

University of Glasgow**Academic Standards Committee – Friday 27 May 2011****Report from Meeting of Academic Regulations Sub-Committee held
on Friday 13 May 2011****Professor Tom Guthrie, Convener****1. Proposed revisions to Masters regulations***1.1 Proposed new regulations combining generic PGT and generic MRes regulations*

The Committee was asked to review the generic MRes regulations, which are outdated and currently lacking in detail.

There are a number of MRes programmes which are governed by the PGT generic regulations, and the Committee's view is that there is the potential for confusion in the existence of two different sets of regulations applying to different MRes programmes. The Committee has therefore investigated the possibility of developing a set of regulations that would accommodate all PGT generic programmes and those programmes that currently fall under the generic MRes regulations.

A set of draft combined regulations is provided at Appendix 1. These regulations reflect comments received from MRes programmes from across the University.

It is worth noting that the typical structure of generic MRes programmes differs from the generic PGT structure as follows:

PGT: 120 taught credits + 60 credits dissertation/other independent work.

MRes: 60 taught credits + 120 credits independent work (often comprised of 2 x 60 credit research projects). (Other variants are permitted by the current regulations, e.g. in the recently introduced MRes in Arts the number of taught credits varies, and the norm is to complete one large dissertation.)

The following points are drawn to ASC's attention:

- s. 1.3: While the generic PGT programmes have just one progression point (after completion of 120 taught credits) the MRes programmes generally impose requirements in relation to commencement of the first research project (usually after completion of 60 taught credits), and in relation to commencement of the second project. Section 1.3 will allow programmes with such requirements to be listed separately. Programmes wishing to be listed under this section will need to be explicit about how their requirements differ from the standard provisions and these requirements will have to be clearly brought to the attention of students in course documentation.
- S. 4.1(i): It was suggested that all programmes should include a minimum of 60 taught credits with a view to being able to offer a PG Certificate as an early exit award. However, the MRes Molecular Medicine only offers 45 credits that could be described as taught. The Committee's initial view was that a minimum number of taught credits was not essential and that it was more important that the breakdown

of credits permitted the award of exit awards. (In the case of the MRes Molecular Medicine it appeared that a further 15 credits would be available as a separate (research-based) course thus permitting students to accumulate the 60 credits required for the PG Certificate.) However, there is also a view that there should be a minimum number of taught credits in order to maintain a distinction between the programmes covered by these awards and programmes that are purely research-based.

ASC's view is invited on whether a minimum number of taught credits should be stipulated in the regulations.

- It is noted that in some cases the structure of the programme does not exactly align with the credit requirement for a PG Diploma. For example, the MRes in Arts might involve 90 credits of taught courses and 90 of dissertation.
- S. 8: MRes Biomedical Sciences requested that there should be no automatic entitlement to reassessment of coursework. The Committee's view is that, in line with revised provisions on reassessment of coursework being introduced into the Code of Assessment, exemptions should not be permitted without a strong case being made.
- S. 9: Requirements for award: On PGT programmes, an average standard of C3 is required on the taught courses, which generally amounts to 120 credits, whereas a D3 is required on the dissertation/independent work (60 credits). The norm for MRes programmes is 120 credits of dissertation/independent work and 60 of taught courses. There is therefore the potential for inconsistency in the standard required for the masters award if the same taught/dissertation grades are required in the MRes structure as for the PGT. One means of addressing this would be to require at least two thirds of grades to be at C3 or above for the award of the MRes. ARSC's discussion on this issue highlighted the difficulty of using C (rather than D) as the grade effectively representing the satisfactory standard in relation to the taught courses on the PGT programmes. **The Committee agreed to propose to ASC that there be consistency between the PGT and MRes programmes in this respect: it is suggested that the requirement for award of the masters on those programmes where the credits are predominantly obtained from research-based courses should be an average of at least two thirds of the credits at C3 or above.** It was agreed that the general principle of setting the standard at C for PGT courses should not be reopened at this point. The proposed standard for the award of the MRes appears to align with the standards required at the various progression points.
- S. 9: Requirements for merit and distinction: Three of the existing MRes programmes suggested that the grades required for these awards should be expressed as an average across all the programme courses rather than being stipulated separately in relation to the taught courses and the dissertations/projects. The reason given was that students who perform weakly at the start of the programme would have insufficient opportunity to compensate with improved performance by the end of the taught element. The Committee noted that the rules on merit and distinction were amended in the last session in response to the view that the standard had previously been too low. The Committee's view is that the requirements for merit and distinction are appropriate, and that programmes may wish to review their early courses to ensure that they are not unduly demanding.

ASC is asked to consider the points above and to approve the proposed regulations for inclusion in the University Calendar 2011-12

1.2 Proposed introduction of early progression point in MRes Molecular Medicine

The Committee considered a proposal by the MRes Molecular Medicine to introduce a progression point after students have completed a 15 credit introductory taught course. The programme wishes to prevent students from progressing to the first research project if they fail to achieve a minimum grade of D3 on the introductory course. The rationale presented was that if students are unable to reach this standard after two attempts, there would be serious reservations about their ability to function in a laboratory environment. From experience, staff are concerned about the negative impact on other work being carried out in the lab in allowing such students to progress.

The Committee's view is that, in principle, such a progression point could be justified. However, it raises issues in relation to international students who have experienced significant upheaval and expense in coming to Glasgow being required to terminate their studies after just 15 credits' worth of study. **The Committee agreed to suggest to ASC that the proposal should be accepted subject to such students being offered alternative courses which would at least offer the opportunity of exiting with a PG certificate. If there are compelling reasons why this would not be possible, consideration should be given to returning a substantial proportion – if not all – of the fees paid by the student.**

Members noted serious concerns over the University's policies generally in relation to the non-reimbursement of fees in the event of Masters students not completing the intended programme of study, and requested that this be drawn to ASC's attention for possible review.

2. Code of Assessment 2011-12

The Code of Assessment showing all proposed amendments for inclusion in the University Calendar 2011-12 is attached as Appendix 2.

ASC is asked to approve the following amended regulations:

Provisions on reassessment: sections 16.6 – 16.13

These proposed regulations reflect a number of decisions made by ASC:

- Eligibility for reassessment to apply to all course components where the overall course threshold grade has not been achieved;
- Reassessments to be in essentially the same format and to carry the same weighting as the original assessment;
- Reassessment of coursework to be available unless exemption is agreed by the Head of School;
- The final result following reassessment will reflect the best results for each component;
- Where no reassessment of coursework is possible, the result from the first attempt must be counted.

Reporting of all results as primary grades/secondary bands: sections 16.24, 16.31

These amendments reflect the agreement that while continued marking of components of assessment in percentages is permitted, aggregation must be performed after conversion to a primary grade and secondary band.

Joint Honours Boards of Examiners' meetings: section 16.66(b)

The amendments cover the operation of Boards of Examiners in relation to Joint Honours degrees, and include provision (requested at the April meeting of ASC) for separately constituted Joint Boards.

New regulations regarding Assessment of Study Abroad: currently unnumbered (appearing at the end of the Code)

A Working Party of Learning and Teaching Committee has considered the treatment of grades achieved by students who study abroad. Key principles have been established and ARSC was asked to propose regulations to reflect these. The Committee notes that this is an area where it is essential that there remains flexibility and discretion, and that this is reflected in the regulations. No attempt has been made to incorporate all of the principles into the Code of Assessment as this was not considered appropriate.

