision of word processing facilities;

(e) provision of Braille papers;

(f) provision of a separate examination room.

For other forms of assessment, support is available from the AccessAbility Centre throughout the academic year to assist students in preparing for and completing assessment activities to published deadlines.
7.119 Any reasonable adjustments will be made up to the point of assessment. Coversheets for assessed work will be utilised for the purpose of providing appropriate feedback in the light of a student’s disability or condition.

Publication of results

7.120 For distance learning programmes and for semester one of campus-based programmes, provisional module marks shall be published online, from the SITS record after they have been approved for release by the Panel of Examiners. For campus-based programmes, semester two provisional marks will not be released following the Panel meeting and shall be published online, from the SITS record, once approved for release by the Board of Examiners.

7.121 The Secretary to the Board shall, in liaison with the Registry, ensure that recommendations for awards are entered onto the SITS record immediately following the meeting of the Board of Examiners. These awards shall normally be published online by the Registry to students within two working days. The date of the Board of Examiners’ meeting shall be the award date for the student.

7.122 Module and award results will not be released to those students in debt to the University.

Conferral and certification of awards

7.123 The conferral of an award shall take place either at a Degree Congregation held in January or July, or at a meeting of the Senate. Students will normally be expected to have their degree conferred at the Degree Congregation soonest after their award date.

7.124 Certificates shall be produced and dispatched to graduates following each conferral.

7.125 Those students for whom conferral takes place at a meeting of the Senate shall also be invited to attend the next Degree Congregation.

7.126 A summative Higher Education Achievement Report will be produced for undergraduate graduating students.
The following extract from Senate Regulations 11 states the University’s regulations on plagiarism, academic dishonesty and cheating. The full regulation can be found at:

http://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/sas2/regulations/documents/Senatereg11-discipline.pdf

Definitions of breaches of academic integrity

11.6 The University’s primary functions of teaching and research involve a search for knowledge and the truthful recording of the findings of that search. Any action knowingly taken by a student which involves misrepresentation of the truth amounts to academic dishonesty and as such, is an offence which the University believes should merit the application of very severe penalties.

11.7 Offences in this category include, but are not confined to:

(a) cheating in written examinations;
(b) copying work from or using work written by another person;
(c) soliciting or commissioning work;
(d) making work available to another person for copying;
(e) submitting for assessment work that has been previously submitted for another assessment (self-plagiarism);
(f) copying from published authorities, including on-line sources, without acknowledgement;
(g) pretending ownership of another’s ideas;
(h) falsifying results.

11.8 Cheating involves actual, or attempted deception and/or dishonest action in relation to any academic work of the University. Taking any unauthorised material, paper or equipment, into an examination is considered to be attempted deception and therefore prohibited. Unauthorised material includes notes in any form. Unauthorized equipment includes mobile telephones, all models of calculator not specifically approved for an examination and other electronic devices. Students are responsible for ensuring that they do not have with them in the examination any unauthorised material or equipment. It is not necessary for the University to prove that the unauthorised material or equipment was used in the examination. Talking to another candidate during an examination is also considered to be attempted deception and is prohibited.

11.9 Plagiarism is used as a general term to describe taking and using another’s thoughts and writings as one’s own. Plagiarism can occur not only in essays and dissertations, but also in scientific experimentation, diagrams, maps, fieldwork, computer programs, and all other forms of study where students are expected to work independently and produce original material.

11.10 Collusion is the active cooperation of two or more students to jointly produce material where there is a requirement that that material be produced independently. A student who knowingly allows any of his or her academic work to be acquired by another person for presentation as if it were that person’s own work is also guilty of collusion.

Plagiarism and collusion: departmental procedures for investigation and consideration of allegations

11.49 The Head of each Department shall appoint a member of the academic staff of his or her department as Plagiarism Officer. The role of the Plagiarism Officer is to consider cases of suspected plagiarism and/or collusion identified in work submitted for assessment set by the department, other than in time-constrained written examinations. Where a student is found to have been cheating in written
examinations or falsifying results in other ways, the allegations will, instead, be referred to the relevant Authorised Officer as set out under these regulations.

11.50 Where an internal examiner suspects plagiarism and/or collusion, s/he shall gather the necessary evidence. Wherever possible this shall include the original source(s) that may have been used inappropriately. It may also include a review of other assessed work submitted by the student for evidence of plagiarism or collusion.

