



**University of
Leicester**

STUDENT AND ACADEMIC SERVICES

Code of Practice on Examining

**Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate
Programmes**

2011/12

CODE OF PRACTICE ON EXAMINING

Contents

	Page
Preface	3
Equal opportunities and risk management statements	4
1. Code of Practice on the Assessment of Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate Students	5
2. Procedures Governing the Appointment of Examiners	13
3. Code of Practice on External Examining	17
4. Code of Practice on Internal Examining	22
5. Procedures Governing the Conduct of Boards of Examiners	24
6. Procedures Governing the Consideration of External Examiners' Reports	27
7. Code of Practice on Plagiarism	29
 Appendices	
I. General Regulations Governing Courses for First Degrees	35
II Postgraduate Awards	39
III Medium of Instruction	40
IV Undergraduate scheme of assessment and examination conventions	41
V Postgraduate Assessment Conventions, Schemes of Assessment and Classifications	48
VI University Policy on the Return of Assessed Work	52
VII Illness and Notification of Mitigating Circumstances	54
VIII Examination Regulations	56
IX Academic Discipline: Examinations	60
X Instructions Regarding the Use of Examination Anonymity	62
XI Nomination Form for the Appointment of External Examiners	64
XII Covering Note for External Examiner's Report to the Vice-Chancellor	66
XIII Appeals process for students on taught programmes	68

CODE OF PRACTICE ON EXAMINING UNDERGRADUATE AND TAUGHT POSTGRADUATE PROGRAMMES

Preface

This Code of Practice was first issued in 2010. It combines the *Code of Practice on Examining for First Degrees* and the *Code of Practice on Examining for Taught Postgraduate Programmes*, which themselves followed the precepts laid down in the *Code of Practice on the External Examiner System* prepared by the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals and incorporated in the *Reynolds Report on Academic Standards in Universities (1986)*. The Code takes account of recommendations of good practice contained in *Guidelines on Quality Assurance (HEQC 1996)*, the *Graduate Standards Programme (HEQC 1996)*, the Dearing Report (1997), and the section on External Examining of the QAA's current Code of Practice. The Code is under review following the publication of the new QAA Quality Code.

Copies of the Code are sent to senior University Officers, Heads of College, Academic Directors, Heads of Departments and Schools, Departmental Examinations Officers, External Examiners, College Academic Advisors, the Secretary of the Academic Policy Committee and staff in the Quality Office. A limited number of additional paper copies are held in the Quality Office, and an on-line version can be found on the Student and Academic Services website at <http://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/sas2/quality> Any comments on the operation of the Code should be addressed to College Academic Advisors, the Examinations Officer or the Academic Registrar.

The Code is revised and re-issued annually and any significant amendments approved by the Academic Policy Committee. Each edition takes account of procedural issues arising from each year's diet of examinations, and of relevant national developments, and in particular of recommendations of good practice arising from QAA audits and contained in QAA publications.

The Academic Directors of the Colleges draw the attention of departments to any breaches of the procedures laid down in this Code which they may observe during their annual review of External Examiners' reports for the Academic Policy Committee. That Committee is responsible through its academic reviews of departments for monitoring overall compliance with the Code.

Quality Office
Student and Academic Services

CODE OF PRACTICE ON EXAMINING UNDERGRADUATE AND TAUGHT POSTGRADUATE PROGRAMMES

Equal opportunities and risk management statements

Equal opportunities: The University's examination procedures support and reflect the institution's equal opportunities commitments by providing an assessment environment characterised by:

- *transparency*
- *consistency of approach*
- *fairness*
- *anonymity for all written examinations and most other assessed work*
- *confidentiality*
- *responsiveness to students with requiring special assessment support*
- *scrutiny by external authorities, reporting directly to the Vice-Chancellor*
- *a robust appeals procedure.*

Risk Management: Any actual or apparent failure of its academic standards would be highly detrimental to the University's reputation, and all the procedures governing assessment are in part designed to minimise the risk of this happening. Controls are applied at the level of individual staff (for example, through systems of moderation and double marking), through administrative action (for example, through the application of security measures) through the activities of groups (the operation of Boards of Examiners), through high-level scrutiny (the Vice-Chancellor's consideration of external examiners' reports) and through review (appeals).

UNIVERSITY OF LEICESTER

1. CODE OF PRACTICE ON THE ASSESSMENT OF UNDERGRADUATE AND TAUGHT POSTGRADUATE STUDENTS

University regulations, structures and procedures

- 1.1 Appendices I to III to this Code of Practice on Examining for Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate Degrees set out the University regulations, procedures and conventions which provide the institutional framework to the assessment of undergraduate and taught postgraduate students.

The remainder of this Code should be read in the context of these overarching regulations, procedures and statements.

[Note: The term 'department' is used throughout this document to denote the organisational unit responsible for course delivery; it is recognised that in some academic areas teaching and assessment is co-ordinated by Schools and that the operation of this Code will therefore be a School responsibility.]

Approval and monitoring of schemes of assessment and degree classification

- 1.2 Schemes of assessment for new courses must be presented alongside other course approval documentation¹. The introduction of a new undergraduate course will not be approved until a scheme of assessment covering all years of the course is available for scrutiny. During the process of programme approval new postgraduate programmes will be required to illustrate which of the postgraduate schemes of assessment the programme will adopt.

Particular attention will be paid to schemes for joint degrees and other collaborative courses in order to ensure that in the process of combining elements from different schemes, the assessment regime remains appropriate.

In 2005 the University approved a single scheme of degree classification for all undergraduate programmes. The operation of this scheme will be monitored annually and a full review may be held where appropriate to address specific issues arising from the application of the scheme.

In 2010 the University Academic Policy Committee approved a recommendation that individual departments may, in exceptional circumstances be permitted to request dispensation from elements of the Scheme, if sufficient academic grounds exist. In such cases departments are required to submit a detailed proposal for consideration by the Academic Policy Committee, with whom the final decision will rest.

- 1.3 Departments are held to be responsible for conducting an annual review of the operation of the scheme of assessment for each individual undergraduate and postgraduate programme, incorporating:
- feedback from external examiners
 - recommendations from academic staff arising from module/programme review
 - any student feedback on the timing, structure, content and outcome of assessments
 - any issues arising from the previous year's mark and award profile, and from decisions taken in respect of borderline candidates and special cases.

¹ see also the Code of Practice on Programme Development and Approval (<http://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/sas2/quality>)

It will normally be the case that such reviews will be undertaken during the department's consideration of its external examiners' reports and its formulation of a response to the Vice-Chancellor.² The response must include confirmation that the review has taken place, and contains details of the outcome, either recorded in the response itself, or set out in a separate attachment, which might be the minutes of a meeting at which the examiner's report was considered. Evidence that this process is being carried out will be sought by the Academic Directors of the Colleges during their annual review of the preceding year's external examiners' reports and departmental responses, and in the annual and periodic developmental reviews carried out by the Academic Policy Committee.

- 1.4 In addition, the Academic Policy Committee conducts an annual scrutiny of a summary of degree classes awarded by the University, with a view to identifying any clear anomalies or trends which might require investigation.

Schemes of Assessment

- 1.5 Schemes of assessment for individual programmes must be:

For Undergraduate programmes

- compliant with the University's degree classification scheme and University Regulations

For Taught Postgraduate programmes

- compliant with either Scheme A or Scheme B of the University postgraduate scheme of assessment (or the scheme of assessment for M.Res degrees where appropriate) and University Regulations

For all programmes

- expressed in a readily-comprehensible form
- accurate
- precise
- logically-constructed, so that there is either a self-evident link between module size and assessment weighting, or a clear understanding of the reasons for any dislocation between the two
- consistent with any other schemes of assessment applying to programmes offered by the department
- widely publicised (see 1.7 below)
- subject to annual review (see 1.3 above).

- 1.6 Schemes of assessment must also be comprehensive, embracing such matters as:

- subject benchmarking requirements
- the assessment requirements of professional bodies
- the rules of progression in cases where threshold standards have been set which distinguish between undergraduate degree programmes (for example, between the B.Sc. degree in Chemistry and the M.Chem. degree), and progression within degrees (for example, progression from Postgraduate Certificate to Postgraduate Diploma to masters level on a taught postgraduate programme)
- the weighting and assessment regime applicable to study abroad or to students on placements.

- 1.7 Schemes of assessment must be published in departmental and/or course handbooks, issued to internal, external and additional examiners, and made available to internal and external reviewers upon request (see 1.10 below in relation to its publication of descriptions of methods of assessment).

² see also the Code of Practice on Annual and Periodic Developmental Review (<http://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/sas2/quality>)

- 1.8 Departments wishing to implement amendments to assessment on their specific programmes which potentially affect registered students must seek the approval of the College Academic Committee. Where students have already commenced or completed assessments which would be affected by a change in the overall scheme, departments will not be permitted to alter their schemes of assessment until those students have graduated, unless it can be demonstrated that the alteration constitutes an improvement for all the students concerned.

Assessment methods

- 1.9 Departments must keep under review the assessment methods in operation in each module and across each programme of study in order to ensure that:
- there is comparability across the programme between module size and assessment load
 - there is comparability across a suite of programmes offered by a department between module size and assessment load
 - there is correspondence between learning objectives and the assessment methods employed to measure the achievement of these
 - each student experiences a range of assessment methods appropriate to the aims and objectives of the degree programme
 - the possibility of assessment overload or underload is monitored, particularly where multiple assessment methods are used within a single module, or where innovative or relatively untried assessment methods are being used
 - students are provided with sufficient opportunities for revision and reflection
 - unintentional coincidence of assignment deadlines is avoided.
- 1.10 The assessment types and methods used by a department must be described in the departmental/course handbook, accompanied by an explanation of their primary purpose in terms of measuring academic achievement, and an identification of any additional benefits for students in terms of the transferable skills gained through the assessment process.
- 1.11 Programme specifications must include a description of the methods of assessment utilised throughout the course.
- 1.12 Module specifications (required for the approval of new modules) must set out the assessment regime for each module, and must be amended whenever the assessment regime is changed.

Setting assignments/examination question papers

- 1.13 All examination question papers and essay/project titles relating to summative assessment which contributes towards the final degree classification must be submitted to an external examiner for comment, and the deadlines for the preparation of the papers should allow sufficient time for this external review. It is not necessary to submit to an external examiner details of small-scale exercises and tests conducted throughout the year (for example, in Mathematics and Modern Languages), even where these may contribute to the overall final classification. The external should, however, be briefed about the function of such forms of assessment in the overall scheme, and has the right to ask for further details, including examples of students' work.
- 1.14 Departments must ensure that there is no conflict in terms of scope, or overlap in terms of content, between the question papers set in any one year. The recycling of questions year-on-year should be avoided, except where the use of multiple choice question papers requires the availability of a bank of questions.

- 1.15 Care should be taken to avoid the replication of essay titles in subsequent written examination questions, or the setting of examination questions which are so loosely defined that they allow students to answer by recycling in an unthinking way the research conducted for previously-submitted assessed work, either undertaken by themselves or by others.
- 1.16 Deadlines must be expressed in such a way as to leave students in no doubt as to the department's intentions, and they must be widely publicised, and included in the Departmental Handbooks. They should, if possible, be set early in the week in order to ensure that students are not able to obtain unfair advantage by choosing to forfeit some marks in order to gain additional time at the weekend. Requirements such as the format of covering notes to essays, the handing-in point for written work, and the number of copies to be submitted must be strictly enforced.
- 1.17 The system for dealing with late submissions without good cause should, if possible, be separated from the system for applications for extensions on medical or other special grounds. For the former, no negotiation should be permitted, and for undergraduate students late submission should lead automatically to the imposition of a penalty (see 1.19 below)
- 1.18 Penalties should be applied as soon as the deadline is reached. Periods of grace should not be used unless exceptional circumstances outside the department's control mean that students would be disadvantaged if a concession was not granted.
- 1.19 The University's undergraduate penalty scheme is as follows:
- a penalty of 10% of the available marks for the written work should be imposed upon the expiry of the deadline
 - a penalty of 5% of the available marks should then be imposed on each of the ten subsequent working days
 - '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, 20 would be the available mark in a 1-20 marking scheme)
 - 'working day' in this context means a period of twenty four hours or part thereof from Monday to Friday inclusive.
- 1.20 The range and timing of penalties for the non-completion of non-standard forms of learning or assessment (for example, 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 this scheme set out above.
- 1.21 Exemptions and extensions must be granted:
- only by staff authorised by the Head of Department*
 - in accordance with published departmental procedures
 - uniformly across all the degree programmes to which they apply.

(*or in the case of the College of Medicine, Biological Sciences and Psychology, the Director of the relevant teaching activity.)

Security and confidentiality

- 1.22 Departments are responsible for the security of question papers during the process of production, consultation with the external examiner and transmission to the Examinations Office, and for the security of completed answer books during the marking period, and must comply with any published University guidelines and Examinations Office procedures relating to these processes. The Examinations Office is responsible for the security of examination question papers from the point at which those papers arrive in the Office until they are handed to the Chief Invigilator prior to the commencement of the examination, and for the security of answer books from the point at which they arrive in the Examinations Office after the examination until they are collected for marking. The Chief Invigilator is responsible for the transportation of question papers and completed answer books between the Examinations Office and the examination room.
- 1.23 A high level of security must be applied to the transportation and storage of answer books during the marking period, especially where marking is undertaken off-campus.
- 1.24 Marked work should only be returned to students *via* departmental pigeon holes if it is first placed in a personally-addressed and sealed envelope marked Confidential.
- 1.25 Examination scripts must not be returned to students after their results are announced, but must be held in a secure place, either in the department or, by arrangement with the Examinations Office, in a central store. Scripts for first and second year undergraduate examinations which do not contribute to the final degree classification must be retained until after the September Examinations for the year in question and the ensuing appeals period are concluded. Scripts for examinations which contribute to the final degree classification or award at either undergraduate or postgraduate level must be retained until after the degree is conferred. The secure disposal of scripts is the responsibility of the Examinations Office.
- 1.26 Module marks obtained by an individual student are regarded as confidential to that student, and should therefore not be displayed on notice boards or set out on pass lists other than in a form through which the identity of each student is anonymised.
- 1.27 Under the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998, students making data subject access requests are entitled to see any examiners' comments recorded on examination scripts, and this information must be provided within five months of the date of the request or forty days from the announcement of the result, whichever is the sooner. Departments must therefore:
- ensure that markers, including any external or additional examiners, are aware of this right
 - issue advice to examiners to prohibit the recording on scripts of any extraneous, irrelevant or inappropriate comments
 - require examiners to write legibly and intelligibly.

This will ensure that the University is able to comply with the requirement of the Data Protection Act that the examiners' comments can be reproduced 'in a meaningful form'.

- 1.28 Students making data subject access requests are also entitled to be supplied with the relevant extract of any minutes of boards of examiners or sub-committees in which they are named (or identified by candidate number), unless the data cannot be disclosed without additionally disclosing personal data about a third party.