The principles agreed by the working party are as follows:

- The overarching principle is fairness to students, whether they study abroad or at home, while encouraging mobility.
1. School and subject coordinators or committees that have responsibility for arranging periods of study abroad should obtain as much information as possible about the course content and assessment processes in the host institution, before our students go there, to judge comparability of their marks, grades or credits with those awarded in Glasgow.
 2. There should be clarity and transparency about how an assessment during a period of study abroad is treated.
 3. Students should be informed, in advance of choosing a course of study abroad, how their marks, grades or credits will be treated when they return to the University of Glasgow. (We would also encourage students to find out for themselves as much as they can about study and assessment in a host institution they intend to visit).
 4. Systems of translation should be developed at programme level and these should be approved at programme or School level before students undertake a period of study abroad. It is the responsibility of programme boards/committees to apply the system of translation and periodically review it to ensure that it continues to be fit for purpose.
 5. These systems of translation should be subject to the University's Quality Assurance procedures and information about them included in annual course monitoring reports. Reports about agreed processes should also be forwarded to College Learning and Teaching Committees to ensure consistency of approach across the College.

- | |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">6. No assessments undertaken abroad will be marked again by assessors in the University of Glasgow.7. Students should receive full recognition at the appropriate level for an assessment undertaken during a period of study abroad.8. Exam Boards will continue to exercise their judgment in discretionary cases. |
|--|

3. Issues relating to provisions on Good Cause

3.1 Grade adjustments

ARSC was asked to consider recent correspondence regarding the application of the rules on Incomplete Assessment and Good Cause in cases where students who had undertaken assessment submitted a good cause claim. The correspondence indicated that the practice in some areas of the University is to invite the Exam Board to consider a small grade adjustment where all assessment has been completed but the student's performance has been materially affected by adverse circumstances. The adjustments are limited to one band for the course as a whole. Assessments are set aside only when the circumstances are so severe that they grades are judged to be completely unreliable. The view put forward was that such adjustments appeared to be fairer to students who would find the burden of reassessment very heavy. Reference was made to long-term health conditions and on-going severe personal circumstances.

ARSC's view was that the Code of Assessment does not permit grade adjustment as this breaches the fundamental principle that undemonstrated performance should not be credited. The regulations explicitly prohibit adjustments being made for students who experience chronic health conditions. A practice of altering students' results by one secondary band had been cited but this in itself suggested that what was being addressed was not manifest prejudice (one of the requirements for establishing good cause). Also it was noted that the blanket policy of adjusting by one secondary band could have markedly different consequences depending on what the original grade was.

ASC's view is invited on this issue.

3.2 Alternative assessment opportunities in Honours

The Committee considered the application of the rules on Incomplete Assessment and Good Cause in relation to junior honours students who miss some or all of the spring assessment diet (having attended fully throughout the year and thus wishing to proceed immediately into senior honours). The Committee's view was that there was a general expectation that such students should undertake the outstanding assessment(s) at a special diet later in the session. (This could be during the August diet, or later if appropriate.)

The Committee was also asked to consider whether in view of the rule that permitted the award of a classified honours degree with as little as 75% of the assessment having been completed, it might be appropriate to advise a student not to undertake all of the assessment for the junior honours year. The Committee's view was that generally all assessment should be attempted, though there might be exceptional circumstances where consideration could be given to omitting some part of the assessment.

It was noted that one of the requirements for progressing to the senior honours year of the BSc was that a student should be eligible for the award of an ordinary degree, thus all 120 credits from junior honours needed to be completed.

ASC's view is invited on this issue.

4 Application of the rule on 'Counting of Courses'

Section 6.2 of the PGT generic regulations states that in calculating a student's overall result, the outcome of all courses must be taken into account. ARSC was asked to consider the case of a PGT student awarded a CR in one course taken in the second semester of a one-year programme. This result would leave the student short of the required number of credits for the degree. The Committee's view was that the student should be permitted the opportunity to take another course – or repeat the same course – in the following session, thus allowing the student the opportunity to achieve the required number of credits. However, in view of s. 6.2, it was suggested that the student's overall aggregation score should include the CR outcome, namely a zero, rather than the score arising from the later course taken. **ASC is invited to consider this interpretation of the relevant provision.**

It is worth distinguishing the situation above from that of a student who completes the required number of credits but whose profile of grades does not satisfy the relevant requirements. It is ARSC's understanding that the latter student would not be permitted the opportunity to take another course in the following session with a view to achieving an improved result. (The student would - in most cases - have had two opportunities at the relevant assessment in their year of study.)

5 Duration of Examinations

At the beginning of the 2010-11 session, ASC asked ARSC to consider the current regulations in relation to the timing and duration of examinations as laid out in sections 16.14 – 16.21 and Schedule D of the Code of Assessment. The duration of examinations permitted by the regulations reflect the credit rating, the level of the course and the weighting of any other summative assessment components.

ARSC had invited Schools to bring to the Committee's attention areas where the regulations were not being complied with or where it was considered that the regulations presented Schools with difficulties.

A number of areas had come forward to advise that their schemes of assessment were not currently in compliance with the regulations, and through dialogue with the Committee, most have now amended their assessments or are in the process of doing so. The few remaining courses where arrangements are not in compliance with the regulations are being referred to the Clerk of Senate, though the Committee's view is that all courses should now be required to be compliant with the regulations.

6 Discretion in the award of honours classification

ARSC considered a paper outlining objections to the current proposals concerning discretion in the award of honours classifications.

One of the main objections raised concerned the narrowing of the discretionary zones between classifications. The paper included figures showing the proportion of students from the discretionary zones being promoted to a higher classification in the relevant subject area. The Committee expressed surprise at the figures. The numbers being

promoted from 2.2 to 2.1 and from 2.1 to 1st in the .5 - .9 range (88% and 86% respectively) suggested to the Committee that the effective borderlines were 14.5 and 17.5 respectively. In the .1 - .4 range, the proportion being promoted was 48% and 43% respectively. Members' own experience was that promotion from the latter range of the zones was rare. The Convener noted that the members of the working group that had formulated the proposals had also reported low rates of promotion from the lower range of the zones. It was noted that it would be possible to introduce the new guidelines on the exercise of discretion without narrowing the bands, in order to permit a period of wider consultation, but the Committee's view was that this was not in fact necessary.

ASC is invited to note ARSC's views.

Proposed combined regulations incorporating generic PGT and generic M.Res programmes

REGULATIONS

A student admitted onto a programme leading to an award must follow the instructions issued on behalf of the relevant School or Institute and be aware of the content of the Programme Document (often referred to as the Programme or 'Course' Handbook) which will contain further details on the Programme including, in some cases, further requirements associated with the award.

1. Application of Regulations

- 1.1 These regulations apply without modification to the degrees listed in §11 below.
- 1.2 These regulations apply also to the degrees listed in §12 below subject to alternative requirements described in the relevant Programme Document. The requirements for these degrees may vary only in respect of duration of study (§3) or progress (§7) to reflect the requirements of professional or statutory bodies.
- 1.3 These regulations also apply to the degrees listed in §13 below subject to alternative requirements described in the relevant Programme Document. The requirements for these degrees may vary only in respect of progress (§7) to reflect specific requirements as to the ability and preparedness of the candidate to undertake the particular types of independent work required within that programme.
- 1.4 In these regulations the taught courses and the dissertation(s) or other substantial pieces of work which comprise a programme are referred to as courses.

2. Admission

Before being considered for admission to study for an award to which these Regulations apply, a candidate must normally have obtained a degree or equivalent.

3. Duration of Study

The minimum period of study for the award of a Masters degree is 12 calendar months. The maximum period for full-time study is 24 calendar months of registered study. The maximum period within which all students must complete the programme is five years from the date of initial registration.

4. Programme Components

- 4.1 In order to qualify for an award in respect of the programmes specified in §11 and §12, a candidate must complete minimum credits as follows:
 - (i) For the award of a Masters degree: 180 credits, which includes both taught courses (**amounting to at least 60 credits**) and at least 60 credits in the form of one or more dissertations or other pieces of substantial independent work.
 - (ii) For the award of a Postgraduate Diploma: 120 credits.
 - (iii) For the award of a Postgraduate Certificate: 60 credits.
- 4.2 Taught courses will normally be undertaken during the academic session (September – June) and are specified in the relevant Programme Document. The length and nature of the courses consisting of a dissertation or other substantial independent work is as specified in the relevant Programme Document.