11.51 The internal examiner shall submit the evidence, together with a written explanation of his or her concerns, to the Plagiarism Officer. The Plagiarism Officer may, in confidence, request further information from the internal examiner or other members of staff in relation to the case.

11.52 If, after these investigations are concluded, the Plagiarism Officer determines that there is no case to answer, the Plagiarism Officer may dismiss the case.

11.53 Unless the Plagiarism Officer determines that there is no case to answer, the Plagiarism Officer shall write to the student, presenting the evidence assembled, and provide them with an opportunity to make a written response to the allegation(s) of plagiarism and/or collusion, including any information which s/he considers should be taken into account as mitigating factors for their actions. Information relating to any mitigating circumstances should wherever possible be supported by documentary evidence. A deadline shall be set for the submission of the written response which shall not be fewer than five working days from the date of notification of this request. In determining whether factors which mitigate the allegation of plagiarism are established by a student, it is noted that guidance on academic integrity is provided within departments to all students and ignorance of the rules of academic writing and integrity will therefore not provide a defence to an allegation of plagiarism. Circumstances which can provide valid mitigation for an allegation of plagiarism will be exceptional.

11.54 The Plagiarism Officer may, when writing to the student to present him or her with the evidence, require the student, in addition to providing a written submission, to attend a meeting to discuss matters relating to the allegations. The student shall be given at least five working days written notice of a meeting. Where the Plagiarism Officer determines to offer a meeting to the student, the deadline for submission of the written response shall normally be set which is not less than five working days after the date of the meeting.

11.55 The Plagiarism Officer may request that the internal examiner who reported the alleged plagiarism and/or collusion attend the meeting. The student may be accompanied by a friend or representative in accordance with the general provisions for this in these regulations. A member of staff of the University shall also be asked to attend the meeting to take notes. A record of the meeting shall be made by that member of staff which shall on request be made available to the student.

11.56 If, having been served due notice, a student does not submit a response to the allegations and/or fails to attend the meeting called under paragraph 11.54 above, the Plagiarism Officer may proceed to determine an outcome to the case without offering any further opportunity to the student to make representations.

11.57 Having reviewed the evidence assembled and the response (if any) received from the student, the Plagiarism Officer shall determine one of the following regarding the allegation:

(a) that there is no case to answer and dismiss the case;

(b) that plagiarism or collusion are not proved, but that there is evidence of poor academic practice, as defined in paragraph 11.63, and that the student should be warned, directed to academic support within the department, and required to undertake the University’s on-line plagiarism tutorial;

(c) that there is evidence of plagiarism or collusion, and impose a departmental-level penalty as permitted under these regulations;
(d) either (i) that there is evidence of plagiarism or collusion for which a Plagiarism Officer cannot impose an appropriate penalty under these regulations, or (ii) that the case is too complex to resolve without a full hearing, and refer the matter for consideration by a Student Discipline Panel.

11.58 As noted at 11.53 above, instances in which circumstances may be accepted as mitigating an offence of plagiarism will be exceptional. Where the Plagiarism Officer concludes that mitigating circumstances are relevant and should be taken into account in determining penalty, the Plagiarism Officer shall determine the most appropriate penalty to be applied and shall have authority, where considered appropriate, to reduce the severity of the category of penalty that would otherwise be applied. In determining whether particular circumstances are relevant, the Plagiarism Officer will take into account whether the circumstances have previously been disclosed in a timely manner, as required under the University’s Regulations.

11.59 The Plagiarism Officer shall notify the student concerned of the outcome of the case, including reasons for the judgement, normally no more than 10 working days following the deadline for the student’s written response. Where the Plagiarism Officer determines that the outcome should be 11.57(b) above, their letter should direct the student to the sources of further training and advice.

Plagiarism and collusion: Departmental penalties for plagiarism and/or collusion

11.60 For definitions of plagiarism and collusion see paragraphs 11.9 – 11.10 above. The scheme of penalties for plagiarism and/or collusion operates on the basis that departments have a responsibility to ensure that all students understand clearly what constitutes plagiarism and collusion and are provided with advice on how to avoid these offences. Explicit guidance should be provided during the first few weeks of study through course materials, study skills teaching and/or completion of on-line tutorials. Students must acknowledge when they use ideas, words or images etc. that they have taken from the work of others. This acknowledgement must be adjacent to the material used (eg. in-text citation) not simply an inclusion in the reference list and the extent of any copying or quotation must be clearly shown.