- 1.29 Examination results, including degree classifications, constitute personal data and must not be disclosed to third parties without the consent of the student concerned. It is the responsibility of Student and Academic Services to obtain the consent of students to the inclusion of their names on publicly-displayed pass lists, degree congregation programmes, etc., and to notify departments of any students who have withheld their consent.
- 1.30 Examination results must not be released by the University to anyone other than the individual to whom they relate. Results must not be communicated by telephone. Results may be communicated face-to-face, by email with the consent of the student, or via a secure website, such as Blackboard.
- 1.31 Results (i.e. marks, recommended awards and degree classifications) cannot be withheld from students in financial arrears, but the University may decide in such cases not to award or confer the degree until the debt is paid.

Feedback on Assessment

- 1.32 The University has an approved policy for returning feedback on assessed work. This can be found in Appendix VI (departments are expected to implement this policy as soon as possible, and must be compliant by the commencement of the 2012/13 academic year at the latest.)
- 1.33 Departmental/course handbooks must include an explanation of departmental marking conventions (for example, the use of alphabetic grades), and a description of how these relate to degree class mark bands. At postgraduate level course handbooks should include an explanation of postgraduate mark schemes and how these relate to the relevant postgraduate scheme of assessment. The marking criteria for distinguishing between pass, merit and distinction level work should be clearly publicised.
- 1.34 Written feedback to students should:
 - comply with a departmentally-agreed system of reporting
 - be undertaken in such a way as to promote learning and facilitate improvement
 - meet published deadlines for the return of work.
- 1.35 Where examinations are held in January, departments are required to provide students with feedback on their performance in these first semester modules by 28 February each year. The results at this stage are regarded as provisional and should normally be provided on a pass/fail basis, or as an indication that progress is satisfactory, with information about levels of attainment being offered informally through consultation with personal and academic tutors or the course director.
- 1.36 For undergraduate students, at the end of the second semester, unofficial results may be released by departments after the meeting of the relevant Board of Examiners, provided that marks due to be considered by another Board of Examiners (for example, Combined Studies) are not issued. It should be made clear that results are not official until they are confirmed by the University.
- 1.37 For postgraduate taught students, unofficial results may be released by departments following the relevant Board of Examiners meeting, provided that these results are marked as provisional and subject to the approval of the University.
- 1.38 The University Registry provides all undergraduate students with a record of their previous year's marks during the summer vacation, except where students have

September re-sits, in which case the record of marks is issued during the Autumn Term. Students may obtain a formal transcript of the individual year's marks upon application to the University Registry. Undergraduate students are issued with a full Higher Education Achievement Report in the July in which their degree congregation takes place.

- 1.39 Postgraduate students are issued with a full academic transcript in the month in which their graduation congregation takes place.
- 1.40 Degree certificates are issued to graduates at the degree congregations, or posted to *in absentia* candidates by recorded delivery where the student has formally requested this and confirmed the address to which it should be sent.

Marking standards and marking consistency

- 1.41 Marking must be undertaken in accordance with agreed written criteria, which should be made available to all the examiners, including external examiners.
- 1.42 Student anonymity in the marking of written examinations is compulsory (see Appendix X to this Code), and should also be adopted for continuously assessed work except where there are practical considerations relating, for example, to the type or timing of the assessments or to the size of the student group, which render anonymity either unworkable or undesirable on educational grounds.
- 1.43 Marking trends should be monitored annually, both during module review and when the department considers its external examiners' reports (see 1.3 above). Particular attention should be paid to the excessive use of borderline marks, and to any perceived failure to use the full range of marks available to the examiners, especially at the upper end of the scale.
- 1.44 Departments should have written guidelines relating to:
 - the treatment of borderline candidates
 - the annotation of examination scripts
 - the way in which presentational skills, spelling and use of English should be assessed
 - double and second marking
 - moderation.
- 1.45 Departments must have in place written marking and moderation procedures which set out how marking standards which relate to the final degree classification are scrutinised. The type and extent of scrutiny may vary from module to module, depending on the mode of assessment, the significance of the outcome in the overall scheme and, to some extent, the conventions of the subject, and departments may adopt combinations of blind double marking, second marking, moderation (where all scripts are reviewed) and sampling, provided that:
 - the procedures overall are robust enough to provide the necessary guarantee both of the standards of student attainment and the standard of marking
 - any work which contributes to the final assessment which is marked by postgraduate students must always be second marked
 - dissertation/project supervisors do not act as the sole markers of work they have supervised; such work must always be independently scrutinised.

These procedures must be included in the briefing documentation sent by the department to the external examiner(s).

- 1.46 For summative assessment which contributes to the final degree, departments must have in place mechanisms for scrutinising the standards of marking which are sufficient to:
- provide unequivocal information on student performance to boards of examiners
 - provide evidence of robust procedures to external examiners, internal and external reviewers, and students querying or appealing against assessment outcomes
 - ensure that the ultimate responsibility for applying academic standards rests with the University's academic staff
 - remove any possibility of claims of favouritism, collusion or unfair treatment.
- 1.47 Evidence must exist and be retained for review purposes which demonstrates that scrutiny of marking standards has taken place. This means that scripts or a cover sheet must be signed or otherwise annotated by a second marker/moderator/sampler, who must always have the status of internal examiner* (unless in exceptional circumstances, such as for some language papers, the second marker is the external examiner).

[*For the purposes of examining the M.B.,Ch.B. degrees, University Clinical Teachers fall into the category of academic staff, and serve as internal examiners]

Staff Development

- 1.48 Departments should ensure that new Examination Officers receive induction and training from the previous Officer. The University's Examinations Officer is responsible for briefing departmental Examinations Officers on University procedures.
- 1.49 All new staff should be provided with information and training on departmental assessment practices. The mentors of staff on probation should pay particular attention to the need to monitor probationers' assessment practices and outcomes. Sampling of the marking standards being applied by new staff should be undertaken regularly.
- 1.50 Training in marking and grading practices should be provided by departments to their postgraduate research students and additional examiners, and the activities of these examiners should also be kept under close review through regular sampling.
- 1.51 Academic staff should be encouraged by their Heads of Department to participate in staff development activities relating both to traditional marking and grading practices, and to new approaches to assessment.

2. PROCEDURES GOVERNING THE APPOINTMENT OF EXAMINERS

- 2.1 Ordinance 17 (Examiners and Examinations) states that examinations for degrees, diplomas or certificates are the responsibility of Boards of Examiners comprising the Internal and External Examiners for each of the subjects or groups of subjects included in the scope of the examination. In every subject or group of subjects in all final examinations (i.e. where the award of degrees is confirmed and degree classifications determined), there must be at least two examiners, one at least of whom must not be a member of the academic staff of the University.
- 2.2 Boards of Examiners are empowered to make recommendations to the Senate for the award of degrees, diplomas and certificates.

External Examiners

- 2.3 External Examiners are appointed by Senate on the recommendation of the Academic Policy Committee.
- 2.4 The Academic Policy Committee receives recommendations from departments for the appointment of individuals as External Examiners (see 2.9 and 2.10 below for the role of the Vice-Chancellor's Advisory Committee in the scrutiny process). In making recommendations for appointment, departments should have regard to the following:
- only persons of seniority and experience who are able to command authority in the relevant discipline should be recommended for appointment
 - individuals who have not served before as external examiners should where possible serve alongside more experienced examiners for at least part of their period of service. The University recognises that this may not always be possible at postgraduate level.
 - in order to have sufficient time for the proper performance of their duties, individuals are expected to hold not more than two concurrent External Examinerships at first degree level, and not more than two concurrent External Examiners appointments at postgraduate level (including their appointment at Leicester)
 - an External Examiner should not be appointed from a department in an institution where a member of the University department is serving as an examiner, except where this is unavoidable because the subject is taught in only a very small number of institutions, or where there is deemed to be little or no overlap of responsibilities (for example, between undergraduate and postgraduate examining); in all such circumstances a special case must be made by the Head of Department when the appointment is recommended.
 - an External Examiner should not normally be succeeded by an examiner drawn from his/her institution
 - former members of staff should not be invited to become External Examiners until at least three years have elapsed since their departure, or such longer period as may be necessary to ensure that they are not involved in moderating the work of students whom they might have taught
 - care should be taken to ensure that in all other respects, the independence of the External Examiner is not compromised (for example, individuals who are currently engaged in collaborative research activities with members of staff in the department should not normally be selected)

- care should be taken to ensure that any additional responsibilities or duties undertaken by an External Examiner during the period of appointment do not compromise or conflict with the core role of examining (for this reason, serving External Examiners are not invited to serve as assessors on internal academic review panels or programme approval panels)
 - External Examiners drawn from outside the higher education system, for example from industry or the professions, may be selected in certain circumstances, but because of the need to compare subject standards across the higher education sector, such individuals should not be asked to serve as sole examiners unless the course concerned is highly vocational.
- 2.5 The number of External Examiners for any particular degree programme must be sufficient to cover the full range of the syllabus. More than one External Examiner will be required where there is a large number of students or where the degree programme is broadly based. Wherever possible, appointments should be phased.
 - 2.6 External Examiners for courses validated by the University in associated institutions, or franchised to other institutions, or offered in association with other institutions, must be external both to the university and to the institution concerned.
 - 2.7 Recommendations for appointment must be made using a nomination form obtainable from the Quality Office or the Student and Academic Services website (the form is reproduced as Appendix XI to this Code). This form requires the nominee to provide information to assist in the assessment of 2.4 above. The relevant Head of Department (or School) is required to endorse each nomination.
 - 2.8 Potential External Examiners should be given sufficient information about their role and the University's requirements in order for them to make an informed decision about whether to accept the appointment.
 - 2.9 Prior to its submission to the Academic Policy Committee, each nomination is vetted by the Vice-Chancellor's Advisory Committee in order to monitor University-wide compliance with this Code and to obtain an overview of the overall standard of appointments. VCAC may refer back to departments for further information any nomination which appears problematic, and in exceptional circumstances may refuse to endorse a nomination.
 - 2.10 General endorsement by VCAC does not imply that academic approval of the appointment has been given. Only the Academic Policy Committee has this power, and it may engage in such further investigation as may be required before an appointment is recommended to Senate for approval.
 - 2.11 As the appointment of External Examiners also requires the approval of Senate (as specified in Ordinances 10(8) and 17(3)), formal letters of appointment are not issued until Senate has approved specific recommendations. Heads of Department are advised to make this time-lag clear to prospective examiners when discussing the appointment with them.
 - 2.12 New External Examiners should wherever possible be appointed before the examiners they are due to replace have completed their periods of service. Every effort should be made to ensure that vacancies do not occur during which a subject or course is without an External Examiner.
 - 2.13 Support for the operation of the External Examiner process is provided by the Quality Office. A single budget for undergraduate External Examiners' fees is fixed

annually and held centrally by the Academic Registrar. It is assigned to departments annually on a subject-by-subject basis, utilising a scheme approved in 2005 by the (then) Standing Committee of Deans, summarised as follows:

£200 flat rate payment for each examiner
£10 per finalist

There is a fee of £250 for non-subject based External Examiners (for example, for the B.A. degree in Combined Studies).

Departments are consulted as to the distribution of the fee between their examiners, and the examiners are notified of the agreed sum by the Examinations Office. The fee is paid to the examiner upon receipt of confirmation from the Vice-Chancellor's Office that a report has been submitted.

Postgraduate Taught and Distance Learning Students

A budget for External Examiners fees is fixed annually and held centrally, under the control of the Academic Registrar. Notification of the fees payable to individual examiners is undertaken by the Quality Office in consultation with departments. Separate budgets are held by the appropriate Departments for distance-learning courses. All processing of appointments, reports and claims forms is undertaken by the Quality Office. The fee is paid to the examiner upon confirmation from the Vice-Chancellor's Office that a report has been submitted.

The fees for external examiners for postgraduate courses are summarised as follows:

£100 flat rate payment for each examiner
£17 per FTE registered on the course

- 2.14 External Examiners who fail to meet the requirements of the office (for example, by not producing written reports, or not attending scheduled meetings) may be asked by the Vice-Chancellor to tender their resignation.
- 2.15 The expenses for External Examiners for campus-based undergraduate and taught postgraduate programmes are paid from central funds by the Quality Office, on production of a claim form and receipts. External Examiners fees for all distance-learning programmes are paid by the appropriate Department or Centre via the Quality Office on production of a claim form and receipts.

Internal Examiners

- 2.16 Lists of Internal Examiners for each programme are compiled annually by the Quality Office for approval by the Academic Policy Committee.
- 2.17 Internal Examiners must be members of the academic staff of the University or designated as Recognised Teachers of an Associated Institution (under Ordinance 29). Under Ordinance 17(4) individuals with a substantial teaching role who do not fall into these categories may be approved as Internal Examiners on the authority of Senate. A member of staff in one department who is examining for a degree course in another department is still an Internal Examiner (internal describes a relationship with the University as a whole, not with any particular part of it).
- 2.19 Academic staff have a contractual obligation to undertake examining duties under their terms and conditions of appointment.

Additional Examiners

- 2.20 The status of Additional Examiner is offered to those who, because they provide assistance with teaching a particular course, may also be called upon to assist with the examining of that course. The category includes staff on associate contracts, research or other-related staff, honorary lecturers and associate tutors. The names of Additional Examiners are reported to Academic Policy Committee alongside those of the internal examiners.

Postgraduate Students

- 2.21 Postgraduate students may be employed by departments to assist with teaching and assessment on undergraduate programmes, and postgraduate research students may be employed to assist with teaching and assessment on taught postgraduate programmes. The employment of students in this capacity should take account of the following restrictions:
- postgraduate students may not serve as members of Boards of Examiners
 - postgraduate students may not act as sole markers of any piece of work which contributes to the final degree classification
 - responsibility for teaching and examining rests entirely with the academic staff of the University, who are held accountable to their Head of Department for the actions of any persons employed to teach or examine on their behalf
 - formal feedback to students on their performance in University examinations should be provided by members of the academic staff.
- 2.22 Training in marking and grading practices should be provided to postgraduate students involved in assessment, and their activities should be closely monitored.

3. CODE OF PRACTICE ON EXTERNAL EXAMINING

Purposes of the External Examiner system

- 3.1 The University endorses the following description of the function of the External Examiner system and the role of External Examiners contained in section 4 of the QAA's Code of Practice. This code is under review following the publication of the QAA's revised Quality Code.

The external examining function should help institutions to ensure that:

- *The academic standard of each award and its component parts is set and maintained by the awarding institution at the appropriate level, and that the standards of student performance are properly judged against this;*
- *The assessment process measures student achievement appropriately against the intended outcomes of the programme, and is rigorous, fairly operated and in line with the institution's policies and regulations;*
- *Institutions are able to compare the standards of their awards with those of other higher education institutions.*

An institution should ask its external examiners, in their expert judgement, to report on:

- i. whether the academic standards set for its awards, or part thereof are appropriate*
- ii. the extent to which its assessment processes are rigorous, ensure equity of treatment for students and have been fairly conducted within institutional regulations and guidance*
- iii. the standards of student performance in the programmes or parts of programmes which they have been appointed to examine;*
- iv. where appropriate, the comparability of the standards and student achievements with those in some other higher education institutions;*
- v. good practice they have identified.*

Period of service

- 3.2 External Examiners will normally be invited to hold office for four-years, with extensions to five years being disallowed in all but the most urgent or extraordinary circumstances. A central register of appointments is maintained by Student and Academic Services.