5. Minimum Requirement for the Award of Credits

Credits for courses contributing to a candidate's curriculum shall be awarded subject to the fulfilment of required conditions. The minimum requirements for the award of credits are set out in the Code of Assessment at §16.40 – §16.44 of the chapter *University Fees and General Information for Students* in the *University Calendar*.

6. Assessment

- 6.1 Regulations for assessment are, insofar as not modified by these regulations, governed by the Code of Assessment which is contained in the *University Fees and General Information for Students* chapter of the *University Calendar*.
- 6.2 Courses for which the candidate has registered must be counted towards the calculation of the candidate's average aggregation score for the purposes of regulations 7, 9 and 10 unless other provision is justified by good cause circumstances affecting the candidate.

This regulation applies where course registration continues:

- (a) on the date on which the first summative assessment for that course is to be submitted; or
- (b) on such other date as may be specified in the course document for that course.

7. Candidates for a Masters Degree: Progress

- 7.1 Subject to 7.2 below, a candidate will be permitted to progress to the remaining course(s) required for a Masters degree only if he or she has obtained an average aggregation score of 12 (equivalent to C3) or above in the programme components assessed by the end of the second semester of study with at least 75% of the credits at Grade D3 or better and all credits at Grade F or above. The Programme Document may specify a course or courses in respect of which a specific grade is a minimum requirement of progression. Exceptionally, a candidate may be permitted to progress where it is judged that the candidate's performance offers a reasonable prospect of that candidate's reaching the standard required for the award of the Masters degree following reassessment.
- 7.2 A candidate who has commenced study midway through an academic session will be permitted to progress to the remaining course(s) required for a Masters degree only if he or she has obtained an average aggregation score of 12 (equivalent to C3) or above in the courses assessed by the end of the session in which study was commenced, with at least 75% of the credits at Grade D3 or better and all credits at Grade F or above. The Programme Document may specify a course or courses in respect of which a specific grade is a minimum requirement of progression. Exceptionally, a candidate may be permitted to progress to the dissertation or other substantial independent work where it is judged that the candidate's performance offers a reasonable prospect of that candidate's reaching the standard required for the award of the Masters degree following reassessment.

8. Reassessment of the Dissertation

Where a candidate requires a higher grade in any dissertation or other substantial independent work in order to satisfy the requirements set out in §9.1 or §9.2 below, reassessment of that dissertation or other substantial independent work will be permitted on one occasion only, under such conditions as the Examiners may prescribe in each particular case. Normally, resubmission should be no later than 3 months after the date of the meeting of the Board of Examiners. There is no automatic entitlement to repeat any previous practical work associated with a dissertation or substantial independent work or to undertake further practical work.

9. Requirements for the award of a Masters degree and rules for award of distinction and merit

- 9.1 Where the structure of the programme includes 120 credits of taught courses a candidate will be eligible for the award of the degree on obtaining an average aggregation score of 12 (equivalent to C3) or above in the taught courses described in Regulation 4, with at least 75% of these credits at Grade D3 or better, and all credits at Grade F or above, and obtaining a grade D3 or better in the dissertation or other substantial independent work.
- 9.2 In other cases a candidate will be eligible for the award of the degree on obtaining an average aggregation score of 12 (equivalent to C3) or above in 120 credits (including all taught courses) with at least 75% of these credits at Grade D3 or better, and all credits at Grade F or above, and obtaining a grade D3 or better in the remaining credits involving dissertation or other substantial independent work.
- 9.3 A candidate who has achieved at the first attempt an average aggregation score of 15 (equivalent to B3) or above for the taught courses and Grade B3 or above for the dissertation or other substantial independent work where this forms only one programme component; or a Grade B3 or above for each dissertation or other substantial independent work where there is more than one programme component in that form will be eligible for the award with Merit. Where the average aggregation score for the taught courses falls within the range 14.1 and 14.9 the Board of Examiners shall have discretion to make the award with Merit. No discretion can be applied in relation to the grade required for the dissertation or other substantial independent work.
- 9.4 A candidate who has achieved at the first attempt an average aggregation score of 18 (equivalent to A5) or above for the taught courses and a Grade A5 or above for the dissertation or other substantial independent work where this forms only one programme component; or a Grade A5 or above for each dissertation or other substantial independent work where there is more than one programme component in that form will be eligible for the award with Distinction. Where the average aggregation score for the taught courses falls within the range 17.1 to 17.9 the Board of Examiners shall have the discretion to make the award with Distinction. No discretion can be applied in relation to the grade required for the dissertation or other substantial independent work.

10. Requirements for the award of a Postgraduate Diploma or Postgraduate Certificate and rules for award of distinction and merit

- 10.1 The requirement for the award of a Postgraduate Diploma is an average aggregation score of 9 (equivalent to D3) in 120 credits, with not less than 80 of these credits at Grade D or above.
- 10.2 The requirement for the award of a Postgraduate Certificate is an average aggregation score of 9 (equivalent to D3) in 60 credits, with not less than 40 of these credits at Grade D or above.
- 10.3 These awards may be granted with Merit or Distinction according to the criteria specified in §9.2 and §9.3 above.

CODE OF ASSESSMENT: 2011-12

The revisions to the Code of Assessment for 2011-12 are shown below. Clauses 16.6 – 16.13, 16.24, 16.31, and 16.66(b) require approval by ASC. The remaining changes reflect previously agreed regulatory revision. No change is shown for the zones of discretion in the Notes on Schedules 3b) as current proposals from ASC and EdPSC remain to be considered by Senate on 2 June 2011.

16 CODE OF ASSESSMENT FOR UNDERGRADUATE AND TAUGHT POSTGRADUATE PROGRAMMES

The Code of Assessment is governed by Resolution No. 564 of the University Court which came into effect on 1 October 2003. The effects of subsequent amending Resolutions are incorporated in the Regulations below.

These Regulations are reproduced in the online [Guide to the Code of Assessment](#) where they are accompanied by commentary and examples.

General

16.1 Each approved course⁷ contributing to an award of the University shall have a credit rating based upon the notional learning hours required for its completion, and determined in accordance with the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF)⁸. Regulations governing awards of the University may express the criteria for making such awards directly or indirectly in terms of accumulated credit points. The minimum requirement for the award of credits is addressed in §16.40 - §16.44 below.

16.2 (a) Each such course will incorporate a scheme of assessment which:

- (ai) assesses candidates' performance against the intended learning outcomes of the course;
- (bij) includes an appropriate combination of formative and summative elements;
- (eiii) deploys forms of assessment appropriate to the intended learning outcomes of the course, taking due account of its credit rating;
- (div) where re-assessment is provided for in the degree regulations, makes provision for the re-assessment of candidates in accordance with the regulations;
- (ev) may be changed only through procedures approved by Senate;
- (vif) may be varied exceptionally in a given session in response to specific circumstances subject to the approval of the Clerk of Senate;
- (viig) is as far as practicable anonymous.

(b) Each scheme of assessment will set out the individual components of assessment and their respective weighting in the calculation of the final grade for the course

(i) 'Component of assessment' means each of the weighted assessments set out in the course specification document.

(ii) Each component of assessment may include sub-components except that individual questions in an examination or other piece of coursework shall not be regarded as sub-components.