11.61 The evaluation of individual cases is the responsibility of the Departmental Plagiarism Officer, who is well-placed to determine the severity of the offence in the context of the academic discipline and the nature and scale of the assignment.

11.62 In applying the penalties set out below the Plagiarism Officer will take into account the principle that operation of the penalties for plagiarism must not put a student into a better position than if the piece of work in question was not plagiarised but did not merit a pass mark.

11.63 Four categories of plagiarism have been identified and a penalty will be applied for each of these. A lesser category of poor academic practice is also recognized, which will not attract a penalty:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor academic practice (PAP)</td>
<td>This is not a disciplinary offence and does not count as a first offence in the context of the Category 3 plagiarism definition. PAP involves collaboration or poor citation practice where there is evidence that the student did not appreciate the rules of academic writing or where the extent of copied material can be considered so slight that it does not justify disciplinary proceedings or a penalty. The work in question includes (among other characteristics): • a limited amount of material or copied text expressing ideas or concepts taken from the work of others in the student’s own words but without appropriate citation. • a limited amount of material or copied text which is referenced in the bibliography but is not properly cited. • a limited amount of material or copied text that has been subjected to minor linguistic changes with or without citation. • a limited amount of material or copied text that is cited but not in quotation marks. • limited collaboration between students as evidenced by structure, source or copied text; this includes cases where the written work is original throughout.</td>
<td>A formal warning but no penalty is issued by the Departmental Plagiarism Officer and the student is directed to academic support within the department. The student is required to undertake the University’s online plagiarism tutorial. In cases of poor academic practice the mark will reflect the academic merit of the work; the mark is likely to be low.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First offences occurring in the first semester of a student’s course should normally be treated as poor academic practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1 plagiarism and/or collusion</td>
<td>The work breaches the rules of academic integrity by presenting the material of others as the student’s original material. Category 1 plagiarism includes (among other characteristics): • short blocks of material or copied text expressing ideas or concepts taken from the work of others without appropriate citation, or copied text that is cited but not in quotation marks. • short blocks of material or copied text which is referenced in the bibliography but is not properly cited • short blocks of material or copied text that have been subjected to minor linguistic changes and presented as the student’s own, with or without citation. • short blocks of material or copied text that is cited but not in quotation marks. • collaboration between students as evidenced by structure, sources or short blocks of copied text, (including copied text subjected to minor linguistic changes) or similar bibliographies. A short block of text may be as small as two continuing lines. • Short blocks of copied code, other computer files or experimental results copied from another student or the work of others from online resources or books without appropriate referencing.</td>
<td>A mark of zero (0) should be awarded for the assessment in which the plagiarism was found to occur. The module mark is calculated on the basis of the zero mark for the plagiarised assessment. If this results in failure of the module, where resubmission is available, the student may resubmit the assessment for a capped module mark. The cap should be set at the pass mark for the programme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Category 2 plagiarism and/or collusion | A Category 2 offence will be committed when the copied material represents a significant proportion of the work. The line between Category 1 and Category 2 offences will be determined by the level of similarity between the work and the source material on a case by case basis. Category 2 plagiarism includes (among other characteristics):