Briefing of examiners

- 3.3 The Departmental Examinations Officer is responsible, under the direction of the Head of Department, for providing the External Examiner with the following information, both at the beginning of the period of office and either annually thereafter or by arrangement with the External Examiner (the examiner's preferences in this matter being the deciding factor):

- general information about the department and its courses (e.g. departmental handbook);

- specific information about the subject/course to be examined, including:
 - course handbook
 - course descriptions and programme specifications
 - overall course aims and learning outcomes
 - relevant syllabus details (down to module level, if appropriate or if requested)
 - schemes of assessment
 - departmental marking practices (e.g. policies on blind-marking, double-marking, sampling, etc.)
 - grading criteria, including any departmental definitions of the attributes associated with the award of a particular class of degree
 - Special features, such as periods spent abroad or industrial placements.
- information about the role and duties of the External Examiner in relation to the specific course or subject area (see 3.6 to 3.16 below);

The Departmental Examinations Officer is also responsible for arranging the timing of meetings of Boards of Examiners in consultation with the External Examiners. External Examiners should be given as much notice as possible of proposed dates of meetings.

- 3.4 The Departmental Examinations Officer or Course Director (as appropriate) should ensure that the External Examiner is informed about any changes to syllabus content, marking procedures or schemes of assessment as soon as they occur.
- 3.5 For all taught programmes the University's Quality Office is responsible, under the direction of the Academic Registrar, for supplying each External Examiner with:
- the initial letter of appointment and subsequent letters of re-appointment;
 - notification about fees and expenses and procedures for claiming these;
 - a copy of the Programme Regulations;
 - a copy of this Code of Practice on Examining;
 - a copy of the report(s) of the retiring External Examiner(s) and the Head of Department's ensuing observations;
 - information about the presentation of the examiner's annual report to the Vice-Chancellor.

Participation in assessment procedures

Approval of draft examination papers

- 3.6 All draft question papers for modules which contribute to the assessment of the final assessment of an award should be sent to an External Examiner for approval. In appropriate cases External Examiners may be asked to set or complete some questions.
- 3.7 In some subjects, External Examiners may be asked to scrutinise and test model answers.
- 3.8 The External Examiner's involvement in the vetting of September undergraduate Examination papers, and the timetable for this, should be established by the

department during the initial briefing process and should accord with the requirements in 3.6 above.

Assessment of examination scripts, dissertations, projects and other work

- 3.9 Departments should be mindful of the need to keep the burden of External Examiners' work within reasonable bounds by means of the judicious selection of material for scrutiny. The guiding principle for selection should be that the examiners should have sufficient evidence to confirm comparability of standards to those in other institutions and to determine that internal marking and classifications are consistent and fair.
- 3.10 Although an External Examiner has the right to see all examination scripts and any other work which contributes to the final assessment, it is unreasonable to require an examiner to do so, except where there are very few students involved.
- 3.11 Where a department makes a selection of scripts to be sent to the External Examiner, the principles for such selection should be agreed with the examiner in advance.
- 3.12 External Examiners should see a sample of finalists' scripts and relevant assessed work from the top, middle and the bottom of the range. They should normally be sent, or should see at the time the Board of Examiners meets, all scripts and relevant assessed work of borderline candidates and of candidates assessed internally as first class or as failures. In the case of postgraduate programmes the same principles apply. External Examiners should see, either prior to or at the meeting of the Board of Examiners, all scripts and relevant assessed work of borderline candidates, or those assessed internally as distinction level or as failures.
- 3.13 Dissertations and other assessed work should be sent to the External Examiner as soon as they are available. For undergraduate programmes, this should where possible be before the commencement of the final written examinations. External Examiners should not be expected to scrutinise a large volume of such work in the short time available between the end of the examination period and the meeting of the relevant Board of Examiners, unless time for this is set aside during the examiner's visit.
- 3.14 Requirements for the participation of External Examiners in *vivas*, general meetings with students, oral examinations to test language skills or any other face-to-face activity should be clearly communicated in advance of the visit.

Comments and Advice

- 3.15 External Examiners are encouraged to comment on the assessment process and schemes of marking and classification. The participation of an External Examiner in the devising of such schemes may be beneficial, and in some cases essential.
- 3.16 External Examiners may often be able to give valuable advice to Internal Examiners, especially the inexperienced, either directly or through the Head of Department, and are encouraged to do so.
- 3.17 Departments and External Examiners should use any opportunities afforded by the visits of External Examiners to discuss the structure and content of courses and assessment procedures. Departments may also invite their External Examiners to visit on a separate occasion to discuss new course proposals, or may ask for their written comments. Any comments or suggestions made by the External Examiner should be discussed by the department and responded to in writing.

For the External Examiner's role as a member of the Board of Examiners see Section 5: Procedures Governing the Conduct of Boards of Examiners

Written reports

- 3.18 External Examiners are required to provide a report to the Vice-Chancellor in each of the years of their period of service. For undergraduate programmes it is expected that these reports will normally be submitted immediately after the Midsummer examination period. For postgraduate programmes these reports should be submitted as soon as possible following the end of the academic year or final exam board. An annual report relating to the preceding calendar year must be submitted by no later than 31 January the following year.
- 3.19 The University does not wish unduly to restrict the scope of the comments of its External Examiners by requiring them to complete a standard report form. It does require, however, confirmation in the form of a checklist that the administration of assessment arrangements has been properly conducted, and examiners are therefore asked to complete the form supplied to them by the Quality Office and attach it to their reports (a sample copy of the note is attached to this Code as Appendix XII).
- 3.20 The report itself need not duplicate any of the matters covered in the checklist unless there are areas of concern, or where special commendation is appropriate.
- 3.21 In order to assist in the scrutiny of the reports, the University asks examiners to adhere, where possible to a structure in which the following points (or as many of them as apply) are covered:
- (a) Scope of examinations and examination methods
Examiners are asked to confirm that the assessment procedures of the department/course are appropriate to the subject matter, and are relevant, properly demanding and designed to allow for the display of knowledge at a level which compares favourably with other institutions offering similar provision.
 - (b) Marking standards/degree classifications/conduct of vivas
Undergraduate Programmes
Examiners are invited to comment on the marking standards and grading practices operating in the department. Any concerns about the distribution of degree classes, and the performance of students at the top and bottom end of the ranges should be noted.
Postgraduate Programmes
Examiners are invited to comment on the marking standards operating in relation to the course including the use of monitoring devices (such as double marking).
 - (c) Student performance
Comments on the quality of students' work, including presentation and style, are welcomed.

(d) Course aims and objectives, structure and syllabus

Examiners are encouraged to comment on these in the light of their impact on examination procedures and performance, and in a more general sense as they relate to national standards, including the QAA's Qualifications Framework and, where applicable, subject benchmarks. Observations on course literature, departmental handbooks, etc., are helpful.

(e) Teaching methods and teaching quality

The University welcomes the comments of examiners on the quality of teaching, to the extent that this is reflected in the examining process and in the performance of its students. Similarly, any observations on the effectiveness or otherwise of teaching methods, particularly where these are new or distinctive, will be of great assistance.

(f) General issues

Examiners are invited to comment on any issue relevant to their experiences at the University which is not covered in the checklist or in the list above. This is particularly helpful as an overview at the end of an examiner's period of service.

- 3.22 External Examiners should bear in mind that their reports are increasingly likely to be seen by student representatives, both at departmental and University level. Any references to individual students (relating, for example, to performance in oral examinations) would be edited out before this stage but it would be helpful if the identification of individuals could be recorded in the report to the Vice-Chancellor in an appendix.
- 3.23 Fees are paid to External Examiners upon submission of the report. Expenses are paid upon the submission of a claim form. Claim forms should be submitted to the Quality Office.
- 3.24 The University reserves the right to return to an External Examiner for further elaboration any report which is too slight or uninformative to serve the monitoring purpose for which it is intended.
- 3.25 The reports are not regarded as confidential, therefore if an External Examiner wishes to raise a matter in confidence with the Vice-Chancellor, this should be communicated in a separate letter.

See also Section 6: Procedures Governing the Consideration of External Examiners' Reports)
--

4. CODE OF PRACTICE ON INTERNAL EXAMINING

Responsibilities of Heads of Department

- 4.1 Heads of Department are responsible for ensuring that both undergraduate and postgraduate examining within the department is conducted in accordance with this Code of Practice. They may delegate the administration of examinations to Departmental Examinations Officers or postgraduate Course Directors as appropriate.
- 4.2 Heads of Department are required to ensure, through their Departmental Examinations Officers or postgraduate Course Directors as appropriate that:
- (a) External Examiners are properly briefed (see Code of Practice on External Examining);
 - (b) Internal Examiners are informed in a clear and timely manner about their specific responsibilities for setting papers, invigilating, marking (in relation both to formal written examinations and continuous assessment), attending meetings of Boards of Examiners, and providing feedback to students on performance in examination and assessments;
 - (c) training is provided in departmental marking and grading practices for new academic staff, additional examiners and, if appropriate, postgraduate teaching assistants;
 - (d) sampling of marking is undertaken at a level which is deemed to be sufficient to ensure that departmental marking and grading procedures are being properly applied.
 - (e) all markers are informed about schemes of assessment and any changes to these as they occur;
 - (f) a report of the department's consideration of its External Examiners' reports is submitted to each of the External Examiners concerned, including a notification of any consequential changes to departmental procedures;
 - (g) any proposed procedural changes to assessment practices which fall within the remit of external professional bodies are notified to those bodies for approval or for information, as appropriate;
 - (h) robust and secure back-up procedures which comply with the requirements of the Data Protection Act 1998 are in place when marks are recorded, stored or transmitted electronically
 - (i) there is appropriate liaison with the Examinations Office and the Registry about all aspects of the conduct of the examinations, including the provision of information relating to timetabling, invigilation, special requirements and the return of marks by agreed deadlines.

Responsibilities of Internal Examiners:

4.3 Internal examiners are required to ensure:

- (a) that unless they are on study leave or on other approved leave of absence, they are available to undertake such examining duties as may be specified by their Head of Department;
- (b) that they are familiar with the schemes of assessment, regulations and codes governing the examinations they are required to mark;
- (c) that they adhere to agreed departmental marking and grading practices;
- (d) that they comply with University procedures on anonymous marking.
- (e) that they comply with agreed deadlines for the setting of question papers, the marking of assessed work and the marking of examination scripts.

4.4 All staff involved in examination and assessment must apply a high level of security when transporting and storing question papers, answer books and mark sheets, and must comply with Examination Office procedures relating to such matters.

5. PROCEDURES GOVERNING THE CONDUCT OF BOARDS OF EXAMINERS

Membership of the Board of Examiners

- 5.1 Each Board of Examiners is empowered to appoint its own Chairman.
- 5.2 The membership of Boards of Examiners is restricted to the Internal and External Examiners. Additional Examiners may attend meetings only on the authority of the Chairman of the Board, and if they do attend they may not vote.
- 5.3 External Examiners, as full members of the relevant Board of Examiners, have the right to be present at all examiners' meetings at which significant decisions are being taken with regard to the specialisms or courses for which they have responsibility (including the meetings for the setting of papers, although this matter is normally dealt with by post).
- 5.4 There is no requirement that External Examiners should attend a Board of Examiners meeting following the First Semester assessment period but departments are held to be responsible for ensuring that arrangements are in place to ensure that these examinations are appropriately moderated.
- 5.5 External Examiners are required to be present at the meetings of Boards of Examiners where degrees, diplomas and certificates are awarded and degree classifications agreed. If an External Examiner exceptionally cannot attend a meeting where his or her presence is formally required, he or she should be available for consultation by telephone, fax or e-mail.
- 5.6 The University has no formal quorum governing the attendance of Internal Examiners at Boards of Examiners, but given the importance of the decisions taken by examining boards, it is recommended that at least three-quarters of the Internal Examiners in the subject should be present when degree classifications are being determined. Heads of Department are authorised to make attendance at Boards of Examiners compulsory if this facilitates the good conduct of the meeting.

Conduct of Meetings

- 5.7 Departments should agree in advance of a meeting of a Board of Examiners:
 - the format of mark sheets
 - the nature of the material which will be made available to the Board in advance of the meeting and/or on the day of the meeting
 - methods of dealing with evidence of extenuating circumstances (see 5.15 to 5.17 below)
 - procedures for dealing with borderline cases
 - arrangements for *viva voce* examinations
 - procedures for the declaration of the personal interest, involvement or relationship of members with any student under consideration.
- 5.8 The Departmental Examinations Officer (for undergraduate programmes) or for postgraduate programmes, where appropriate, the Course Director, is responsible for ensuring that arrangements have been made for room bookings, catering, secretarial support, etc.

- 5.9 Meetings of Boards of Examiners should be scheduled to ensure that the University timetable for the return of marks to the Registry in mid-summer and September can be met. Furthermore, with regards to postgraduate programmes, meetings of Boards of Examiners should be scheduled to ensure that they take place within a reasonable time following the end of the course to ensure that pass lists can be submitted to the Registry in good time to allow candidates to attend the next scheduled degree congregation.
- 5.10 The Chair of the Board should aim to ensure that sufficient time is allowed for the full consideration of all difficult or borderline cases.
- 5.11 The views of an External Examiner are deemed to be particularly important in confirming the mark to be awarded for a disputed unit of assessment and the final classification to be derived from the array of marks of a particular candidate. Where agreement on such cases cannot be reached, the following procedures should be observed:
- If the External Examiners disagree with a unanimous departmental view on a particular student, the Chair of the Board should attempt to explore the reasons for the conflict and to ensure that the External Examiners are aware of relevant features of the scheme of assessment, University regulations or departmental custom and practice. If no resolution can be reached, the Board should normally apply the recommendation which most favours the student.
 - If the Internal Examiners are divided in their views, they must defer to the view of the External Examiner or, where there are several External Examiners, to the view of the majority of the Externals.
 - If a variety of views are being expressed and there is no clear direction from the External Examiners, the Board should vote on the case, in which case an overall majority view should be sought.
- 5.12 If *viva voce* examinations are not a compulsory element in the final assessment, they should be held only in order to allow a candidate an opportunity of improving his or her position. Vivas should be conducted by an External Examiner, who should be assisted by one or more Internal Examiners.
- 5.13 For every formal University examination, a list of successful candidates must be approved by the relevant Board of Examiners and signed by the Chair. At undergraduate level the signature of all the External Examiners must be appended to final lists of degree results as evidence that they accept the classifications (in the case of joint and Combined Studies degrees, the signature of an External Examiner should be appended to each of the lists of final-year marks which contribute to the degree classification). For postgraduate programmes the signature of the external examiner(s) should be appended to all lists which make recommendations for University awards. A further list, outlining the action to be taken in respect of candidates who are not being recommended for an award should be agreed and submitted to the Registry to be forwarded for Senate approval.
- 5.14 A written record of the proceedings of Boards of Examiners should be maintained and kept in the department. This record should include for each meeting:
- a list of members in attendance
 - one set of mark-sheets showing any revisions and alterations made by the Board
 - the relevant scheme of assessment

- a note of any decisions taken notwithstanding the normal operation of the scheme of assessment
- a note of any close borderline decisions and *viva voce* arrangements.