16.3 The scheme will be implemented in accordance with the following requirements:

- (a) the scheme shall be fully described in the School Instructions issued in written or electronic form to all students enrolled in the course (at the beginning of the course, or as soon as practicable thereafter), with particular regard to dates, deadlines and formats of required work, weights of components of the assessment scheme, the method of marking (e.g. single marking, blind double marking, etc.), procedures for informing students of results and the returning of work, requirements for progression in the relevant programme and provisions for appeal;
- (b) due notice shall be given of dates, times and places of written and oral examinations and other assessment events;
- (c) appropriate provision shall be made for candidates with a formally recognised permanent or temporary disability in consultation with a Student Disability Adviser (see Section 24);

⁷ The term 'course' refers to a self-contained unit of study on a particular topic with defined level, credit value, aims, intended learning outcomes, mode(s) of delivery, scheme of assessment and possibly also pre- and co-requisites.

⁸ Information about the SCQF may be obtained at: www.scqf.org.uk/

- (d) candidates shall be supplied with relevant information on assessment criteria and on schemes for grading, classification and aggregation.

16.4 The scheme shall describe how candidates will receive feedback to guide their subsequent learning. That feedback may include the outcomes of summative assessment. Where these are provided they will be provisional until they are confirmed or amended by the appropriate Board of Examiners.

16.5 Where an examination at Honours level involves two or more subjects, the way in which the results of individual papers or units of assessment are to be aggregated, averaged or profiled to produce an overall classification of the degree should be agreed either when the degree is approved or by the time the written papers are set.

Provision for Reassessment (*in sections 16.6-16.14 the underline denotes areas where changes have been made; for clarity, deleted material has not been shown*)

16.6 In §16.7 - §16.8 below, the 'threshold grade' shall, unless otherwise specified in the regulations for a particular programme, be:

- (a) for undergraduate programmes, grade D;
- (b) for programmes governed by the generic regulations for taught masters degrees and for programmes governed by the generic regulations for postgraduate certificates and diplomas, grade C.

16.7 A candidate who, by the end of the course, has failed to attain the threshold grade in that course shall normally be afforded the opportunity described in §16.8 below to improve that assessment result. There shall be no such opportunity in respect of courses which contribute to the candidate's honours classification except where permitted under the regulations governing a particular award; in such cases the original grade only shall contribute to the honours classification.

16.8 A candidate who has failed to attain the threshold grade shall, subject to the provision of §16.9 below, be permitted one further opportunity to attempt each component of the assessment.⁹ This opportunity will be afforded within the same session as the first attempt at the component. In respect of each component, the assessment offered at this opportunity must be in essentially the same form as the assessment attempted by the student as his or her first attempt and must carry the same weighting within the scheme of assessment for the course as that first attempt. A second further opportunity to attempt the component of assessment shall not be available as a matter of right but may be permitted at the discretion of the College responsible for the programme in accordance with its policies and procedures which shall be published in the relevant course documentation.

16.9 Exceptionally the opportunity to submit coursework for assessment provided for in § 16.8 above may not be available to a student. This will only be the case where it is not possible to replicate the coursework for the purpose of reassessment. This situation may arise from the nature of the coursework, the context in which it may be generated, and the integrity of the assessment as a whole. The decision that it is not possible to replicate coursework must be approved by the Head of School and details of coursework in which it is considered to be impossible to generate a reassessment must be clearly set out in the relevant course documentation.

16.10 Where, under §16.45 - §16.53 below, a Board of Examiners is satisfied that a candidate has been prevented by good cause from completing an assessment, that assessment shall not be counted as an attempt made by, or available to, the candidate.

16.11 Exceptionally, where a second or permitted subsequent attempt at an assessment is not available to the candidate until a subsequent academic session, the candidate shall not be entitled to assume that the content of the course will be unchanged, and it shall be the responsibility of the candidate, in conjunction with the School responsible for the course, to make appropriate preparation for that assessment.

16.12 Unless otherwise specified in the regulations for a particular programme, the final grade awarded for a course following reassessment shall be calculated as follows:

- (a) The best grades for each component of assessment will be used, and
- (b) Where any coursework cannot be replicated the original grade for that component shall be used in the calculation.

16.13 The grade so calculated will be published by Registry subject to the following provisions:

- (a) for undergraduate programmes, the number of grade points derived from the final result for a course following reassessment shall be not more than ~~10~~9 and not less than the number of points determined by the grade originally achieved;
- (b) for programmes governed by the generic regulations for taught masters degrees, reassessment results for taught courses shall be capped so that the ~~aggregation score~~grade points¹⁰ contributing to the final award shall not be greater than 12 and not be less than that achieved at the first attempt; there shall be no capping in relation to reassessment of the dissertation or other substantial independent work.

⁹ This includes offering reassessment in sub-components.

¹⁰ ~~Aggregation scores are aligned with primary grades and secondary bands in Schedule A, and an aggregation score of 12 corresponds with the grade/band C3.~~

16.14 Further to §16.7 above, and notwithstanding §16.12 above, a candidate who, by the end of the course, requires an improved assessment result in order to complete a graduating curriculum in that academic session, shall normally be afforded the opportunity described in §16.8 above irrespective of the result obtained on completion of the course. This entitlement shall be limited to courses totalling no more than 60 credit points. On completion of the reassessment, the candidate shall be awarded the number of grade points corresponding to the grade achieved in the reassessment or, if higher, that corresponding to the grade achieved in the original assessment.

Timing and Duration of Examinations

16.14 Where all or part of a course's scheme of assessment consists of an 'end of course' examination, that examination shall normally be held within the academic session in which the course has been taught.

16.15 The duration of an examination which occurs within the main examination diets, and which forms all or part of a course's summative assessment, is subject to a limit determined by the level at which the course is taught, its credit rating, and the extent to which the examination contributes to the summative assessment of the course as a whole.

16.16 Where more than one such examination for the same course occurs within the main examination diets, the maximum duration prescribed in §16.17 - §16.18, and the references in the same clauses to 'examination', shall apply to these examinations in combination.

16.17 The duration of an examination as defined in §16.15 where it contributes 100% of the course's summative assessment, may not, subject to §16.19, exceed the number of minutes prescribed in Schedule D.

16.18 Where such an examination accounts for less than 100% of the course's summative assessment, the maximum duration of such an examination shall be determined by the product of that percentage (expressed as a decimal fraction) and the number of minutes appropriate to credits and level indicated in Schedule D. Where the result of this calculation is less than 60 minutes, the maximum duration shall be rounded up to 60 minutes and, otherwise, subject to §16.19, the result shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of 30 minutes.

16.19 Where the calculated maximum duration is 60 minutes or 90 minutes, the College in which responsibility for the examination lies may approve an extension of 30 minutes where such an extension is justified by the nature and content of the examination.

16.20 The examination duration determined by these regulations may be allocated to two or more individual examinations which may be 60, 90, 120, or (only in the spring examination period) 180 minutes in length, all of these durations being inclusive of reading time.

16.21 The maximum durations prescribed in §16.17 - §16.19 shall not limit the provision available in §24.7 - §24.9 to allow extra time to examination candidates with disabilities.

Standards

General

16.22 The standard achieved by a candidate in all summative assessments required by a course shall be judged by the relevant Board of Examiners in terms of the candidate's attainment of the stated intended learning outcomes for that course.

16.23 Judgement shall be expressed in terms of the primary grades and secondary bands set out in Schedule A or in terms of the grades set out in Schedule B below.

16.24 Judgement shall be made through direct reference to the primary verbal descriptors for intended learning outcomes and the primary verbal descriptors for professional practical competence set out in Schedules A and B. Reference shall also be made to such subsidiary information as Schools may prepare to amplify the primary verbal descriptors in terms specific to a particular field of study. Where the outcome of the chosen mode of assessment is a proper percentage score it shall, [before being reported to students](#), be converted into a primary grade and secondary band by reference to a conversion scheme determined by the Board of Examiners as appropriate for the assessment in question and subordinate to the relevant grade descriptors.

Penalties for late submission of coursework

The regulations set out in §16.25 - §16.28 below will apply, notwithstanding the normal provision of §1.9, to all taught students.