- significant or numerous blocks of material or copied text expressing ideas or concepts taken from the work of others without appropriate citation.
- significant or numerous blocks of material or copied text which is referenced in the bibliography but is not properly cited;
- significant or numerous blocks of material or copied text that have been subjected to minor linguistic changes and presented as the student’s own, with or without citation.
- significant or numerous blocks of material or copied text that is cited but not in quotation marks. Significant blocks of text may be as small as several continuing lines
- collaboration between students as evidenced by structure, sources, significant or numerous blocks of copied text, (including copied text subjected to minor linguistic changes) or similar bibliographies.
- blocks of copied code, other computer files or experimental results copied from another student or the work of others from online resources or books without appropriate referencing. | A mark of zero (0) should be awarded for the assessment in which the plagiarism was found to occur. The module mark is calculated on the basis of the zero mark for the plagiarised assessment. If this results in failure of the module, the student should be required to resubmit the assessment in order to fulfil the learning outcomes and obtain the module credits where this is required for progression purposes. No mark will be awarded. If this penalty does not result in the failure of the module, the module mark obtained for the module should be further reduced by 10% of the maximum available mark. |
| Category 3 plagiarism and/or collusion - ‘repeat offence’ | A Category 3 offence will be committed if a Category 1 or 2 penalty has been applied to a student’s work on a previous occasion (i.e. a repeat offence). Contemporaneous offences or offences in which a student has had no opportunity to act upon advice arising from an earlier offence due to close submission dates etc. are not treated as repeat offences but may attract PAP, Category 1 or Category 2 penalties in the normal way. The Plagiarism officer shall determine whether the latest instance of plagiarism is Category 1 or Category 2 in the level of severity. The penalty to be applied shall then take into account the category of penalty of the prior offence. | If both offences are Category 1 then the penalty on the second offence is a Category 2 penalty. If either of the two offences is a Category 2 offence then the penalty on the second offence is a Category 3 penalty. The Category 3 penalty is as follows: A mark of zero (0) should be awarded for the assessment in which the plagiarism was found to occur. The module mark is calculated on the basis of the zero mark for the plagiarised assessment. If this results in failure of the module, the student should be required to resubmit the assessment in order to fulfil the learning outcomes and obtain the module credits where this is required for progression purposes. No mark will be awarded. If the penalty does not result in the failure of the module, the module mark obtained for the module should be further reduced by 10% of the maximum available mark. If this penalty does not reduce the degree classification at the end of the programme by one class, the degree class should be reduced by one class. Where reduction in the degree class would result in undergraduate students not obtaining an Honours degree, or in Foundation degree students or postgraduate students failing the programme, their cases should be considered by a disciplinary panel. |
A Category 4 offence is the most severe plagiarism where the departmental processes do not provide a sufficient penalty. Examples include purchasing of work or soliciting to do so or multiple repeat offences. It may also be appropriate to refer to a disciplinary panel a case which is complex and where the department is unable to establish the facts, for example a case of apparent collusion where the identification of the guilty party cannot be ascertained. A disciplinary panel has the power to impose penalties up to and including expulsion from the University.

Refer to Panel

11.64 **Plagiarism in the honours-level or postgraduate project or dissertation** will normally be considered as Category 2 or Category 4 plagiarism depending on the scale of the plagiarism. A Category 2 penalty applied to a postgraduate dissertation will result in failure to obtain a Master’s degree since no Master’s award can be made where a zero mark is recorded for the dissertation. In such cases a resubmission is not offered and the Board of Examiners will consider whether an interim award is available. Where the plagiarism in the project or dissertation is very serious or a repeat offence then this will be treated as Category 4 plagiarism.

11.65 **Resubmission of a student’s own work (self-plagiarism).** This occurs when a student submits material for assessment which s/he has previously submitted as part of another assessment exercise and which has been marked. The extent of the offence would be evaluated using the above categories.
Appendix 1:
Discovery-Led and Discovery-Enabling Learning Strategy
Discovery-led and Discovery-enabling Learning Strategy
2016 - 2020

Who we are and will be...

We will put student benefit at the heart of our decisions about education and the student experience, because our students matter and learning matters.

At a time of unprecedented change in higher education our commitment to providing the highest quality student learning experience must be paramount. Recognising that in recent years that aspiration has proved challenging, we must appreciate our corporate responsibility, be self-aware and refocus our efforts to achieve these goals.

All University of Leicester students, wherever they are and however they study, will enjoy the best education and experience we can imagine. All members of the University contribute to our students’ learning, which is enriched by our research and scholarship and supported by every means to enable them to succeed.

Students graduating from our programmes will be resourceful, independent and resilient. Proud of their achievements they will maintain a lasting connection with us. As well as a continuing curiosity about themselves and others, they will have the qualities of integrity, openness of mind, breadth of perspective and concern for ethics that equip them for professional success and active, informed citizenship now and into the future.

We will work to support social mobility by ensuring that we reach out to those who have the potential to benefit from higher education but whose background and social experience militate against such an aspiration.
Our commitments

Offering a vibrant, successful academic portfolio
1. We will develop a distinctively flexible, exciting curriculum, so that students have opportunities to balance disciplinary depth and interdisciplinary breadth and follow undergraduate and postgraduate programmes that fit their plans for the future.