Consideration of Extenuating Circumstances

- 5.15 There is no University requirement for student anonymity to be retained beyond the marking stage, so most Boards of Examiners will consider students by name. In order to preserve the privacy of individuals, to prevent any special pleading and to streamline the Board's procedures, a mitigating circumstances sub-group normally meets prior to the main Board in order to consider cases and formulate recommendations to steer the Board's deliberations. (It is accepted that in very small departments or for very small programmes being separately examined, such a meeting may not be necessary.)
- 5.16 Where a student's circumstances fall outside the categories which the sub-group is authorised to consider, the case should always be discussed by the full Board.
- 5.17 The University Regulation governing the notification of mitigating circumstances is included in Appendix VII.

6. PROCEDURES GOVERNING THE CONSIDERATION OF EXTERNAL EXAMINERS' REPORTS

- 6.1 External Examiners are asked in their letters of appointment to submit an annual report to the Vice-Chancellor. The receipt of the report triggers the payment of the External Examiner's fee.
- 6.2 The Vice-Chancellor reads each report and sends a letter of thanks to the examiner. Occasionally he comments on a matter raised in the report.
- 6.3 The Vice-Chancellor sends the report to the relevant Head of Department, and asks for a response. He may draw attention to a specific point raised in the report and ask for an immediate comment on this. All correspondence is copied to the Academic Registrar.
- 6.4 The Vice-Chancellor's request to Heads of Department contains a reminder that the reports should be considered at a departmental meeting, and they should be circulated to all the internal examiners, including any academic staff outside the main department. Departments are expected to have mechanisms in place which allow for discussion about the issues raised in the reports and ensure that any remedial action can be taken swiftly.
- 6.5 The External Examiner should be notified by the department of the way in which his or her recommendations are being carried forward.
- 6.6 A copy of each report and the departmental response, appropriately anonymised to remove any references to individual students, should be referred to the departmental Student Staff Committee (or its equivalent) and any substantive comments from this source incorporated into the departmental response. If the Student Staff/ Committee meeting takes place after the Head of Department's response to the Vice-Chancellor, a supplementary report on any significant issues identified by the student body (if any) should be sent separately to the Vice-Chancellor.
- 6.7 The Academic Registrar sends a copy of each External Examiner's report to the Head of the relevant College as soon as it arrives from the Vice-Chancellor in order to ensure that any urgent matters are known about and are being addressed.
- 6.8 Heads of Department are asked to send the Academic Registrar a copy of their response to the Vice-Chancellor, and these, together with the reports, are presented in their entirety for consideration by a panel of Academic Directors of the Colleges, which reports to the Academic Policy Committee. The departmental response may be in the form of a memorandum, a report, or the minutes of an examining board or staff meeting.
- 6.9 At the meeting of the panel of Academic Directors, the Directors are asked to comment on the reports relating to their Colleges. The panel then identifies any matters of general concern and a report on its conclusions is incorporated into the minutes of the meeting.
- 6.10 The panel's reports for both undergraduate and taught postgraduate programmes are submitted to the Academic Policy Committee for consideration and from thence referred to College Academic Committees where required.
- 6.11 In addition to input into assessment practices, External Examiners' reports are used for academic planning at departmental level, for internal periodic developmental reviews, and for audits and reviews conducted by the Quality Assurance Agency.

They may, at the Vice-Chancellor's discretion, be submitted to any external bodies conducting a review of the subject area or of the institution.

- 6.12 The Quality Office sends each new External Examiner copies of the retiring Examiner's reports and the departmental responses.

7. CODE OF PRACTICE ON PLAGIARISM

(applicable to both undergraduate and postgraduate students)

Induction

- 7.1 All departmental handbooks should incorporate the University statement on academic honesty and the regulation on academic dishonesty, or should draw students' attention to other departmental handouts which contain this information. Handbooks should also provide details of the departmental and University support offered to students who are in any doubt about plagiarism or who require assistance with writing techniques.
- 7.2 For students on taught programmes, induction at the beginning of each module should cover any departmental expectations relating to seminar work, group project work, computer assignments or any other academic activity where students might be required to work together. Students should be left in no doubt about the extent to which collaboration is either required or forbidden, both in the completion of any research required by the module, and in its writing-up.
- 7.3 Where possible, students should be provided with an opportunity for discussing the issue of plagiarism and asking questions about departmental policies. They should be notified about the use of Turnitin, the JISC Plagiarism Detection Service, and encouraged to consult the on-line JISC Advisory Service, which contains a wealth of information and guidance on avoiding plagiarism (<http://www.jiscpas.ac.uk/>).
- 7.4 It should not be assumed that students at either undergraduate or postgraduate level enter the University with an existing knowledge of academic conventions, of what plagiarism is, or of how they can avoid it. Instructions about the use of primary and secondary sources, bibliographical techniques and referencing should be presented in clear and unambiguous language and should include as many examples as possible drawn from the subject being studied. Illustrations of good and bad practice should use sources which students are likely to recognise as relevant to their studies.
- 7.5 Special induction procedures may be required for students whose first language is not English, and particular care should be taken to ensure that students whose cultures encourage deference to expert opinion understand that repetition of the words and thoughts of such experts without acknowledgement of their source constitutes plagiarism. All students also need to understand that they are at times expected to challenge received opinion, and that high grades are awarded to those who can demonstrate mastery of the subject and independence of mind.
- 7.6 For distance-learning students, departments must provide very clear written guidelines which take account of the varying cultures in which the students are living and working. Associate tutors should be made aware of the need to encourage discussion about plagiarism in study groups and other support meetings. Feedback on any written work which displays evidence of direct plagiarism or undue reliance on third party material should clearly state where the problem lies and how this should be remedied.
- 7.7 Research training programmes offered to all new research students provide the means of ensuring that advanced postgraduate students (APGs) acquire a thorough ground in the scholarly conventions applicable to their discipline. The review of student progress and attainment which precedes transfer from APG to full Ph.D. student status should thoroughly test this knowledge.

Early registration period

- 7.8 The early period of each student's registration should be regarded as developmental for the purpose of instilling good academic practices. For undergraduate students, the submission of the first piece of written work provides an opportunity for the identification of any problems, and the detection of plagiarism at this stage should be dealt with by means of counselling from academic and personal tutors. For students on taught Master's courses, procedures should be put in place which allow the first written submission to be used developmentally, notwithstanding the fact that the work may contribute to the final assessment. This may be achieved by:
- assigning a relatively small number of marks to the assignment
 - allowing an immediate resubmission where students have failed to comply with good practice
 - allowing students to submit a first draft of the assignment for departmental comment.
- 7.9 Particular attention should be paid to the possibility of plagiarism in the marking of first assignments for postgraduate courses, where very limited opportunities exist for remedial action. Where possible, highly experienced markers should be used for these first pieces of work to improve the chances of identifying plagiarised material. It should be borne in mind that plagiarism which only comes to light at the end of the course cannot be dealt with in the developmental way described above, but only through the application of penalties.

Identifying plagiarism

- 7.10. Plagiarism can be identified by markers through:
- recognising familiar passages (for example from books or articles in reading lists), or the verbatim copying of lecture handouts
 - observing marked improvements in written style and/or linguistic competence
 - noting the random juxtaposition of paragraphs with differing authorial styles (linking sentences written by the student will sometimes be used to mask this)
 - recognising similarities between students' work, providing possible evidence of collusion or unauthorised copying
 - scrutinising 'cheat sites' on the web on the topic of the assignment in order to see the potential source of purchased essays
 - using the JISC Turnitin software.

Procedures for discouraging plagiarism

- 7.11 When the developmental period is over, the onus falls on the student to comply with departmental requirements and University Regulations. In order to reinforce the message that the student must take responsibility for his or her actions, departments should require students to complete a cover sheet to accompany the submission of key pieces of assessed work (the department having first determined the pieces of work to which this requirement should apply). The cover sheet should include the following:
- (a) Name of student
Module title and number
Title of work
Number of words

- (b) A reference to any departmental material explaining the nature of plagiarism and rules on the presentation of written work where applicable, and to the University's Regulation on Academic Dishonesty (e.g. 'Please refer to the Department's Guidelines on the Presentation of Written Work, pp 13-17, and to the University Regulation on Academic Dishonesty contained in the Departmental Handbook before you sign this declaration')
 - (c) This statement: *I confirm that I have read and understood the Department's instructions on the presentation of written work and the University's Regulation on Academic Dishonesty and I declare that the submission attached to this statement and presented to the University of Leicester for assessment complies with University requirements and is my own work.*
 - (d) The student's signature
 - (e) The date of submission
- 7.12 Departments should assist students by specifying course requirements in a clear and accessible manner, and should where appropriate periodically reissue any relevant instructions or guidelines (for example, in second- and third-year handbooks where these exist). Some departments issue specific guidance on final-year dissertations and projects, or on Master's degree dissertation preparation, and this is recommended practice if for these submissions students are expected to comply rigorously with academic conventions.
- 7.13 Departments should also continue to publicise to campus-based students the existence of Student Development, and to reassure students that advice can be sought from academic and support staff at any stage in their studies. The service also offers web-based support (<http://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/ssds>).
- 7.14 Departments should ensure that they are not inadvertently putting pressure on students by making unreasonable demands on them, particularly in relation to deadlines for the submission of written work. Weak students may respond to such pressure by cheating.
- 7.15 Essay/project titles should be reviewed periodically, both in relation to the topics covered and the style of the questions, to ensure that where possible a personal response from the student is encouraged, not just a repetition of received opinion.

Poor scholarship

- 7.16 Inexperienced students may submit work which inadvertently includes plagiarised material. The first test in determining whether plagiarism penalties should be applied is therefore for the marker to assess whether an appropriate response to the inclusion of third party material, or to poor referencing or an incomplete bibliography, is to mark the work at its face value, with the penalty for the student being the award of a low or failed mark (the latter being redeemable by resit). Where there is any doubt about whether a piece of work falls into this category, the programme leader or Head of Department should be consulted.
- 7.17 A written warning should be issued to students who fall into this category i.e. who fail because their work is derivative or poorly referenced, alerting them to the danger of continuing with unsound scholarly practices, and their attention should be drawn to departmental and University guidelines on avoiding plagiarism.

Pursuing a plagiarism investigation

7.18 Where plagiarism is suspected or discovered in circumstances where there can be no reasonable doubt that a student understands (or has been given the means of understanding) his or her academic responsibilities, the following procedures should apply:

- the marker should refer the piece of work to a colleague for an informal second opinion
- if plagiarism is confirmed beyond reasonable doubt, the Head of Department should then be consulted, together with the Departmental Examinations Officer in the case of an undergraduate student
- the Head of Department should authorise a formal re-marking of the piece of work in question, and at the same time initiate a review of all the assessed work submitted by the student concerned in order to establish whether other offences have been committed
- the External Examiner should be consulted as appropriate, and should normally always be involved in the examination of cases relating to final-year undergraduate and postgraduate students
- the Head of Department should then determine which of the following procedures should apply:
 - referral of the case to a small panel established to make recommendations to the Board of Examiners (this is likely to be an appropriate strategy in large departments)
 - direct referral of the case to the Board of Examiners

The student should be presented with the evidence of the plagiarism, either during an interview or in written correspondence, and asked to provide an explanation or commentary. Care should be taken to ensure that any concerns raised in the student's mind about the department's investigations do not jeopardise his/her ability to perform in any written examinations taking place at the same time. Where suspected plagiarism is identified during a final undergraduate examination, it is therefore recommended that the matter be pursued immediately after the student's examinations have finished. A *viva voce* examination may be held at this stage in order to substantiate a claim that plagiarism has taken place.

7.19 In reaching a conclusion about the appropriate method of dealing with a case of plagiarism, Heads of Department may seek the advice of the Academic Registrar. In order to ensure that departments interpret this Code, and the Regulation on Academic Honesty which underpins it, in a consistent manner, paragraphs 7.20 to 7.23 below set out the range of penalties applicable to cases of plagiarism and the circumstances in which they will normally be applied.

The penalties below are those that should be applied in clear-cut cases. It is recognised that course structures vary, that students will have mark profiles which do not match the assumptions underpinning these penalties, and that special circumstances of varying types may apply. Boards of Examiners should therefore review each case carefully in order to ensure that the penalties are appropriate to the specific offence.

It should be noted that in cases of very severe plagiarism, even where this is a 'first offence', then it is appropriate to utilise the more severe penalties straight away. For example, at undergraduate level, in a case of the submission of an entire piece of work written by another it would be appropriate to award a mark

of zero. Where this piece of work is part of an assessment that counts towards the degree classification the down-grading of the degree class, if not occurring automatically, should be considered.

Penalties for plagiarism

7.20 Undergraduate students

First offence: Failure of the module, resit allowed, severe written warning

Second and third offences: A mark of 0 for the module.
Resubmission required for the purposes of progression

Possible downgrading of degree class if the offences are for modules which contribute to the final classification, and if the normal application of the standard scheme of assessment incorporating marks of 0 does not automatically lead to a downgrading. In applying this penalty, Boards of Examiners will have due regard to the significance of the plagiarised work in the overall scheme of assessment.

Fourth offence or multiple* simultaneous offences after the second offence: Termination of course

[*In this context 'multiple' means plagiarism in more than one separate module and plagiarism applying to double modules of 30 or 40 credits].

7.21 Taught postgraduate students

Where written assignments are submitted consecutively:

First offence in the taught element of the programme: Failure of the module, resit allowed, severe written warning

Second offence in the taught element of the programme: Mark of 0 for the module. Resubmission required for the purposes of progression

Subsequent offence in the taught element of the programme: Termination of course

Where a number of written assignments are submitted simultaneously (for example, at the end of the first semester)

One offence in the taught element of the programme: Failure in the module, resit allowed, severe written warning

Two offences in the taught element of the programme: Mark of 0 for each module. Resubmission required for the purposes of progression

Three or more offences in: Termination of course

the taught element of the programme

All programmes:

Plagiarism in the dissertation without a previous offence:	Failure with downgrading to Postgraduate Diploma
--	--

Plagiarism in the dissertation with a previous offence:	Termination of course
---	-----------------------

7.22 Research students

First offence during the development of the thesis	Severe written warning
--	------------------------

Plagiarism in the submitted thesis	Normally failure without the right of resubmission
------------------------------------	--

7.23 It should be noted that in cases of very serious plagiarism, even where this is a 'first offence', then it is appropriate to utilise the more severe penalties straight away. For example, at undergraduate level, in a case of the submission of an entire piece of work written by another it would be appropriate to award a mark of zero. Where this piece of work is part of an assessment that counts towards the degree classification then down-grading of the degree class, if not occurring automatically, should be considered.

7.24 The appeals procedures for students whose registrations are terminated because of plagiarism will be as for termination on the grounds of failure.

7.25 Marks of zero awarded in respect of plagiarism are recorded on the student's University transcript, and in departmental records, and the offence may be reported to any relevant professional body.