16.25 Deadlines for the submission of coursework which is to be formally assessed will be published in course documentation, and work which is submitted later than the deadline will be subject to penalty as set out below. Where the work in question is a dissertation or other independent work for which, in order to qualify for the degree, a minimum grade is prescribed, the penalty will be discounted for the purpose of determining whether that prescription has been met.

16.26 Except as modified by §16.27 - §16.28, the primary grade and secondary band awarded for coursework which is submitted after the published deadline will be calculated as follows:

- (a) in respect of work submitted not more than five working days after the deadline:
 - (i) the work will be assessed in the usual way;

(ii) the primary grade and secondary band so determined will then be reduced by two secondary bands for each working day (or part of a working day) the work was submitted late.

(b) work submitted more than five working days after the deadline will be awarded Grade H.

16.27 Penalties for late submission of coursework will not be imposed if good cause is established for the late submission in terms of the definitions and procedures set out in §16.45 - §16.53.

16.28 Without prejudice to the regulations governing good cause for late submission of coursework set out in §16.45 - §16.53, a candidate who is unable to submit coursework by the published deadline, or who anticipates being unable to do so, may apply for a deferral of the deadline, or exemption from the penalties set out in §16.26 (a). Any such application will be subject to the following constraints.

- (a) The application will be submitted to, and considered by, the person (normally the course convener) identified in course documentation as responsible for coursework assessment.
- (b) The outcome of the application will be determined at the discretion of the person responsible for coursework assessment who will require to be satisfied that the candidate submitting the application has been prevented by circumstances beyond his or her control from submitting the relevant work on time.
- (c) Deferral of the submission deadline, or exemption from a late penalty, will be commensurate with the duration of the circumstances causing the late submission, and will be subject to a limit of three working days.
- (d) Where the application is not submitted until after the deadline for submission of the work itself, relief from a late penalty will normally be granted only where the circumstances preventing the candidate from submitting work on time have also prevented application for a deferral of the deadline for submission.

Aggregation

16.29 Where the assessment scheme of a specific course or programme requires aggregation across two or more components to obtain an overall outcome, the aggregation scores set out in Schedules A and B shall be employed.

16.30 Schedule B shall be employed only for the assessment of demonstration of professional competence. The aggregation scores therein shall not be combined with those of Schedule A in the process of aggregation.

Aggregation of Assessments across a Course

16.31 Aggregation to establish a result for a course shall require the computation of the mean, rounded to an integer value, of the relevant aggregation scores of the component assessments ~~or, where the component assessments yield proper percentage scores, the mean percentage score converted to an integer aggregation score (see §16.29).~~ Where appropriate the computation shall employ weights as specified in the course documentation. In carrying out the aggregation all assessment components which are summative must be included.

16.32 The primary grade or secondary band to be reported as a result for the course shall be that in Schedule A or B, as appropriate. The primary grade or, in the case of honours and taught postgraduate courses the mean score, shall be carried forward to subsequent aggregation required to determine the programme award (See §16.34 - §16.39.)

Aggregation of Results of Courses across a Programme

16.33 Where there is provision for assessment to be split between examination diets, a Board of Examiners shall determine and report the results for the individual components of the programme after each intermediate diet and the overall award after the final diet.

Undergraduate Non-Honours Programmes

16.34 The standard obtained by a candidate in each qualifying course of the award expressed as a primary grade shall be converted into grade points, as the product of the grade points per credit set out in Schedule ~~C-A~~ and the credit rating of the course. The sum of the grade points relating to the qualifying courses comprising the programme shall be divided by the sum of their credit ratings to obtain the Grade Point Average (GPA).

16.35 The regulations of each award shall state

- (a) the minimum GPA required for the award, distinguishing as necessary between GPAs derived from attainment of intended learning outcomes and those derived from demonstration of professional practical competence
- (b) the minimum GPA required for identified categories of the award such as with Merit, Distinction or Commendation or such sub-degree awards as may be made
- (c) limitations on the permitted extent of compensation of performance below the stated minimum for the award in individual components of the programme consequential on the computation of the GPA.

Honours Degree and Integrated Masters Programmes

16.36 The mean scores corresponding to the required components of the honours programme shall be summed and an overall mean computed, where appropriate employing weights as specified in the programme documentation, and

rounded to one decimal place.¹¹ Where appropriate, overall means shall be computed separately in respect of assessment relating to Schedules A and B.

- (a) There shall be four classes of honours: first, upper second, lower second and third. A candidate who is not placed in one of the four classes shall have failed the honours programme. (This shall not prevent the award of an unclassified honours degree within the terms of regulation §16.52(d)(i)).
- (b) Where Schedule A alone applies the honours class awarded shall be that shown in Schedule A as having the range of aggregation scores in which the overall mean lies, except that a Board of Examiners shall have discretion as defined in the Notes to the Schedules. In exercising that discretion the Board of Examiners must apply the guidance set out in the Guide to the Code of Assessment. In determining whether a candidate for joint or combined honours falls within the range in which there is discretion, all of the grades achieved by the candidate across both subjects must be taken into account.
- (c) Where Schedules A and B apply severally to components of an honours programme the honours class awarded shall be the lower of those in the two Schedules in which the corresponding means lie, except that a Board of Examiners shall have discretion as defined in the Notes to the Schedules.
- (d) The weighting of courses for the calculation of an Honours classification for an undergraduate Honours degree should normally follow the credit weighting of those courses in the third and fourth years of the Honours programme. These weightings must be set out in the programme specification.
- (e) The weighting of assessments for the calculation of an Honours classification for an integrated Masters degree should normally give weight to the third, fourth, and fifth years of the programme, with the assessment in the fifth year counting for at least 50% of the calculation. These weightings must be set out in the programme specification, and should normally fall within the range of 10:20:70 to 20:30:50.

BDS, BVMS and MB ChB Programmes

16.37 The mean scores corresponding to the required components of the programme shall be summed and an overall mean computed, where appropriate employing weights as specified in the programme documentation, and rounded to one decimal place¹¹. Where appropriate, overall means shall be computed separately in respect of assessment relating to Schedules A and B.

- (a) There shall be three categories of award: honours, commendation and pass. A candidate who is not placed in one of the three categories shall have failed the programme.
- (b) The regulations of each award shall state the minimum results in terms of Schedules A and B required for the award and for the individual categories of award.

Taught Postgraduate Programmes

16.38 An average grade for the programme shall be determined by summing the scores corresponding to its required components, where appropriate employing weights as specified in the programme documentation, and calculating an overall mean rounded to one decimal place an integer value¹¹. This mean shall be translated to the corresponding grade in Schedule A or B as appropriate, overall means being computed separately in respect of these Schedules.

16.39 The regulations of each award shall state:

- (a) the minimum average grade required for the award;
- (b) the minimum grade required in any component or components of the programme, and such limitations on the permitted extent of compensation of performance below such minima;
- (c) the minimum average grade and other criteria required for identified categories of the award such as with Merit or Distinction.

Minimum Requirement for the Award of Credits

16.40 References are made throughout §16.41 - §16.44 of these regulations to a candidate's failure to meet fully the submission requirements for his or her assessment in the absence of good cause. The means by which good cause may be determined and the provisions made in circumstances where good cause is established are addressed in §16.45 - §16.53.

16.41 Except as modified by §16.44, the minimum requirement for the award of credits for a course is the submission of at least 75%¹² by weight of the course's summative assessment (including any examinations). Schools may specify further requirements such as monitored attendance at classes and examinations. All such requirements shall be specified by the School concerned, and given to students in writing at the beginning of the course. Where the scheme of assessment for a course permits resits or reassessment, requirements involving submission of assessments or attendance at examinations must be fulfilled by the end of the academic year in which the course is taken subject to an exception in cases where a student misses an assessment with good cause.

¹¹ A mean score should be rounded in accordance with the following example: 15.65 should become 15.7 whilst 15.64 should become 15.6.