Assuring and enhancing quality
1. A commitment to academic quality and standards is a crucial element of our creative and collaborative approach to improving our teaching and our students’ learning and experience.
2. We will support all staff in developing their teaching skills and ensure that our processes allow them to demonstrate, and be recognised and rewarded for, their roles in developing, delivering and enabling the best education we can imagine.

Excellent recruitment, induction and transition
1. We will enrich and support future students, through an excellent programme of relationships with schools and colleges, accurate and engaging information for all prospective students, teachers and parents, and an unyielding commitment to widening participation in higher education.
2. Our welcome, induction and approach to the first year of higher education will build engagement, a sense of enjoyment and belonging, and the capacity for success, independence and pride.
3. We recognise that there are progressive transitions to, within and from higher education and we will support our students in moving successfully throughout all these stages.

Transformative teaching and learning
1. Our curricula, teaching and assessment will be enjoyably challenging: the best education is demanding, transforming and enlivening, and it will focus on future employability and professional success.
2. Our education will be enriched by research and scholarship, both discipline-based and in pedagogy.
3. We will make sure that our students can engage in and, where helpful, combine different forms of learning, by face-to-face contact, distance, blended, part-time, or work-based, all of which aim to be the best they can be.
4. Our programmes and modules will provide a variety of high-quality learning, assessment and self-evaluation opportunities; by focusing on feed-forward as well as feedback, we will better prepare our students for the opportunities, behaviours and demands of the professional workplace.
5. We will ensure that every student has an opportunity to engage in a professionalising and transforming experience in a work placement or an internship, as a volunteer, an ambassador or a mentor.
6. We will imagine and advocate for a teaching and learning estate, resources and technologies that support our ambitions.
A student experience that engenders success
1. We will do what is best for our current and future students, recognising them as individuals and with educational benefit and employability as our first considerations.
2. Our communications with and support for students will be engaging, informative and positive; they will generate an atmosphere of mutual respect and convey a sense of the obligations as well as entitlements that stem from membership of a larger educational community.
3. We will engage in dialogue with our students and their representatives, in order to foster their creative and constructive contributions and their sense of responsibility for their education, and to encourage them to take a lead in projects that will improve their learning and experience.
4. We will encourage our students to be independent, to learn for life, to value their education and to contribute as alumni to our ongoing work in education and scholarship.
Our priorities, 2016-2020

A vibrant, successful academic portfolio will be delivered by:
- Changing our undergraduate and postgraduate taught offer to introduce greater flexibility, agility and responsiveness to changing markets and demand, including the introduction of the Pathways Project;
- Ensuring that we best utilise and develop different modes of programme delivery, by face-to-face, distance, blended, part-time, work-based or MOOC;
- Implementing the changes to our academic provision, including standardisation of credit hours, credit weighting, assessment loading and levels of variation; successful roll-out of new academic year in 2017-18.

Assuring and enhancing quality will be delivered by:
- Generalising an approach to programme and module development that brings together programme teams with educational designers, quality advisers and marketing advisers from the early stages of each development project;
- Developing approaches to help us:
  - identify, recognise and reward excellence in teaching and student-centred practice, including ways of enabling staff to demonstrate excellence;
  - support each individual in enhancing the quality of their teaching, assessment, feedback, curriculum design and student support;
  - create a stronger academic career development path around teaching, student experience and student recruitment;
  - better utilise and draw together the talents of our teaching-focused staff.

Excellent recruitment, induction and transition will be delivered by:
- Implementing the revised Schools and Colleges Partnerships strategy to enable us to:
  - fulfil our aspirations in widening participation and access to higher education
  - better target our approaches to schools and provide more support to staff engaging in recruitment activity within schools
  - increase applications and raise our entry standards
- Developing and implementing a universal peer mentoring scheme for all new students;
- Developing the idea of a ‘Fabulous First Year’ for undergraduate programmes into a set of concrete projects;
- Supporting students through each stage of transition, particularly between programme years.