7.26 Where a student is found to have been cheating in written examinations or falsifying results, the case will be referred to the Academic Registrar for consideration under the Code of Student Discipline. The Academic Registrar is authorised to recommend to Senate that its powers held under Ordinance 10(19) to recommend to Council the temporary or permanent exclusion from the University of the student concerned be invoked.

Honours Degree Programmes : General Regulations

1. 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.)
2. 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.
3. The following degree classification mark bands apply to all first degrees awarded by the University):

First Class Honours	70% and above
Upper Second Class Honours	60% - 69%
Lower Second Class Honours	50% - 59%
Third Class Honours	40% - 49%
Pass	35% - 39%
4. The names of successful candidates registered for honours degrees will be presented in five divisions - first class honours, second class honours (upper and lower), third class honours, and pass. The M.B.,Ch.B. degrees may in cases of exceptional merit be awarded with honours, which are not classified.
5. Students demonstrating outstanding proficiency in a final-year oral examination in French, German or Italian may be awarded a distinction in Spoken French, Spoken German or Spoken Italian.
6. Students may be required to read one or two supplementary subjects. Except in the case of the B.A. degree in Modern Language Studies, the level of attainment in the supplementary subject examination(s) will not be considered in the final classification. Course modules for supplementary subjects are the same as those offered as Combined Studies subjects, or are of an equivalent standard.
7. First-degree courses leading to the degree of Bachelor extend over not less than three academic years. First-degree courses leading to the degree of Master extend over not less than four academic years. (Advanced standing may be conferred in accordance with the Regulations for Matriculation as published in the University's General Regulations.)
8. For all full-time degrees 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. The Undergraduate Programme Regulations specify those modules which are core and optional in each semester of each year of course. The Module database, which gives details of module content and workload, is available for consultation in departments, on the University Website and in the University Library and should be read in conjunction with these regulations. A similar modular structure applies to the first two or three years (Phase I) of the courses for the M.B.,Ch.B. degrees and is described in the Course Handbook for those degrees.

Note: Where staffing changes or other unavoidable circumstances necessitate any alterations to the courses set out below, students will be notified by their departments. Not all optional modules will necessarily be available in any one year.

9. The teaching year is divided into two semesters (the First and Second Semesters), which are contained within three terms (the Autumn, Spring and Summer Terms). The First Semester comprises an eleven-week teaching period (preceded by a one-week induction period), followed after the Christmas Vacation by two weeks for examination and assessment. The Second Semester comprises a further ten-week teaching period, followed by six weeks for examination, assessment and preparatory study for the next session. Oral examinations for modern language courses may be held in the final week of the Second Semester.
10. Transfers of course must be effected by means of a change of course form, duly approved and submitted to the Registry by no later than the end of the second week of the First Semester. Transfers of module must be effected by means of a change of module form, duly approved and submitted to the Registry by no later than the end of the second week of the semester in which the module is offered. Transfers from a degree programme to a foundation programme must be effected by means of a change of course form, duly approved in consultation with tutors on the relevant foundation programme and submitted to the Registry normally by no later than the end of the second week of the First Semester and in all cases by no later than the end of the Autumn Term.
11. 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 <http://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/sas2/courses/documentation/1112> and in departmental literature.

First-, Second- and non-finalist Third-Year Assessment (excluding the M.B.,Ch.B. degrees)

12. 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 (but see 13 and 14 below).

Note: The attention of students is drawn to the regulations concerning attendance, work and progress as published in the General Regulations. Students who fail to satisfy departmental attendance and workload requirements may be refused the opportunity of resitting module examinations, or in cases of gross neglect, may have their course terminated.

13. In order to be credited with the modules applying to any one academic year, students must:
 - (i) have satisfied the relevant requirements for each module as set out in (12) above
 - and
 - (ii) have achieved a credit-weighted average mark of 40 per cent or more across all the modules taken in the year
 - and
 - (iii) have achieved a pass mark in each module complying with the designations of pass/fail set out in (14) below.
14. 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 per cent or above). Exceptionally, for the purposes of satisfying the demands of professional bodies, or for some other specifically approved significant academic reason, some modules may be designated as having to be passed at Honours Level.

15. Feedback on First Semester performance will be provided by departments after the First Semester assessment period and at the latest by 28 February each year. At this stage, the results are regarded as provisional and will normally be provided on a pass/fail basis or as an indication that progress is satisfactory, with information about levels of attainment being offered informally through consultation with personal and academic tutors. Official pass lists will be issued after the end of the Second Semester, and departments are at this stage authorised to release the marks obtained for both First- and Second-Semester modules.
16. Students who have not satisfied the module requirements set out in (13) above will have their performance reviewed by the relevant Board of Examiners in June in the light of the results obtained in both the First and Second Semesters. Boards of Examiners will determine 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 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 will be deemed to have failed all modules in which a mark of less than 35 per cent has been obtained unless the University has determined that a specific module must be passed at 40 per cent (see 14 above), in which case in that module only a mark of 39 per cent or less will be deemed to be a fail mark.

The Boards of Examiners will then present to the University's Quality Office the names of those students who are deemed to have failed one or more modules in the course of the academic year. It will be the responsibility of the Quality Office to ratify and communicate all decisions taken by Boards of Examiners, and the responsibility of the University Registry to issue official results, transcripts and certificates.

17. Students who are declared in June to have failed any modules taken during the year may be allowed to present themselves in September of the same year for re-examination in any written examinations associated with those failed modules. Students who have failed or have not completed any elements of assessed course work may be provided by their department with the opportunity of (re) submitting the work before the end of the academic year or by a date specified by their department. 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 in June. The maximum mark which can be obtained in an examination deemed to be a resit is 40 per cent.
18. Students who fail to satisfy the examiners in September will be considered by the relevant Board of Examiners. In the light of their overall performance, the Board may determine that such students should:
 - (a) have their registration terminated;
 - (b) be permitted to resit either failed modules or all modules in January and June of the following year without returning into residence in the meantime;
 - (c) in exceptional circumstances be permitted to repeat all or part of the failed section of the course;
 - (d) 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 or, where core modules are involved, repeating failed modules.

Note: In reaching decisions on students who have failed examinations, Boards of Examiners will comply with University Regulations and agreed guidelines, 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 semester or academic year. The scale of the interruption must be such that it would be unreasonable to expect a student to take the examination relating to that part of the programme without repeat attendance.

Where a department has given advance notice to its four-year degree students they must achieve a threshold average mark for progression within the four-year degree, then 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.

Final Assessment (excluding the M.B.,Ch.B. degrees)

19. Final-year modules may be assessed in January and/or June, or in June alone (see Module database or course literature for details). Departments will be in a position to offer feedback on First Semester performance by 28 February each year (see 14 above), but the final assessment of performance in relation to the award of degree classes is undertaken by Boards of Examiners in June.
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, which will be in the following year (January and/or June), and they will be considered for the award of a classified degree in June of that year. The relevant Board of Examiners will determine whether such students are required to resit all final-year modules or only those failed.
21. Any students may, at the discretion of the examiners, be required to attend an oral examination.

Additional general regulations governing the LL.B. degree, the degrees of M.B.,Ch.B., and the non-modular B.A. Humanities degree are incorporated into the relevant course regulations.

Programme Specifications incorporating Course Regulations for each programme of study can be found at the following web page:

<http://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/sas2/courses/documentation/1112>

(Extract from General Regulations 2011/12)

University Postgraduate Awards

1. The higher degrees undertaken by course of instruction awarded by the University are:

Master of Arts (M.A.), Master of Business Administration (M.B.A.), Master of Laws (LL.M), Master of Research (M.Res), Master of Science (M.Sc.)

A Master's degree is awarded to candidates who have successfully completed the requirements of the programme specified in regulations, including the submission of a satisfactory dissertation, and have obtained 180 credits at postgraduate level.

2. Postgraduate Diplomas and Certificates may be awarded in all programmes.

A Postgraduate Diploma is awarded to candidates who have successfully completed the requirements of the programme specified by regulations and have obtained 120 taught credits at postgraduate level.

A Postgraduate Certificate is awarded to candidates who have successfully completed the requirements of the programme specified by regulations and have obtained 60 taught credits at postgraduate level

3. The degrees of M.A., M.B.A., LL.M, M.Sc., M.Res and the Postgraduate Diploma may be awarded with merit or distinction.

Medium of Instruction

Other than for the purposes of teaching foreign languages, the medium of instruction at the University is English. All forms of University examinations and assessment are conducted in English unless they are designed to test written or spoken aptitude in a foreign language.

(Extract from General Regulations 2011/12)

Undergraduate Examination Conventions and Scheme of Assessment

(a) Degree Classifications

The following degree classification mark bands apply to all first degrees awarded by the University:

First Class Honours	70% and above
Upper Second Class Honours	60% - 69%
Lower Second Class Honours	50% - 59%
Third Class Honours	40% - 49%
Pass	35% - 39%

Degree class descriptors

The following descriptors relate to a student's average performance across all the modules which contribute to the final degree classification. The learning outcomes specified for each degree programme reflect the University's Learning and Teaching Strategy, which outlines, within the appropriate subject context, the key skills and attributes of the Leicester Graduate.

N.B. For all degree classes, it is not a requirement that the student should achieve all the learning outcomes at the required level. However, for first and second class degrees, students are expected to achieve at least a majority of the specified learning outcomes at the specified level.

First Class: 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: 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: 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: 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 Degree: 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.

(Approved by the (then) Learning and Teaching Committee)

Note: There are two approved variations of the scheme of assessment: the existing version applies to students who entered their second year before the 2010/11 academic year; an amended version applies to new students and students entering their second year in the 2010/11 academic year. (Approved by the Academic Policy Committee, June 2010).

(b) Scheme of Assessment (applicable for students who entered their second year BEFORE the 2010/11 academic year):

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

Pass/Fail threshold for the programme (at the first attempt an overall failure entails a resit; at the second attempt it entails course termination)

Students who fail 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.

Students who fail modules to the value of 50 credits, or have a weighted average mark of less than 35%, will fail the programme.

First

Modules to the value of at least 120 credits at 70% or better, a weighted average mark greater than or equal to 65%, and failed modules worth less than 40 credits

Or Weighted average mark greater than or equal to 70%

2.1

Modules to the value of at least 120 credits at 60% or better, a weighted average mark greater than or equal to 55%, and failed modules worth less than 40 credits

Or Weighted average mark greater than or equal to 60%

[Or: Weighted average mark greater than or equal to 65% 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
(Dropped class from 1st because of failures)]

2.2

Modules to the value of at least 120 credits at 50% or better, a weighted average mark greater than or equal to 45%, and failed modules worth less than 40 credits

Or Weighted average mark greater than or equal to 50%

[Or: Weighted average mark greater than or equal to 55%, modules to the value of at least 120 credits at 60% or better, and modules to the value of 40 or 45 failed credits
(Dropped class from 2.1 because of failures)]

Third

Weighted average mark greater than or equal to 40%

[Or: Modules to the value of at least 120 credits at 50% or better, a weighted average mark greater than or equal to 45%, and 40 or 45 failed credits
(Dropped class from 2.2 because of failures)]

Pass

Weighted average mark greater than or equal to 35%

Scheme of Assessment (applicable for new students and students entering their second year IN or after the 2010/11 academic year)

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

Pass/Fail threshold for the programme (*at the first attempt an overall failure entails a resit; at the second attempt it entails course termination*)

Students who fail 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.

Students who fail modules to the value of 50 credits, or have a weighted average mark of less than 35%, will fail the programme.

First

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

Or Weighted average mark greater than or equal to 70%

2.1

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

Or Weighted average mark greater than or equal to 60%

[Or: 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
(*Dropped class from 1st because of failures*)]

2.2

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

Or Weighted average mark greater than or equal to 50%

[Or: 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
(*Dropped class from 2.1 because of failures*)]

Third

Weighted average mark greater than or equal to 40%

[Or: Modules to the value of at least 120 credits at 50% or better, a weighted average mark greater than or equal to 47%, and 40 or 45 failed credits
(*Dropped class from 2.2 because of failures*)]

Pass

Weighted average mark greater than or equal to 35%

Additional Rules

Calculating the weighted average

Three-year Programmes

The weighted average is to be calculated on the basis of all second and third year 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 new students and students entering their second year in or after 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.

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.

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.

Four Year Programmes with a year out

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.

Borderlines

External examiners will be involved in the consideration of borderline cases, and of those just below the borderline with special/mitigating circumstances. *Viva voce* examinations may still be permitted where there is a genuine need to substantiate the information available to a Board of Examiners, but it is anticipated that the current trend away from *vivas* will continue as the new rules become embedded.

Candidates will be considered for promotion to the next higher degree class under the following borderline rules:

First

Modules to the value of at least 120 credits at 68% or better, including modules to the value of at least 90 credits at 70% or better, a weighted average mark greater than or equal to 65%*, and failed modules worth less than 40 credits.

2.1

Modules to the value of at least 120 credits at 58% or better, including modules to the value of at least 90 credits at 60% or better, a weighted average mark greater than or equal to 55%*, and failed modules worth less than 40 credits

2.2

Modules to the value of at least 120 credits at 48% or better, including modules to the value of at least 90 credits at 50% or better, a weighted average mark greater than or equal to 45%*, and failed modules worth less than 40 credits

Note: for four-year integrated programmes, the requirement is 180 credits at the 68/58/48% level and 150 at the 70/60/50% level.

* for new students and students who entered the second year of their programme in or after the 2010/11 academic year, the weighted average mark required to be considered for promotion to a higher degree classification is 67/57/47 respectively.

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, but 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:

- the design of the curriculum and any special features
- the year in which the results were achieved
- the profile of marks, and in particular any distorting elements
- performance in substantial pieces of work (dissertations, projects)
- the outcome of vivas, where these are held
- the outcome of any review by an External Examiner of a student's whole corpus of work or parts of this
- individual and mitigating circumstances
- the impact of marks obtained elsewhere (for example, from a year abroad).

Limits on the number of failed modules

A student cannot graduate with more than 45 failed credits. A fail mark is a mark below a pass for credit: i.e. 34 or less.

(c) Assessment criteria at module level

MARK RANGE	ASSESSMENT CRITERIA FOR UNSEEN EXAMINATIONS
85-100	Excellent application of broad knowledge of the subject. Excellent critical evaluation and analysis of evidence from a wide range of sources expressed in a very well reasoned, logical manner. Excellent organisation of information, with good use of appropriate examples to illustrate points and justify arguments.
70-84	Very good application of broad knowledge of the subject. Very good critical evaluation and analysis of evidence from a good range of sources expressed in a very well reasoned, logical manner. Very good organisation of information, with good use of examples to illustrate points and justify arguments.
60-69	Good application of sound knowledge of the subject. Good critical evaluation and analysis of evidence from a range of sources expressed in a well reasoned, logical manner. Good organisation of information with use of examples to illustrate points and justify arguments.

50-59	Competent application of basic knowledge of the subject. Evidence of critical evaluation and analysis of evidence from different sources expressed with basic reasoning and logic. Competent organisation of information with some use of examples to illustrate points and justify arguments.
40-49	Basic application of limited knowledge of the subject. Limited evidence of critical evaluation and analysis of evidence from limited sources expressed with basic reasoning and logic. Basic organisation of information with limited use of examples to illustrate points and justify arguments
Borderline fail	Limited application of a rudimentary knowledge of the subject. Minimal attempt at critical evaluation and analysis of evidence from limited sources expressed with rudimentary logic and reasoning. Rudimentary organisation of material and use of examples, to illustrate points and arguments.