¹² The College Board of Studies may authorise the setting of a higher percentage of submission in which event that higher percentage must be clearly set out in the School Instructions issued to all students enrolled in the course.

Non-Honours Courses

16.42 Where the outcome of a course does not contribute to a final honours classification the following procedure shall be adopted. If, in the absence of good cause, a candidate fails to submit at least 75%¹² by weight of the course's summative assessment (including any examinations) by the end of the first assessment diet or fails to comply with other requirements specified in writing by the School, and an opportunity exists to redress this situation by the end of the academic year in which the course is taken, the initial outcome shall be Credit Withheld and no grade shall be calculated. Thereafter:

- (a) Where a candidate has submitted at least 75%¹² by weight of the course summative assessment (including any examinations) and/or has complied with the outstanding requirements for the award of credit by the end of the academic year in which the course is taken, the outcome following reassessment will be calculated in accordance with the scheme of assessment described in the School Instructions.
- (b) Where a candidate has not submitted at least 75%¹² by weight of the course's summative assessment (including any examinations) and/or has failed to comply with the outstanding requirements for the award of credit by the end of the academic year in which the course is taken, no grade shall be calculated and the outcome shall be Credit Refused for that course.

16.43 Where a candidate has failed to comply with any mandatory requirement for the award of credit and this cannot be remedied by the end of the academic year in which the course is taken, no grade shall be calculated and the outcome shall be Credit Refused for that course.

Honours Assessment

16.44 Where the outcome of a course contributes to a final honours classification the following procedure shall be adopted. In all cases the references to non-submission are to non-submission in the absence of good cause which is defined in §16.45 (a).

- (a) The extent of submission of honours assessment shall be determined as a percentage of the totality of summatively assessed work, based on the published assessment weightings required by the honours assessment scheme approved by Senate. The calculation of this percentage shall take into account all components of assessment over all courses contributing to the honours assessment, rather than being carried out on a course by course basis.
- (b) If by the end of an honours programme a candidate has:
 - (i) submitted 75% or more of the honours assessment, and
 - (ii) complied with other requirements set out in School Instructions,the grade for any course in which he or she has submitted less than 75% of the assessment shall be calculated by awarding a grade H for any missed assessment and the grade for the course calculated in accordance with the scheme of assessment described in the School Instructions. This grade will be used for the purposes of honours aggregation.
- (c) If by the end of an honours programme a candidate has submitted less than 75% of the honours assessment he or she shall be refused credit for any course in which he or she has submitted less than 75% of the assessment.
- (d) Where a candidate has not completed all of the assessment for a course examined before the final year of the honours programme the grade for that course shall be returned as Credit Withheld. On completion of the honours assessment the grade for any such course shall be calculated as above.

Incomplete Assessment resulting from Good Cause

Scope and definitions

16.45 For the purposes of §16.46 - §16.53 of these regulations:

- (a) 'Good cause' shall mean illness or other adverse personal circumstances affecting a candidate and resulting in either:
 - (i) the candidate's failure to
 - attend an examination, or
 - submit coursework at or by the due time¹³, or
 - otherwise satisfy the requirements of the scheme of assessment appropriate to his or her programme of studies; or,
 - (ii) the candidate's performance in examination or other instrument of assessment being manifestly prejudiced.

A chronic medical condition shall not itself be considered a good cause although a short-term exacerbation of such a condition might be so judged.

¹³ §16.26 sets out penalties for late submission of coursework; these will not be applied in the event of good cause being demonstrated. In the event of coursework being submitted not more than three days late as a result of circumstances beyond the control of the candidate, the candidate may apply for exemption from these penalties - see §16.28. If a candidate is so permitted to defer submission of coursework, the 'due time' hereafter in these regulations will be the later time permitted.

- (b) 'Evidence' shall mean a report descriptive of the medical condition or other adverse personal circumstances which are advanced by the candidate for consideration as amounting to good cause. Such a report should include a supporting statement from an appropriate person as indicated by the University's Student Absence Policy¹⁴. Where the report refers to a medical condition of more than seven days' duration the report must be completed by an appropriate medical practitioner.
- (c) The events described in paragraphs (i) and (ii) of paragraph (a) of this regulation shall constitute incomplete assessment.

Procedure

16.46 Where an incomplete assessment may be the result of good cause, it shall be the responsibility of the candidate concerned to make the circumstances known to the Head of the School responsible for the assessment, and to provide appropriate evidence¹⁵. Notification later than one week after the examination, or after the date at which submission of the work for assessment was due, shall not be taken into account unless circumstances have prevented the candidate from notifying the Head of School within this time. A candidate may not retract a claim of good cause more than one week after the examination or the date at which submission of work for assessment was due, nor after the date of publication of the results of the assessment, whichever date was earlier.

16.47 The primary responsibility for determining such claims of good cause shall lie with the appropriate Board of Examiners. However, in the event of a meeting of the Board of Examiners not being anticipated until some significant time after the examination or submission date missed by the candidate claiming good cause, the Head of School shall determine the outcome of a claim of good cause in consultation with the relevant Assessment Officer. Any such decisions shall be reported to the Board of Examiners at the next available meeting. Although the Board of Examiners may pass comment on such decisions, it may not overturn a decision where this would cause detriment to the candidate.

16.48 In considering claims of good cause:

- (a) the evidence provided by the candidate claiming good cause, and any relevant and available material submitted by him or her for assessment shall be scrutinised;
- (b) fairness to the individual candidate claiming good cause must be balanced with fairness to other candidates and the integrity of the assessment as a whole;
- (c) in the event of the candidate having failed to attend an examination or examinations, or having failed to submit course material or other work for assessment at or by the due time, it shall be determined whether the failure to attend or submit has been justified by good cause;
- (d) in the event of the candidate having submitted work for assessment by examination or otherwise, it shall be determined whether such work has been manifestly prejudiced by good cause. If such prejudice is established the work affected shall normally be deemed not to have been submitted.

Outcomes

16.49 Where it is determined that the evidence presented does not support the candidate's claim that he or she was prevented by good cause from attending an examination or submitting work for assessment on or by the due time, the candidate shall be awarded Grade H or equivalent for the assessment or assessments in question. Where it is determined that the evidence presented does not support the candidate's claim that his or her performance in assessment was manifestly prejudiced by good cause, his or her work shall be assessed as though no claim of good cause had been received. The candidate's grade for the course as a whole shall, subject to §16.40 - §16.44, be calculated accordingly.

16.50 In the event of incomplete assessment arising from good cause being established the candidate shall, subject to §16.52 below, normally be expected to complete his or her assessment by attending the examination at a subsequent diet, or submitting outstanding work for assessment, if an opportunity to do so occurs within his or her period of study. In considering whether this requirement should apply, the desirability of the candidate's assessment being conducted in full should be balanced with the practical considerations and financial costs to the candidate and the University of providing a later completion date. Consideration should also be given to the candidate's other assessment commitments to ensure that he or she is not unreasonably burdened. In order to permit such completion:

- (a) a special sitting of an examination may be arranged, or the candidate shall be required to attend for examination at a scheduled diet; and/or,
- (b) a date for completion of non-examination assessment shall be set;

as appropriate in the circumstances. In any such event, that sitting or submission shall be regarded as the candidate's first attempt if the examination or assessment missed would itself have been his or her first attempt.

16.51 If the outstanding work in respect of which good cause is established is identified in regulations as a requirement for the award of a degree this work must be submitted for the candidate to qualify for the award of that degree.

¹⁴ The [Student Absence Policy](#) is available online.

¹⁵ In accordance with the Student Absence Policy, evidence relating to absence should be submitted, via WebSURF.