Transformative teaching and learning will be delivered by:
- Supporting and resourcing a culture of innovation and the sharing of ideas and approaches to enhancing the student learning experience;
- Drawing on scholarship and pedagogical research to enhance our approach to programme delivery;
- Building internationalisation and sustainability into the curriculum and student experience;
- Developing a strategy and schedule for a twenty-first century teaching and learning estate, and twenty-first century teaching and learning resources and technologies;
A student experience that engenders success will be delivered by:

- Further emphasising the role of the student voice and a balance between obligations and entitlements through a new Student and Staff Charter;
- Building on our already strong relationships with the Students’ Union and student representatives and developing ‘partnership projects’;
- Creating a stronger focus on retention and engagement and to identify and support students at risk;
- Building on our strengths and growing profile in employability and professional futures by engaging more directly with employers and expanding opportunities for students to engage in internships, work placements and volunteering activities.
Our Culture

An excellent, transformative learning experience for all our students is critically dependent on an enabling culture. This culture will engender a sense of belonging and common purpose for our students and all staff, academic and professional service.

Staff will be encouraged to be innovative and creative in their teaching and support of learning. This approach will be fostered by active collaborations within and between academic and corporate service departments and divisions.

We will recognise that we are all learners and will support and encourage our students and colleagues in their development.

We will recognise, applaud, reward and share excellence in the support of student learning in all areas of the University’s activities.

In developing our approach to education we will foster and build relationships and value the different contributions that all members of the University can make to enhance that education.

Our Environment

The physical, virtual and cultural environments all underpin the effective implementation of the Learning Strategy.

We will support the development of a physical estate that supports student learning in the 21st century with a mix of formal, informal, flexible, social and common spaces to best suit our approaches to teaching and learning and to foster the engagement of students with their disciplines, with each other and with staff.

We will support the development of the digital campus through the effective use of the virtual learning environment and the wider range of learning-enabling resources for teaching, assessing and supporting our students’ education and skills development, while also recognising the benefits and values of face-to-face interactions.

We will work towards the establishment of a ‘One-Stop Shop’ for Student Services, comprising the co-location of the front-facing elements of Student Welfare, AccessAbility, Counselling & Well-Being and Careers Development Services.

University of Leicester Learning Strategy 2016-2020
Our Measures of Success

Our success will be measurable through a range of qualitative and quantitative metrics. Progress against these will be reviewed annually, but over the first three years of the Strategy (2016-18) critical indicators will include:

Measures:
- Successful outcome of the 2016 QAA Higher Education Review; monitored by APC
- Improvement in the national rankings based on the student experience to re-establish Leicester as a Top 20 University; monitored by ULT
- Retaining our ranking in the top 5 research-led HEIs for widening participation; monitored by Admissions and Planning Offices
- An increase in the number of undergraduate applications per place and the relative quality of the admitted students *; monitored by Admissions Office, External Relations and report to ULT

Project Outcomes:
- Successful initial implementation of Pathways in 2016 – 17 with more programmes engaging in subsequent years; monitored by College Academic Committees (CACs) & APC
- Successful implementation of curriculum and academic year restructuring; monitored by Registry, CACs and APC
- Completion of the Student Journey Project including: re-implementation of SITS; full auto-scheduling of the timetable; integration of electronic grading in the VLE with SITS; monitored by Registry and ITS reporting to ULT

Targets:
- Progressive improvement in the National Student Survey (Target 90% satisfaction, currently 85%), Post-Graduate Taught Experience Survey and Post-Graduate Research Experience Survey*; monitored by CACs and APC
- Improvement in the rankings for the DELHE survey (Target upper quartile of HEIs and exceeding benchmark, currently on benchmark, ranked 56th)*; monitored by Careers Development Service and Careers Development Advisory Board
- A significant increase in the proportion of staff holding a recognised teaching qualification, including HEA Fellowships (Target 90%)*; monitored by Planning Office, report to APC & ULT
- An increase in student retention (from 91.6 to 94% - equivalent to Top 20 mainstream universities)*; monitored by Planning Office, CACs and APC

*These KPIs should be directly translated into the Learning Strategies for each College and reported on by departments through the Annual Developmental Reviews
Linkage to Other Strategies

The Learning Strategy is closely dependent on a number of divisional strategies aside from the University’s overarching Strategic Plan, these include:

- **Physical Environment Strategy**
  - creation of the One-Stop Shop for student services,
  - high quality teaching space,
  - development of flexible social and group learning space.

- **Digital Strategy**
  - ‘digital by default’,
  - electronic submission, marking and feedback,
  - full roll-out of Lecture Capture supporting changes to approaches to teaching.