MARK RANGE	ASSESSMENT CRITERIA FOR ASSESSED ESSAYS COMPLETED IN STUDENTS' OWN TIME
85-100	Content drawn from a range of well chosen primary and secondary sources. Excellent critical evaluation and analysis of evidence expressed in a very well reasoned, logical manner. Excellent organisation of information, with good application of appropriate examples to illustrate points and justify arguments. Excellent presentation.
70-84	Content drawn from a range of primary and secondary sources. Very good critical evaluation and analysis of evidence expressed in a very well reasoned, logical manner. Very good organisation of information, with good use of examples to illustrate points and justify arguments. Very good presentation.
60-69	Content drawn from a good range of primary and secondary sources. Good critical evaluation and analysis of evidence expressed in a well-reasoned logical manner. Good organisation of information with use of examples to illustrate points and justify arguments. Good presentation.
50-59	Content drawn from a basic range of sources. Competent critical evaluation and analysis of evidence expressed with basic reasoning and logic. Competent organisation of information with some use of examples to illustrate points and justify arguments. At least acceptable presentation.
40-49	Content drawn from limited range of sources. Limited evidence of critical evaluation and analysis of evidence expressed with basic reasoning and logic. Basic organisation of information with limited use of examples to illustrate points and justify arguments. Presentation may be poor.
Borderline fail	Content drawn from rudimentary range of sources. Minimal attempt at critical evaluation and analysis of evidence expressed with rudimentary logic and reasoning. Rudimentary organisation of material and use of examples, to illustrate points and arguments. Presentation may be poor.

MARK RANGE	ASSESSMENT CRITERIA FOR DISSERTATIONS.
85-100	Excellent review of a wide range of relevant literature. Excellent organisation of information, with very good use of appropriate examples to illustrate points and justify arguments. Excellent critical evaluation and analysis of evidence, identifying and suggesting reasons for inconsistencies. Excellent presentation.
70-84	Very good review of a wide range of relevant literature. Very good organisation of information, with very good use of appropriate examples to illustrate points and justify arguments. Very good critical evaluation and analysis of evidence, identifying and suggesting reasons for inconsistencies. Very good presentation.
60-69	Good review of a range of relevant literature. Good organisation of information with use of examples to illustrate points and justify arguments. Good critical evaluation and analysis of evidence, with some identification of gaps and inconsistencies and attempt to address them. Very good presentation.

50-59	Competent review of a reasonable range of relevant literature. Competent organisation of information with some use of examples to illustrate points and justify arguments. Evidence of critical evaluation and analysis of evidence with some acknowledgement of inconsistencies. Acceptable presentation.
40-49	Limited review of a basic range of relevant literature. Basic organisation of information with limited use of examples to illustrate points and justify arguments. Limited evidence of critical evaluation and analysis of evidence, with little or no acknowledgement of inconsistencies. Presentation may be poor.
Borderline fail	Limited review of a rudimentary range of relevant literature. Rudimentary organisation of material and use of examples, to illustrate points and arguments. Virtually no identification of inconsistencies in the evidence. Presentation may be poor.

MARK RANGE	ASSESSMENT CRITERIA FOR EXPERIMENTAL/ SURVEY PROJECTS
85-100	Excellent introduction to the project, addressing a wide range of relevant literature. Excellent presentation of a sound data set, demonstrating very good experimental/survey design and thorough, technically competent and systematic data collection. Excellent discussion of results in the light of relevant literature with acknowledgement and good attempts to reconcile inconsistencies and irregularities. Clear statement of the implication of the study and sensible suggestions for further work.
70-84	Very good introduction to the project, addressing a wide range of relevant literature. Very good presentation of a sound data set, demonstrating very good experimental/survey design and thorough, technically competent and systematic data collection. Very good discussion of results in the light of relevant literature with acknowledgement and good attempts to reconcile inconsistencies and irregularities. Clear statement of the implication of the study and sensible suggestions for further work.
60-69	Good introduction to the project, addressing a range of relevant literature. Good presentation of a sound data set, demonstrating competent experimental/survey design and competent and systematic data collection. Good discussion of results in the light of relevant literature with acknowledgement of and some attempt to reconcile inconsistencies and irregularities. Identification of some implications of the study including some suggestion for further work.
50-59	Competent introduction to the project, addressing some relevant literature. Competent presentation of a basically sound data set, with no major flaws in experimental/survey design, and reasonably competent and systematic data collection. Competent discussion of results in the light of some relevant literature, with acknowledgement of at least some inconsistencies and irregularities and a basic attempt at their reconciliation. Identification of a few implications of the study.
40-49	Basic introduction to the project addressing some relevant literature. Limited presentation of basic data set, given some flaws in experimental/survey design, and incomplete data collection. Limited discussion of results in the light of some relevant literature. Acknowledgement of at least some inconsistencies and irregularities. Identification of a few implications of the study.
Borderline fail	Rudimentary introduction to the project addressing at least some relevant literature. Rudimentary presentation of limited data set, given significant flaws in experimental/survey design and incomplete data collection. Rudimentary discussion of results in the light of at least some relevant literature. Limited acknowledgement of at least some inconsistency and irregularities

(Approved by the (then) Learning and Teaching Committee)

Postgraduate Assessment Conventions, Classifications and Schemes of Assessment

Introduction

1. These regulations apply to the schemes of study, assessment and award of the following postgraduate qualifications: MA, MSc, LL.M, MBA, M Res, Postgraduate Diploma and Postgraduate Certificate. Separate regulations apply to the Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE).
2. Each programme of study and assessment will have an approved programme specification which will include information on the following aspects of the programme:
 - a) approved modes of study
 - b) the normal and maximum periods of registration for each mode
 - c) details of compulsory and optional modules
 - d) details of any formal progression points
 - e) titles of any intermediate awards available
3. Any variations to the provision set out in these regulations and any additional regulations will be approved by Senate and detailed in the relevant programme specification.
4. Programmes of study offered under these regulations will comprise taught modules and a dissertation or research project totalling 180 credits. Where 0-credit modules have been approved as part of a programme these will be detailed in the relevant programme specification.
5. Not all modules approved as part of a programme will necessarily be available every year.
6. Taught campus-based programmes usually begin at the start of the Autumn term unless otherwise stated in programme specifications.
7. For the purposes of progression and recommendation for an award the pass mark for programmes offered under these regulations is 50%.
8. Masters degrees offered under these regulations will include a dissertation or research project of 60 credits, unless otherwise approved.
9. All programmes will follow one of the schemes of assessment detailed in these regulations. The scheme of assessment followed will be specified in the relevant programme specification.
10. Departments are permitted to supplement the scheme of assessment followed by designating compulsory modules as 'necessary to pass', meaning that a mark of at least 50% must be achieved in the modules for the qualification to be awarded. Such modules should be clearly identified in programme specifications and handbooks.
11. In exceptional circumstances and with the approval of the Academic Policy Committee modification of a scheme of assessment may be permissible where external accreditation requires it.
12. Where required by the relevant professional, statutory or regulatory body, Senate may approve procedures for the consideration of allegations of professional suitability and/or fitness to practise. The University may determine that a student found professionally unsuitable and/or unfit to practise shall not be awarded a degree or other qualification, irrespective of their performance in assessments.

Progression Points

13. Formal progression points for individual programmes may be specified in the relevant programme specifications. A progression point defines the number of modules and level of attainment which a student must achieve in a specified time

to progress to the next stage of their studies. The programme specification will specify whether, or in what circumstances, any periods of approved suspension may be taken into account when determining whether a student has completed the requirements at a particular progression point.

14. At each formal progression point the department will review the progress of each student and determine whether they have met the requirements to progress to the next stage of the programme. In cases where a student has failed to meet the requirements to progress the department will determine that the student will be required to withdraw from the University and will make a recommendation to the Board of Examiners for an intermediate award where appropriate.

The award of Masters Degrees, Postgraduate Diplomas and Postgraduate Certificates

15. The appropriate degree, postgraduate diploma or postgraduate certificate will be awarded to students who have completed the relevant course in full and satisfied the examiners in the prescribed examinations and assessment.

Classification Conventions

16. **Distinction:** To be awarded a distinction, a student will have achieved the specific learning outcomes of the programme to an excellent or very high standard, displayed a very high command of the subject and technical and analytical skills and demonstrated independence of thinking and excellent research potential.
17. **Merit:** To be awarded a pass with merit, a student will have achieved the specific learning outcomes of the programme to a very good standard, displayed a high command of the subject and technical and analytical skills and demonstrated independence of thinking and very good research skills.
18. **Pass:** To be awarded a pass, a student will have achieved the specific learning outcomes of the programme to a satisfactory standard and displayed a sound command of the subject and technical and analytical skills and demonstrated independence of thinking and sound research skills.

Schemes of Assessment

19. The following two schemes of assessment have been approved for all postgraduate taught awards (except M Res)

Scheme A

20. Scheme A has two variants determined by the structure of the course. Courses with a 60 credit dissertation follow i) and those with a 90 credit dissertation follow ii):

i) Master's

To be awarded a master's degree a student must:

- i) obtain at least 90 credits at 50% or above in the taught modules and no more than 15 credits below 40%;
- ii) have completed all taught modules and their associated assessment requirements; and
- iii) achieve a mark of 50% or above in the dissertation.

To be awarded a master's degree with merit a student must:

- i) obtain at least 60 credits at 60% or more in the taught modules;
- ii) achieve a mark of 60% or above for the dissertation; and
- iii) have no fail marks.

To be awarded a master's degree with distinction a student must:

- i) obtain at least 90 credits at 70% or above in the taught modules and a mark of 60% or above in the dissertation; or
- ii) obtain at least 60 credits at 70% or above in the taught modules and a mark of at least 70% in the dissertation; and
- iii) have no fail marks.

Postgraduate Diploma

To be awarded a Postgraduate Diploma a student must:

- i) obtain at least 90 credits at 50% or above with no more than 15 credits below 40%, and
- ii) have completed all taught modules and their associated assessment requirements.

To be awarded a Postgraduate Diploma with merit a student must:

- i) obtain at least 60 credits or more at 60% or above; and
- ii) have no fail marks.

To be awarded a Postgraduate Diploma with distinction a student must:

- i) obtain at least 90 credits or more at 70% or above; and
- ii) have no fail marks.

Postgraduate Certificate

To be awarded a Postgraduate Certificate a student must:

- i) obtain at least 45 credits at 50% or more in the taught modules and no marks less than 40%; and
- ii) have completed all modules and their associated assessment requirements.

OR

ii) Master's

To be awarded a master's degree a student must:

- i) obtain at least 60 credits at 50% or above in the taught modules and no more than 15 credits below 40%; and
- ii) have completed all taught modules and their associated assessment requirements; and
- iii) achieve a mark of at least 50% or above in the dissertation.

To be awarded a master's degree with merit a student must:

- i) obtain at least 60 credits at 60% or more in the taught modules;
- ii) achieve a mark of 60% or above for the dissertation; and
- iii) have no fail marks.

To be awarded a master's degree with distinction a student must:

- i) obtain at least 90 credits at 70% or above in the taught modules and a mark of at least 60% in the dissertation; or
- ii) obtain at least 30 credits at 70% or above in the taught modules and a mark of at least 70% in the dissertation; and
- iii) have no fail marks.

Scheme B

10.21 Scheme B is as follows:

Master's

To be awarded a master's degree a student must:

- i) obtain a credit weighted average from 180 credits of not less than 50%;
- ii) have completed all taught modules and their associated assessment requirements and obtained a mark of at least 50% in the dissertation.

To be awarded a master's degree with merit a student must:

- i) obtain a credit-weighted average from 180 credits of not less than 60%, including obtaining a mark of 60% or more in the dissertation;
- ii) have completed all taught modules and their associated assessment requirements.

To be awarded a master's degree with distinction a student must:

- i) obtain a credit-weighted average from 180 credits of not less than 70%, including obtaining a mark of 70% or more in the dissertation;

- ii) have completed all taught modules and their associated assessment requirements

Borderline candidates may be awarded a distinction at the discretion of the Board of Examiners. Borderline candidates are defined as those with a credit-weighted average of between 67.5% and 70%.

Postgraduate Diploma

To be awarded a Postgraduate Diploma a student must:

- i) obtain a credit weighted average from 120 credits of not less than 50%;
- ii) have completed all taught modules and their associated assessment requirements.

To be awarded a Postgraduate Diploma with merit a student must:

- i) obtain a credit-weighted average from 120 credits of not less than 60%;
- ii) have completed all taught modules and their associated assessment requirements.

To be awarded a Postgraduate Diploma with distinction a student must:

- i) obtain a credit-weighted average from 120 credits of not less than 70%;
- ii) have completed all taught modules and their associated assessment requirements

Borderline candidates may be awarded a distinction at the discretion of the Board of Examiners. Borderline candidates are defined as those with a credit-weighted average of between 67.5% and 70%.

Postgraduate Certificate

To be awarded a Postgraduate Certificate a student must

- i) obtain a credit weighted average from 60 credits of no less than 50%;
- ii) have completed all taught modules and their associated assessment requirements

Scheme of Assessment for M.Res Degree Programmes

10.22 The following scheme applies to all M.Res degree programmes with the exception of M.Res by individually supervised study, the scheme of assessment for which can be found on pp.51-52 of the General Regulations

- a) To be awarded the degree of M Res a candidate must pass the taught components of the programme and the dissertation with a mark of 50% or above;
- b) To be awarded the degree of M Res with merit a candidate must pass the taught components of the programme with a mark of 50% or above and the dissertation with a mark of 60% or above;
- c) To be awarded the degree of M Res with distinction a candidate must pass the taught components of the programme with a mark of 50% or above and the dissertation with a mark of 70% or above.

Re-sits and Resubmissions

10.23 A student who fails to reach the pass mark in any assessed element of the programme, including the dissertation, may be allowed to re-submit or re-sit assessments where appropriate on one occasion only.

10.24 A student may re-sit examinations or re-submit coursework in relation to an individual module on one occasion only. The number of modules where re-sits or re-submissions are allowed may be detailed in programme specifications or may be at the discretion of the Board of Examiners.

10.25 The mark obtained for re-submitted work or a re-sit is capped at 50%.

10.26 Where a student re-submits or re-sits an examination but does not reach the pass mark the highest of the two marks obtained at first submission/resubmission or sit/re-sit will be applied.