16.52 In respect of work for assessment not excluded by §16.51, where it is determined that the evidence presented supports the candidate's claim that he or she was prevented by good cause from completing that work on or by the due time, and where no means of substituting an alternative assessment may be found, the following regulations shall apply:

- (a) The extent to which the candidate's assessment has been completed shall be determined as a percentage, taking into account the relative weights attributed to the components of a complete assessment as published in the relevant assessment scheme approved by the Senate. The extent of such completion at sub-honours levels and on taught postgraduate programmes shall be determined on a course by course basis; at honours, the extent of completion of assessment shall be determined across the whole honours assessment.
- (b) The Board of Examiners shall make an overall judgement of the candidate's work submitted for assessment, using as far as possible the standards and criteria applied in respect of the work of other candidates.
- (c) Where the candidate has completed 75% or more of the work required for assessment, the Board of Examiners shall recommend an award or other outcome on the basis of the work completed.
- (d) In respect of honours assessment,
 - (i) where the candidate has completed at least 30% but less than 75% of the work required for assessment, an unclassified honours degree may be recommended if the completed portion is of honours standard, or, if the completed portion is not of honours standard, no award shall be made and the candidate will be regarded as not having been presented for honours assessment;
 - (ii) where the candidate has completed less than 30% of the work required for assessment he or she will be regarded as not having been presented for honours assessment.
- (e) In respect of ~~non~~sub-honours and taught postgraduate assessment, where the candidate has completed less than 75% of the work required for assessment he or she will be regarded as not having taken the course.

16.53 Where the Board of Examiners decides to recommend an unclassified honours degree or to make no award, this outcome shall be communicated to the Clerk of Senate together with a reasoned case for the decision. If the candidate has been recommended for the award of an unclassified honours degree, and has not previously refused such an offer, the Clerk of Senate shall invite him or her to accept that award. In the event of the award being declined, the candidate shall be regarded as not having been presented for honours assessment.

Management of the Assessment Scheme

16.54 Overall responsibility for management of the assessment scheme shall rest with the relevant Head of School¹⁶.

16.55 The Examiners for the scheme shall comprise Internal Examiners and External Examiners.

- (a) The Internal Examiners shall be:
 - (i) all members of academic staff who teach the course;
 - (ii) other members of academic staff appointed by the Head of School;
 - (iii) other individuals whose services are to be employed in the assessment process (e.g. Honorary Lecturers, Research Fellows Category A, Graduate Teaching Assistants, staff from Associated Institutions, etc.); such individuals must be nominated by the Head of School through the College (or through the Education Policy and Strategy Committee in the case of Associated Institutions) to the Clerk of Senate for approval on behalf of Senate.
- (b) At least one External Examiner shall be appointed by Court on the recommendation of the Head of School and in accordance with the criteria and procedures agreed by the Senate (see §16.64(a) and (b) below).

16.56 The Examiners, with the appropriate Assessment Officer(s) in attendance and under the chairmanship of the Head of School (or his or her nominee), shall constitute a Board of Examiners for the purpose of determining the results of the assessment procedure.

16.57 The Head of School shall ensure that:

- (a) all Internal Examiners, and especially those who are not members of academic staff of the University, receive appropriate training and other preparation relevant to their role in the assessment procedure;
- (b) each External Examiner has access to the necessary information and assessment material required to assist him or her in reaching a reasonable conclusion on assessment performance, and has the opportunity to attend oral examinations and presentations where practicable;
- (c) invigilators are appointed for all examinations and that they are conversant with the relevant regulations (see Sections 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25).

16.58 The Head of School shall, for each course, appoint a member of academic, or academic related, staff as Assessment Officer with the following delegated responsibilities:

¹⁶ Head of School means the Head or Heads of School or Schools responsible for the course, or other equivalent officers.

- (a) to ensure, in conjunction with the Course Co-ordinator or equivalent, that the relevant course documentation accurately describes the assessment scheme and corresponding procedures;
- (b) to oversee the preparation of the relevant forms of assessment under secure conditions and ensure compliance with Senate's requirements in respect of printing of examination papers;
- (c) to supervise the arrangements for the assessment procedure including: the preparation of lists of candidates entitled to be assessed; procedures for recording the receipt of coursework at the time of its submission, and for safe keeping such records; the anonymity of written work, where practicable, throughout its assessment; and any arrangements for candidates with special needs;
- (d) to maintain throughout the assessment period the security of examination papers, other materials to be assessed and records, including examination attendance slips, relating to the procedure;
- (e) to confirm arrangements for the invigilation of examinations and the secure collection and delivery of the completed scripts where appropriate;
- (f) to ensure that all Examiners are conversant with the learning outcomes of the course, the intentions of the forms of assessment and the appropriate grading or classification scheme in use, and are supplied with marking schemes or other guides where these are employed;
- (g) to convey provisional results and other information pertaining to the course, the assessment and the candidates to the External Examiner(s);
- (h) to collate the provisional results of the assessment procedure and take all steps necessary to ensure their accurate reporting to the Board of Examiners;
- (i) to report to the Board of Examiners on the conduct of the assessment procedure, in particular drawing to its attention relevant information pertaining to the circumstances and conduct of individual candidates and any alleged deficiencies in respect of the operation of the procedure;
- (j) to convey the results authenticated by the Board of Examiners to the Registry;
- (k) to oversee the maintenance of appropriate records of assessment outcomes for the purposes of subsequent monitoring of courses.

An individual Assessment Officer may be responsible for more than one course. Similarly, some or all of the duties detailed above may be undertaken by one or more individuals at School level for some or all courses.

16.59 The Head of College shall ensure that appeals against the outcomes of assessment are considered in accordance with the relevant provisions of the prevailing Appeals Code.

16.60 Any questions of principle or procedure regarding the operation of the regulations governing incomplete assessment and good cause shall be determined by the Academic Standards Committee or, in respect of any individual case, by the Clerk of Senate.

Assurance of Standards

16.61 Examiners shall be responsible for the assurance of standards through the exercise of their academic judgement both directly in the assessment of students' work and indirectly in the design of specific forms of assessment involving mechanical grading operations.

16.62 Internal Examiners shall:

- (a) have access to the relevant course documentation, possess an appropriate level of knowledge of the subject matter of the course, the course aims and the learning outcomes and the corresponding course materials;
- (b) be provided with guidance as to how the grading or classification scheme is to be applied in the context of the particular assessment.

16.63 The method of marking (e.g. single marking, blind double marking, etc.) shall be made clear to students by the School.

16.64 External Examiners shall:

- (a) hold an academic or professional post of an appropriate level of seniority;
- (b) possess substantial prior experience of assessment at equivalent levels on behalf of institutions judged to be delivering and making awards of comparable standards. Exceptionally a professional nominee who lacks the required prior experience may be appointed provided at least one experienced External Examiner is also appointed for the same course;
- (c) be appointed in accordance with the University's agreed procedures (see Section 23);
- (d) have no potential conflict of interest or other impediment to the impartial discharge of the functions of external examining;
- (e) discharge the following functions:

- (i) in respect of the design of the assessment scheme:
 - comment on the syllabus, learning outcomes and assessment scheme of the course and its delivery mechanism in the light of experiences of candidates' learning outcomes, comparable courses and awards elsewhere and developments within the discipline or field;
 - be consulted regarding proposals for the introduction or modification of a course;
- (ii) in respect of a given assessment diet:
 - comment on, in advance, all summative assessment instruments (or, in cases involving a high volume of continuous assessment, a sample may be provided for advance comment);
 - report on the overall standards achieved by candidates and in particular on the comparability of these standards with those of candidates on similar courses or programmes in other UK Higher Education institutions;
 - report on the relationship between these overall standards, programme specifications and published national subject benchmark statements;
 - assess the soundness and fairness of the implementation of the assessment process;
 - adjudicate where necessary, subject to the authority of Senate, over the grade to be awarded to any particular candidate;
 - certify contentment with the assessment outcomes prior to their publication;
 - provide an annual written report to the Principal as required by the University.