- **People Strategy**
  - reward and recognition of teaching
  - improved appraisal processes
  - increased proportion of staff having teaching qualifications.

- **Marketing Strategy**
  - supporting student recruitment

- **Student Services Strategy**
  - supporting student success and retention
  - One-Stop Shop

- **College Learning Strategies**
  - underpinning the implementation of the Learning Strategy
  - meeting the identified targets.
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External Examiner Report Form

This form is designed to collect from external examiners the information necessary to confirm the standards of the University’s awards, the appropriateness of student achievement, and the integrity of the assessment process. It is intended for use with the University’s Senate Regulation 7 governing the Assessment of Taught Programmes of Study, which can be found here:

www.le.ac.uk/senate-regulation7

The deadline for the submission of your report is:

Undergraduate programmes: 31 July in each year
Taught postgraduate programmes: 30 November in each year

We would prefer you to send your report as an email attachment to extexaminers@le.ac.uk but if you would prefer to submit a report as hard copy, please post it to:

Quality Office, Student and Academic Services, University of Leicester, University Road, Leicester, LE1 7RH

The content of your report will be made available to students and it would therefore be helpful if you could avoid references to named members of staff or students.

If you have any queries about the reporting process for external examiners, please contact the Quality Office for guidance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The external examiner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First name(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of current post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current employing institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address for correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The subject area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Department or School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Academic standards

Please list the full title of each programme of study for which you were appointed. For each programme, please indicate whether:

(a) you are satisfied that the threshold standards set for the award are appropriate and in accordance with chapters A1 and A2 of the QAA's Quality Code;
(b) you are satisfied that the achievement of students for each award are comparable with that at other institutions with which you are familiar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Threshold standards are appropriate</th>
<th>Student achievement is comparable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you answered ‘no’ to any of the above sections, or have any concerns about the standard of awards or student achievement, please comment here and indicate any improvements you consider necessary:

Please comment on any concerns you may have about the standards of individual modules or assessments, and indicate any improvements you consider necessary:

Please comment on the appropriateness of the intended learning outcomes for the programme(s) and level of award, in the context of QAA subject benchmark statements where appropriate:

Please comment on the appropriateness of the assessment strategy for the intended learning outcomes of the programme(s) and the level of award:

Please comment on the achievement of students in relation to their peers on comparable programmes at other institutions:

Please comment, where relevant, on the comparability in student achievement between those studying on campus and those studying at a distance:

Please comment, where relevant, on any issues specifically required by a professional, statutory, or regulatory body:

Please comment, where relevant, on the comparability in student achievement between those students studying at the University and those studying with a collaborative partner:
Please comment on whether the assessment processes have measured student achievement rigorously and fairly against the intended learning outcomes of the programme(s) and have been conducted in line with the University’s policies and regulations:

Quality of learning opportunities
Please comment on the way in which the design of the curriculum enables students to attain the programme’s intended learning outcomes:

Please comment on examples of good practice and innovation that you have identified in relation to learning, teaching, and assessment:

Please suggest any areas for improvement that could enhance the quality of learning opportunities provided to students:

**Administrative arrangements**

Did you receive all the necessary information on the programme(s) of study and component modules?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Any comments:

Did you receive sufficient evidence of intended assessment patterns and instruments to agree the appropriateness of the assessment strategy for each module?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Any comments:

Were you able to comment on the questions set for students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Any comments:

Did you receive sufficient material to form a view of whether internal marking properly assessed student performance against appropriate standards?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Any comments:

Did you receive appropriate access to non-written assessment and/or any live assessment events?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Any comments:

Did you receive an appropriate opportunity to meet with students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Any comments:
Are you satisfied that the Board of Examiners meeting was conducted effectively?
Yes ☐ No ☐
Any comments:

Are you satisfied that accurate information and appropriate opportunity for discussion were provided?
Yes ☐ No ☐
Any comments:

Are you satisfied that any issues raised in previous reports have been considered appropriately by the department?
Yes ☐ No ☐
Any comments:

Newly appointed external examiners
Please comment on the University’s arrangements for your appointment and briefing:

External examiners completing a term of office this year
Please provide an overview on developments during your term of office:

Thank you for serving as an external examiner and for submitting your annual report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Office actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report sent to department for comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department’s response received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department’s response sent to external examiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External examiner’s fee paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External examiner’s expenses paid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>