(Extract from General Regulations 2011/12)

University Policy on the Return of Marked Work

Policy Statement

Coursework Assignments

1. Feedback and provisional grading on coursework will be returned within 21 days of the submission date for campus-based programmes; 28 days for distance learning and approved programmes*.
2. In exceptional circumstances where this is not possible, the following actions should be taken:
 - a. Students should be notified in advance of the expected return date and the reasons for the longer turn-round time
 - b. Where possible, staff should provide some interim feedback: for example in the form of generic feedback to the class regarding common errors and potential areas for improvement
3. Students should be notified early in each module, through module handbooks or their equivalent, of both the submission date and the return date for all coursework.
4. Staff engaged in marking should be notified, well in advance, of the marking schedules, in particular the submission and return dates for each piece of work for which they will be responsible so they can plan their diaries accordingly.
5. Submission and return of assignments within a module should normally be scheduled such that students receive feedback on one assignment before completion of a further assignment of a similar format.
6. If the assessment design for a programme comprises single, summative module assignments that are to be submitted around the same time, then there should be provision of an element of formative feedback prior to submission.
7. Where there are co-requisite modules that are taken in parallel within a programme, there should be co-ordination between module convenors such that students receive feedback on one assignment before completion of a further assignment of a similar format.
8. Where possible, end of term/semester submission dates should be avoided in respect of marking and return of hard-copy submissions in order to avoid lengthy delays between the marking of the work and its collection due to intervening vacations. Note that where work is being marked on-line or posted back to students these constraints need not apply.
9. The returned work should incorporate appropriate feedback guidance to enable the students to identify both where they have demonstrated particular strengths and how to improve their performance in future assignments. Further guidance regarding the provision of feedback is provided on the University website.
10. It is recognised that some very large scale pieces of work, such as dissertations, may not be returned within the 21 days. In such cases, staging points should be scheduled when effective feedback on progress can be provided.
11. Consistency of implementation and management of expectation are essential. Heads of Department (or their delegated representatives) should therefore monitor and take responsibility for the turn-round time of coursework and provision of feedback for all their modules. Departments will be asked to comment in their Annual Development Reviews on any exceptions to the turn-round policy.
12. Departments should regularly review their methods of marking and assessment design, incorporating a range of approaches as appropriate.

**The periods of 21 and 28 days are defined as 21/28 calendar days from the published submission date of the piece of work, excepting when this period includes public holidays and days when the University is officially closed, these days of closure being added into the total. There are certain campus-based programmes for which, for professional reasons, large numbers of external experts are involved in marking. Subject to approval, these will also be permitted the longer turn-round time of 28 days.*

Examinations

13. Following the approval of the provisional results by examination boards, departments should make the results available to students within 14 days. Where appropriate this should include a breakdown at the level of the examination and coursework. Students will not normally be informed of their marks on individual examination questions.
14. Students will not be allowed to see their examination scripts.
15. Departments should arrange for feedback on examination performance to be provided in the form of a overview feedback session/written report identifying generic performance strengths/issues. This requirement will not normally apply to finals or end-of-programme examinations.
16. Students should have the opportunity to discuss their results with their personal tutor or adviser.

Illness and Notification of Mitigating Circumstances

Full-Time and Part-Time Campus-Based Students

1. Full-time and part-time campus-based students who suffer a minor illness for a period of less than seven days are required to report this to their departments:
 - a) if the illness leads to absence from classes at which attendance is compulsory;
 - b) where it might be a contributory factor in a failure to meet course deadlines or to perform up to expectations in any academic assignment.
2. Students must self-certify their illness using a standard form available from departmental offices, and must report the illness as soon as they are fit to do so.
3. Where the illness is of more than seven days' duration or is of a non-minor nature, medical advice should be sought and a medical certificate submitted to the University. Students are responsible for arranging the collection of medical certificates and supplying a copy to their department and to the Medical School Office (for M.B., Ch.B students).
4. The seven-day ruling is suspended by the Freeman's Common Health Centre during the First and Second Semester and September re-sit examination periods, when it is the responsibility of students to seek medical help as soon as possible for any ill health experienced during, or near to, the examinations.
5. It is the responsibility of students who are required to produce medical evidence of fitness to continue or resume study to acquire such evidence by the date specified to them by the University.
6. General practices may charge for providing reports and such charges must be borne by the student. In relation to payment for reports from the Freeman's Common Health Centre, financial assistance may be available from the Welfare Centre, to which enquiries should be addressed.
7. In these more severe cases of illness, a student may need to apply for a period of suspension of studies (see General Regulations relating to the registration of students). Students who may require a suspension of studies are advised to consult with their department about this before making a request.

Distance-Learning Students

8. Distance-learning students who suffer a minor illness for a period of less than seven days should report this to their departments:
 - a) if the illness leads to absence from teaching and learning sessions at which attendance is compulsory;
 - b) where it might be a contributory factor in a failure to meet course deadlines or to perform up to expectations in any academic assignment.
9. Where the illness is of more than seven days' duration or is of a non-minor nature and has impact on attendance either at compulsory teaching and learning sessions, meeting course deadlines or performance in any assignment, medical advice should be sought and a medical certificate submitted to the University.
10. It is the responsibility of students who are required to produce medical evidence of fitness to continue or resume study to acquire such evidence by the date specified to them by the University.
11. General practices may charge for providing reports and such charges must be borne by the student.
12. In these more severe cases of illness, a student may need to apply for a period of suspension of studies (see General Regulations relating to the registration of

students). Students who may require a suspension of studies are advised to consult with their department about this before making a request.

Overseas Students (Health Care)

13. Students newly entering the University from overseas are required to report to the Freeman's Common Health Centre within one month of their arrival.

Notification of Mitigating Circumstances

14. It is the responsibility of students to inform their departments of any matters (whether of an academic, personal, medical or other nature) which may be relevant to their academic performance, and to supply substantiating evidence, for example, a medical certificate (see regulations regarding notification of ill health above). Such information should be submitted before the expiry of any departmental deadlines governing the submission of evidence of special circumstances. If no such deadlines exist, the evidence must be submitted as soon as it is available, and in any event before the meeting of the relevant Board of Examiners is due to take place.
15. Appeals against degree classification, termination of course or other academic decisions may be disallowed if the appeal is based on mitigating circumstances which the appeals committee believes should have been communicated earlier to the department concerned

Extract from General Regulations 2011/12

Examination Regulations

The following regulations apply to all examinations.

Registration for Examinations

1. Students are required to register for examinations as part of the module registration process by the published deadlines.

Examination Timetable

2. Examinations will be held in accordance with the published timetable which will be available at least 4 weeks before the commencement of the examination period and will include the date, time and venue of each examination.
3. Examinations are held on six days a week from Monday to Saturday and are normally scheduled for two sessions a day starting at 9.30 am and 2.30 pm.
4. Students should read the Examination Timetable carefully to ensure that they have been correctly entered for their examinations and know the time, date and location of the examinations they are required to take.
5. Misreading the Examination Timetable will not be accepted as a satisfactory explanation for absence from an examination.
6. Special arrangements cannot be made to accommodate students' personal preferences, unless these arise from specific religious requirements identified by the student at the beginning of the academic year, or are associated with support measures identified by the AccessAbility Centre.
7. The extent to which the timetabling of examinations can be adapted to meet specific religious requirements will vary from case to case but the University will make such special arrangements as are in its power, subject to the overriding requirements that the examinations must be scheduled within the published examination periods and that special arrangements for individual students must not disadvantage the majority. Students making requests for special arrangements on religious grounds should recognise that, where it is possible, special measures designed to meet their needs may involve an unavoidable element of inconvenience, for example the requirement to remain *incommunicado* for a period of time.
8. Students are required to be available throughout all formal examination and marking periods (i.e. until the end of term) to answer any queries from the examiners or the Examinations Office or to attend for a viva voce examination if required. Students who cannot be contacted will be subject to such academic penalties as the examiners see fit (including in relation to the illegibility of a script the award of a mark of zero).

Setting Examination Papers

9. The Academic Registrar will publish annually deadlines for the submission of examination question papers.
10. All examination papers must be produced on standard University question paper proformas which can be obtained from the Examinations Office.

Security of Examination Papers and Stationery

11. Examination papers and examination stationery will be held in a secure environment until the time for their release to students.

Invigilation

12. There will be a prescribed number of invigilators in each examination room.
13. Heads of Department are responsible for appointing the required number of invigilators from their Department. Such staff will act as Chief Invigilators and

- Invigilators. Additional Assistant Invigilators will be recruited by the Examinations Office.
14. Invigilation arrangements for examinations are set out in the guidance notes issued by the Examinations Office.
 15. Training for invigilators will be provided on an annual basis by the Examinations Office.
 16. Invigilators are required to comply with instructions issued by the Examinations Office and to ensure that they are aware of their obligations as specified in the Guidance Notes for Invigilators.
 17. Chief Invigilators must collect examination papers from the Examinations Office at least 30 minutes prior to the start of the examination. Other invigilators must report to the examination room at least 20 minutes before the examination is due to commence.
 18. Chief Invigilators are required to start and finish examinations in accordance with the instructions issued by the Examinations Office
 19. Chief Invigilators will be required to complete a report form on the conduct of each examination for submission to the Examinations Office.
 20. If the author of an examination paper is not an invigilator for the relevant examination he/she should normally be in attendance 10 minutes before and for the first fifteen minutes of an examination. Where it is not possible for the author to be present he/she should ensure that their contact details are available or another member of the department is present in their place in order that any issues relating to the examination paper can be addressed.

Conduct during Examinations

21. Invigilators are present at all examinations and are responsible for their proper conduct. Students are required to comply with all instructions issued by an invigilator.
22. Students will be admitted to the examination room by an invigilator shortly before an examination is due to start. Once admitted to the room examination conditions apply so no talking is permitted.
23. Students should sit at a desk allocated for the paper they are sitting in accordance with the notices posted outside the examination room.
24. Students should only bring essential items to examinations as there is limited storage for personal items within examination rooms.
25. **Students are not permitted to wear coats, scarves, hats or outdoor wear, except where exemption applies for religious reasons, during examinations. Invigilators will request students to remove any clothing of this type and to place it in the area reserved for storage of personal items for the duration of the examination.**
26. Students must bring their own pens, pencils, rulers and any other required equipment to each examination. These should be kept in a clear plastic pencil case. Cases and other containers are not permitted on examination desks. Additional material may only be used if issued by an invigilator or where it is specifically allowed in the examination paper rubric.
27. Food and drink are not permitted in the examination room with the exception of water which, if required, should be in a clear plastic bottle with no label.
28. Students should bring their University ID card to all examinations and display it on their desk throughout the examination. ID cards will be checked by an invigilator once the examination has started.
29. Students should complete an attendance slip and place it on their desk for collection by the invigilator once the examination has started.
30. Students should enter their student number, not their name, on the examination booklet. The student number is the nine digit number on the student's University ID card.

31. Examinations will start and finish on the instruction of the invigilator. Students must not open examination papers or start writing until instructed to do so.
32. Valuable items such as keys, purses and mobile telephones may be placed in the clear plastic bags provided on each desk and placed under the student's chair. Mobile telephones must be turned off and no items should be touched during the examination.
33. The use of mobile telephones or other electronic devices is not permitted. If a mobile telephone or other electronic device is not placed in the plastic bag provided and is found on a student during the course of an examination it will be regarded as a disciplinary offence.
34. Students must write legibly. Students submitting illegible scripts will be required to report to their department so that arrangements can be made to have their work legibly transcribed, under examination conditions. All costs associated with this process will be paid by the student.
35. Talking or communicating in any other way with other students in the examination room before, during or after an examination is forbidden. Failure to observe this requirement will be treated as a disciplinary offence.
36. If a student wishes to speak to an invigilator they should raise their hand and stay in their seat.
37. The University operates a zero tolerance policy in relation to cheating in examinations. Invigilators will announce at the beginning of each examination that it is an offence for students to be in possession of **any** notes or other documents or to have **any** information written on their body or clothing. The invigilators will ask anyone with such material to raise their hand. The documentary material will then be collected and the opportunity provided for information on the body or clothing to be removed. After this point, if any student is discovered with such material or with **any** information written on any part of their body or clothing in the examination room it will be automatically assumed that cheating has taken place and the consequence will be the award of a mark of zero to the module.
38. Any student wishing to leave the examination room temporarily should raise their hand to request permission from an invigilator. Students permitted to leave the room will be escorted by an invigilator. Any student who leaves the room without an invigilator's permission will be deemed to have withdrawn from the examination and will not be allowed to return. The Chief Invigilator will provide a report to the Examinations Office in such cases.
39. Any student who causes a disturbance in an examination room will be reprimanded by an invigilator. If the conduct persists the student may be required to withdraw from the examination room and a report will be made to the Academic Registrar.
40. Students who arrive late may be admitted to an examination room during the first 30 minutes of an examination. No additional time will be given.
41. Students are not permitted to leave an examination during the first 30 minutes or the last 20 minutes. In examination rooms where papers of mixed duration are being taken students are only permitted to leave at the invigilator's discretion.
42. Students wishing to leave an examination early must inform the invigilator and must remain in their seat until their script has been collected. They must leave the examination room quietly with minimum disturbance both inside and immediately outside the examination room.
43. At the end of an examination the invigilator will instruct students to stop writing. Students must remain seated at their desks until all scripts have been collected by an invigilator and they are instructed that they may leave.
44. No answer book or part of an answer book, whether used or not, may be removed from the examination room.

Alternative Examination Arrangements

45. Alternative examination arrangements may be made for students with long or short term medical conditions, specific learning difficulties or disabilities, subject to the overall requirement that academic standards should be maintained.
46. Requests for alternative examination arrangements on the grounds of specific learning difficulties must be notified to the Examinations Office by the AccessAbility Centre. Only recommendations supported by the AccessAbility Centre will be considered. Requests for alternative examination arrangements on the grounds of either short or long term medical conditions must be made to the Examinations Office with the support of a doctor from the Freeman's Common Health Centre.
47. Alternative arrangements for students may include the following:
 - (a) Additional time - usually a provision of up to an additional 15 minutes per hour for each examination taken
 - (b) Amanuensis
 - (c) Word processors supplied by the University
 - (d) Special location

Use of Calculators and Dictionaries

48. Except where special arrangements apply the use of programmable calculators is forbidden. Where the use of such calculators is permitted only specified models may be used and any unauthorised calculators will be confiscated. Any suspected misuse of calculators will be reported to the Academic Registrar as a possible disciplinary offence.
49. English Language dictionaries are available in examination rooms and may be consulted through the invigilator who, upon request, will bring the dictionary to the student's desk. No assistance with the use of the dictionary is permitted. Students are not permitted to bring their own dictionaries or electronic translators into the examination room.

Action in the Event of a Fire Alarm

50. In the event of a fire alarm during an examination students will be instructed by the invigilator to stop what they are doing, leave all materials on their desk and make their way to the nearest fire exit. Students must not communicate with each other and examination conditions will be maintained.

(Extract from General Regulations 2011/12)

ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE: EXAMINATIONS

1. Cheating involves actual, intended, or attempted deception and/or dishonest action in relation to any academic work of the University. Taking unauthorised material into an examination (including revision notes or unauthorised equipment) shall be regarded as attempted deception. Talking to another candidate during an examination will also be considered unauthorised behaviour.
2. The Registrar and Secretary has delegated his general powers of jurisdiction to the Academic Registrar in relation to examination offences.
3. First offences of cheating in examinations will be referred to the Academic Registrar to determine penalty. The Academic Registrar may seek advice on any case as s/he sees fit.
4. Multiple instances of cheating or collusion in an examination or test shall always be considered to be repeat offences and will be referred to a Senate Disciplinary Committee regardless of whether the second offence took place in the same examination period.
5. Where a case has been referred to the Academic Registrar, the student shall be notified of the referral and provided with details of the evidence presented against him/her. The student shall be invited to present any statements or evidence in mitigation of his/her actions within a specified period which shall not be less than 7 days.
6. Following receipt of the student's statement of mitigation, or in the absence of any such response, the Academic Registrar shall determine one of the following outcomes:
 - a) that there is no case for the student to answer;
 - b) that the case cannot be resolved summarily by the Academic Registrar and should be referred to the Senate Disciplinary Committee;
 - c) that it is a matter for which a penalty can be determined by the Academic Registrar; penalties available to the Academic Registrar in cases of cheating in an examination are as follows:
 - i) a mark of zero is assigned to the piece of work in question and to the associated module; a reassessment may be awarded where permitted under the Regulations, for progression purposes only; in modules above level 1, the mark of zero may not be excluded from any calculation for the classification of an award.
7. In determining the penalties for academic and professional offences the Academic Registrar shall take into account mitigating circumstances material to the case submitted by the student. Where the Academic Registrar concludes that mitigating circumstances are relevant and should be taken into account in determining penalty, a penalty shall be applied according to precedent. In determining whether particular circumstances are relevant, the Academic Registrar will take into account whether the circumstances have previously been disclosed in a timely manner, as required under these Regulations.
8. The student shall be informed in writing of the outcome of their case. Students found guilty of an offence shall be warned regarding their future conduct and advised to seek further support to avoid a repeat offence.
9. A student may appeal against the summary decision of the Academic Registrar in examination-related cases. The grounds for appeal are:
 - a. procedural irregularity of a material nature, including the commission of an error during the original decision;
 - b. new evidence material to the case which the student can demonstrate was for good reason not available previously;
 - c. the penalty was excessive.

10. An appeal must be submitted in writing, to the Investigating Officers of the Senate Disciplinary Committee, within fourteen days of the imposition of the fine or penalty. In such cases, the decision of the Investigating Officers, shall be regarded as final. At the conclusion of the appeal, the student will be sent a completion of procedures letter and details about the Office of the Independent Adjudicator.

(Extract from General Regulations 2011/12)

Instructions regarding the use of Assessment Anonymity

The following instructions relate to the processes for the anonymous marking of all written examinations shown on centrally prepared examination timetables, and also to coursework assignments.

1. Examination Anonymity

- 1.1 Candidates are required to enter a candidate number rather than their name on their answer books. Where departments use multiple choice or other special answer papers they must not be designed to require the candidate's name.
- 1.2 A student's Candidate Number is the student ID number recorded on the student record system e.g. 073529281. This number is assigned to students at Registration and retained throughout the duration of their course. The number is recorded on the Student ID Card, which must be brought to all examinations.
- 1.3 A master list of names and numbers will be available in each examination room. Candidates who have forgotten their candidate number can be supplied with their number from this list. The list will be of limited and controlled availability.
- 1.4 Candidates will be required to enter their candidate number and their seat number on their scripts and to enter their name and seat number on their attendance slip. The attendance slips can therefore serve as a safety check in the examination room or assist with the unscrambling of any problems resulting from the incorrect recording of candidate numbers by students. At the end of the examination the attendance slips will be kept separate from the scripts.
- 1.5 The Notes for Invigilators include details of the above procedures.
- 1.6 Anonymity should be protected for as long as possible in the assessment process, but is not required at meetings of Boards of Examiners. Departments will be provided with (or will be able to produce directly from the Student Record System) listings for each module detailing numbers and names of students taking the module. This listing can be used for the transcription of marks. A nominated person in each department (e.g. the departmental examinations officer) holds this list. Listings without names can be prepared from these listings and supplied to markers. Only when all marking is complete will the results be transferred to a marks sheet with the names of students. Particular care is required at this point and double-checking is desirable.

2. Anonymous Marking of Coursework Assignments

- 2.1 It is recognised that students may hold concerns regarding the possibility of inequitable marking of coursework assignments resulting from their individual identification. It is also recognised that such inequities would be the product of an unprofessional approach and that there is no substantive evidence of its occurrence in the University of Leicester. The University has specific safeguards in place to ensure fair and equitable assessment practices, in particular moderation or double marking of all coursework assignments. Furthermore, students will normally submit a large number of assignments during the course of their progression to graduation and these are typically marked by different people, thereby minimising any individual variations in marking.

- 2.2 Under the University's Code of Practice for Examining, all examination scripts are required to be marked anonymously. For most undergraduate programmes in the University, this automatically means that the majority of any student's work is marked anonymously.
- 2.3 The Code of Practice also requires that the marking of assessed work, both for examinations and coursework assignments, contributing to the final degree classification should be moderated or double marked as a routine quality assurance procedure (see para 2.1).
- 2.4 There is a range of situations where anonymous marking is either inappropriate or undesirable. These include, *inter alia*:
- Oral presentations
 Assessments located within very small groups, (e.g. tutorial situations with only 4 or 5 students)
 Coursework where it is desirable for feedback to be related to a student's individual development (e.g. consideration of a student's progression from one piece of work to the next)
 Observational assessment of task performance (e.g. practical ability)
 Project work undertaken under the direct supervision of a member of academic staff
- 2.5 Excluding situations such as those described above, anonymous marking of assignments should be considered as an example of good practice in assessment management within the University. In particular, departments should specifically consider the appropriateness of applying anonymous marking procedures for coursework assignments under certain circumstances, as exemplified below:
- 2.6 Where all, or a significant majority of the marks for a module are derived from coursework and/or where the coursework for a module takes the form of a single item of work that is marked by an individual member of staff or that there are several separate elements of coursework, but these are all marked by a single member of staff (though it is recognised that, in either instance the work will be moderated or double marked if it contributes to the degree)

(As approved by the (then) Standing Committee of Deans and updated by the Academic Policy Committee)

UNIVERSITY OF LEICESTER

**APPOINTMENT OF EXTERNAL EXAMINERS FOR
UNDERGRADUATE AND TAUGHT POSTGRADUATE COURSES**

NOMINATION FORM

This form is used to facilitate the progress of recommendations for the appointment of examiners through the University's committee structure, and to provide a record for departmental and administrative purposes. It also provides confirmation that the appointment complies with the provisions of the University's Code of Practice on Examining.

SECTION A

To be completed by the Head of Department

Subject/course:**Years of appointment:**

(stated as the calendar years in which the examiner will serve)

Has a member of staff from your department acted as an external examiner within the proposed examiner's institution during the last five years?

Yes / No

(If yes, please give details)

SECTION B

To be completed by the prospective examiner

Name:

(including title)

Position:**Correspondence address:****Telephone no:****Fax no:****Email address:****Academic qualifications:**

Career to date (summary only):

NB: The University reserves the right to ask for additional information, e.g. a CV, at any stage in the approval process

Details of current external examinerships for taught courses:

Other external examinerships held over the last three years:

Please specify any links which you have with the Department:

Signed _____ (Prospective Examiner) Date _____

Signed _____ (Head of Department) Date _____

This form should be signed by the Head of Department and the original submitted to the Academic Registrar for onward transmission to the Academic Policy Committee. A copy should be retained for departmental records.

Formal letters of appointment are normally issued after recommendations have been approved by Senate. Some time may therefore elapse between the submission of a nomination form and confirmation of appointment.

Please note that the personal data that you have provided on this form will be held on computer by the University for the purpose of student administration in accordance with the University's registration under the 1984 Data Protection Act. Under data protection legislation you may have a right of access to information held about you. Any enquiries about data protection matters, including subject access requests, should be made to the University's Data Protection Officer, Colin Atkinson (Assistant Director, Corporate Information Services, IT Services,, ☎ 0116 2522412)

UNIVERSITY OF LEICESTER

EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT TO THE VICE-CHANCELLOR

Name of Examiner:	
Correspondence Address:	
Subject/Course:	
Year reporting on:	

External Examiners are asked to prepare their reports to the Vice-Chancellor in accordance with the University's Code of Practice on External Examining (see section 3.18 - 3.25 of the Code). The University suggests in the Code that examiners should concentrate in their reports on quality, standards and the achievement of students, but it also needs to assure itself that the organisational and administrative arrangements for meetings of Boards of Examiners have been properly carried out. It therefore asks that the checklist below be completed, and this form attached to the free format element of the report before its submission to: **Professor Sir R.G. Burgess, Vice-Chancellor, University of Leicester, University Road, Leicester LE1 7RH**

Conduct of Examinations

Were you satisfied with:	Yes	Yes, with additional comments in report	Not relevant	No, with details provided in report
(a) Briefing material provided about <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Department • the subject/course • the scheme of assessment • marking and grading practices • your responsibilities as an examiner • the date/time of the examiners' meeting • any domestic arrangements 				
(b) the overall administration of the examinations by the Departmental Examinations Officer/Course Director				
(c) the method of providing you with material for scrutiny (postal arrangements, etc)				
(d) the general level of communications with the Department				

Signature.....

Date.....

External Examiner's Report to the Vice-Chancellor (continued)

Please attach to this form your report covering the following points (or as many of them as apply):

(a) **Scope of examinations and examination methods**

Examiners are asked to confirm that the assessment procedures of the department/course are appropriate to the subject matter, and are relevant, properly demanding and designed to allow for the display of knowledge at a level which compares favourably with other institutions offering similar provision.

(b) **Marking standards/degree classifications/conduct of vivas**

Undergraduate Programmes

Examiners are invited to comment on the marking standards and grading practices operating in the department. Any concerns about the distribution of degree classes, and the performance of students at the top and bottom end of the ranges should be noted.

Postgraduate Programmes

Examiners are invited to comment on the marking standards operating in relation to the course including the use of monitoring devices (such as double marking).

(c) **Student performance**

Comments on the quality of students' work, including presentation and style, are welcomed.

(d) **Course aims and objectives, structure and syllabus**

Examiners are encouraged to comment on these in the light of their impact on examination procedures and performance, and in a more general sense as they relate to national standards, including the QAA's Qualifications Framework and, where applicable, subject benchmarks. Observations on course literature, departmental handbooks, etc., are helpful.

(e) **Teaching methods and teaching quality**

The University welcomes the comments of examiners on the quality of teaching, to the extent that this is reflected in the examining process and in the performance of its students. Similarly, any observations on the effectiveness or otherwise of teaching methods, particularly where these are new or distinctive, will be of great assistance.

(f) **General issues**

Examiners are invited to comment on any issue relevant to their experiences at the University which is not covered in the checklist or in the list above. This is particularly helpful as an overview at the end of an examiner's period of service.

Appeals process for Students on taught programmes

Academic Appeals Regulations

1. These Regulations apply to all students who wish to appeal against the decision of a Board of Examiners or another academic body responsible for decisions on student progression, assessment and award.
2. A student may only appeal on the following grounds:
 - a) that there are or were circumstances materially affecting the student's performance, for which supporting evidence exists, which were not known to the Board of Examiners or other academic body at the time its decision was taken and which it was not reasonably practicable for the student to make known beforehand;
 - b) that there were procedural irregularities in the conduct of examination or assessment procedures of such a nature as to create a reasonable possibility that the result may have been different if it had not occurred;
 - c) that there is evidence of prejudice or bias or lack of proper assessment on the part of one or more of the examiners.
3. An appeal which questions the academic or professional judgement of those responsible for assessing a student's academic performance or professional competence will not be permitted.
4. Where a student's appeal is based on mitigating circumstances as in a) above medical certificates from a qualified medical practitioner or other independent documentary evidence must be provided to support the claim. The evidence supplied must be in English and where the original is in another language a certified copy in English must be submitted. Medical certificates or other documentary evidence should normally be submitted at the time of the illness or other circumstances. Retrospective evidence will be considered at the discretion of an Appeals Panel and students must provide an explanation as to why it was not possible to submit the evidence at the time. Panels will only accept evidence where it considers there was a good reason for it not to have been submitted at the appropriate time.
5. A student must submit an appeal on his or her own behalf. An appeal form with supporting evidence must be submitted to the Quality Office by published deadlines.
6. Students wishing to appeal against a degree classification must submit notice of their intention to appeal to the Quality Office before the degree congregation at which their degree will be conferred.
7. It is a student's responsibility to submit an appeal by the given deadline. Appeals submitted after the deadline will be deemed to be out of time and will not be considered unless there is clear documentary evidence to demonstrate that a student was prevented from submitting the appeal by the deadline.
8. On receipt of an appeal the Quality Office will initially consider whether it has been made on the grounds specified in paragraph 2 above. If no eligible grounds have been cited the student will be advised accordingly and the appeal will either be turned down or a request for further information or evidence made. Where an appeal is turned down there will be no opportunity for a student to appeal against the decision within the University but the right of recourse to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator will be advised to the student via a Completion of Procedures letter.
9. If the appeal has been made on the grounds specified in paragraph 2 above the Quality Office will obtain a report on the appeal from the relevant Head of Department or their nominee. This report, along with the student's appeal form

- and supporting evidence will be considered by the next available appeals panel. A copy of the departmental report will be supplied to the student on request.
10. If on receipt of a copy of an appeal, a department considers that there is new evidence of either mitigating circumstances or a procedural irregularity in light of which a Board of Examiners would have been likely to have reached a different decision it may request the opportunity to refer the student's case back to the Board of Examiners.
 11. An appeals panel will comprise three members of the academic staff of the University drawn from the annual list nominated by Colleges and approved by the Academic Policy Committee. No member of the panel will be drawn from the student's own department(s) or have had previous involvement with the student. Postgraduate appeals panels will be Chaired by the Graduate Dean or her nominee. For undergraduate appeals there will be a pool of named staff approved as Chairs by the Academic Policy Committee.
 12. A member of the Quality Office will serve as Secretary to each appeal panel. The student and department will be notified of the date on which an appeal will be considered.
 13. Students are not required to attend panel meetings. Their case will be considered on the basis of documentation submitted.
 14. A record of the appeals panel meeting will be kept by the Secretary.
 15. After considering the evidence an Appeals Panel may decide in the case of undergraduate or taught postgraduate students:
 - a) To dismiss the appeal
 - b) To uphold the appeal and require the Board of Examiners or appropriate academic body to reconsider its decision taking into account such information or findings that the Appeals Panel deems appropriate
 16. After considering the evidence an Appeals Panel may decide in the case of a research student:
 - a) To dismiss the appeal
 - b) To uphold the appeal and recommend that the student be permitted to re-submit for the degree for which he/she was registered
 - c) To uphold the appeal and recommend that the student be permitted to re-submit for a master's degree
 - d) With respect to (b) and (c) above the Panel may choose to recommend the appointment of new examiners
 17. The University reserves the right to refuse to continue with the operation of appeals procedures if the appeal is conducted in a way which is abusive, offensive, defamatory, aggressive or intimidating, or pursued in an unreasonably persistent or vexatious manner. In such cases the final decision rests with the Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor.
 18. Each year an annual report on the number and nature of appeals will be prepared by the Quality Office for consideration by the Academic Policy Committee.

(Extract from General Regulations 2011/12)