16.65 All examiners shall maintain the security of examination scripts and other materials to be assessed. Throughout the assessment process examiners must ensure that the identity of any candidate is not disclosed through any form of communication, including e-mail. Examination scripts and other assessed materials must be retained by Schools for the periods prescribed by Senate.

16.66 (a) Meetings of the Board of Examiners in respect of a particular course or programme shall be formally called and constituted, separately from other meetings such as School meetings. Subject to (b) below, All Examiners shall be members of the Board of Examiners and shall be invited to all meetings of the Board: the quorum shall comprise the Head of School (or his or her nominee), the Assessment Officer, an Internal Examiner and an External Examiner. Exceptionally, where due cause is shown, if no External Examiner is able to be present then written confirmation of the discharge of the functions of the External Examiner may be considered as equivalent to attendance. There may be agreement between the Head of School, the Assessment Officer(s) and External Examiners that attendance by the External Examiner(s) at Board of Examiners meetings for re-assessments is not required. No person other than Examiners and others with direct responsibilities for examining and related administrative and clerical matters shall attend or observe meetings of the Board of Examiners. The business of the Board of Examiners shall be minuted and particular records kept of the External Examiner's adjudications, comments and recommendations, as well as particular decisions made by the Board in respect of incomplete assessment, good cause and disciplinary matters. Returns of results shall be completed, checked by two persons and confirmed at the meeting of the Board of Examiners.

(b) In the case of joint or combined honours degrees the decision on classification of the honours degree for the programme shall be taken at a meeting of the subject Board of Examiners which takes place later. At such meetings the Board may be composed as set out in (a) for that subject or may involve a smaller number of members selected by the Board for that subject and representing that Board with power to agree a final classification on its behalf. The other subject will be represented by a number of members of the Board of Examiners for that subject. These representatives will have authority to agree the final classification to be awarded for the joint/combined honours degree and will convey the views of the earlier Board of Examiners, including those of External Examiner(s) present to the later meeting. At the later meeting each of the subjects will have an equality of votes in determining the final degree classification. Where practicable the unapproved grades for the subject which has the later Board of Examiners meeting will be made available to the earlier Board of Examiners to enable it to discuss the final classification appropriate in light of these.

16.67 If a Board of Examiners suspects, on the basis of evidence before it, that a disciplinary offence has been committed by a candidate in respect of the assessment, the Board shall invoke the provisions of the Statement on Plagiarism (see Section 31) or Code of Student Conduct, as appropriate.

16.68 The Senate Office shall forward External Examiners' reports to Schools within eight weeks of receipt identifying points to which a response is required. The Head of School shall arrange for External Examiners' reports to be considered by a School meeting and for appropriate responses to be made to specific recommendations made by the External Examiner: such responses to be conveyed within three months of receipt to the Senate Office.

16.69 The Head of School shall ensure that the assessment scheme and its operation are monitored through the Annual ~~Course~~-Monitoring Report on the course.

16.70 The Head of School shall encourage staff to take advantage of opportunities provided by the University to develop their knowledge of assessment procedures and practices with a view to ensuring that assessment schemes are effective and appropriate.

Central Administration of Assessment

16.71 Where an examination is a component of a summative assessment scheme the Head of the Registry shall, in conjunction with the Assessment Officer responsible for the course:

- (a) determine a suitable date and time for the examination¹⁷;
- (b) allocate adequate accommodation, scripts and other materials as appropriate for the number of candidates to be examined;
- (c) provide for secure delivery of the examination paper(s) to the accommodation.

The Head of Registry may delegate all or part of this to the Assessment Officer responsible for the course.

16.72 The Senate Office shall determine and administer procedures to be followed in respect of the appointment, reporting, remuneration and payment of expenses of External Examiners. Procedures shall include provision for the instruction of individual External Examiners to ensure that they understand and can fulfil their responsibilities.

16.73 The Head of Registry shall:

- (a) provide lists of candidates upon which the official return of the results shall be made by the Assessment Officer;
- (b) prescribe the way in which each result shall be recorded and the completed lists returned;
- (c) reject any returned list which does not conform to the prescription;
- (d) authenticate the accepted lists for releasing the results.

16.74 Responsibility for releasing the results on behalf of Senate shall rest solely with the Head of the Registry who shall determine and administer, subject to the approval of Senate, appropriate procedures for processing the overall assessment results provided by the Assessment Officer(s) for a course to enable:

- (a) the publication of results via any internet-enabled computer either on or off-campus;
- (b) the recording of results on the candidates' central records maintained by the Registry.

Candidates, nonetheless, are responsible for informing themselves of the results.

16.75 It shall be stated that all released results are subject to correction in the event of detection of an error.

16.76 If an error is detected in the return made to the Registry or in the published result then:

- (a) where the erroneous result is less advantageous than the result to which the candidate is entitled, the Clerk of Senate shall be informed and shall authorise the Head of Registry to correct the result;
- (b) where the erroneous result is more advantageous than the result to which the candidate is entitled, the Head of the Registry shall immediately notify the Clerk of Senate and inform the candidate that the result is suspended; the Clerk of Senate shall initiate a reconsideration of the result in conjunction with the relevant Head of College and Head of School and the Head of Registry; they may decide to sustain or correct the result in the light of all the factors known to them and shall communicate their decision forthwith to the Head of Registry.

In either case the Head of Registry shall communicate the outcome to the candidate in writing, advising, if appropriate, of the right to appeal, and shall correct if necessary the candidate's record. Any decisions regarding further progression or award dependent on the incorrect result shall be null and void, and the candidate reconsidered on the basis of the correct result.

16.77 The Registry shall produce and make available a transcript of the results obtained by each candidate which shall conform in scope and layout to principles agreed by Senate.

16.78 Exceptionally when on an occasion some provisions of this code have not been followed, the assessment results shall remain valid provided that the Head of the Registry, in consultation with the Clerk of Senate, is satisfied that the assessment has been conducted substantially in accordance with the code.

¹⁷ In scheduling examinations, the Registry shall take reasonable steps to ensure that no student is normally required to sit more than three examinations in two days and shall avoid, as far as possible, a student sitting a morning examination the day after an evening examination.

SCHEDULE A

All Courses				Primary verbal descriptors for attainment of Intended Learning Outcomes	Honours Class	BDS, BVMS, MBChB
Primary Grade	Gloss	Secondary Band*	Aggregation Score/Grade Point			
A	Excellent	A1 A2 A3 A4 A5	22 21 20 19 18	Exemplary range and depth of attainment of intended learning outcomes, secured by discriminating command of a comprehensive range of relevant materials and analyses, and by deployment of considered judgement relating to key issues, concepts and procedures	First	Honours
B	Very Good	B1 B2 B3	17 16 15	Conclusive attainment of virtually all intended learning outcomes, clearly grounded on a close familiarity with a wide range of supporting evidence, constructively utilised to reveal appreciable depth of understanding	Upper Second	Commendation
C	Good	C1 C2 C3	14 13 12	Clear attainment of most of the intended learning outcomes, some more securely grasped than others, resting on a circumscribed range of evidence and displaying a variable depth of understanding	Lower Second	Pass
D	Satisfactory [†]	D1 D2 D3	11 10 9	Acceptable attainment of intended learning outcomes, displaying a qualified familiarity with a minimally sufficient range of relevant materials, and a grasp of the analytical issues and concepts which is generally reasonable, albeit insecure	Third	
E	Weak	E1 E2 E3	8 7 6	Attainment deficient in respect of specific intended learning outcomes, with mixed evidence as to the depth of knowledge and weak deployment of arguments or deficient manipulations	Fail	Fail
F	Poor	F1 F2 F3	5 4 3	Attainment of intended learning outcomes appreciably deficient in critical respects, lacking secure basis in relevant factual and analytical dimensions		
G	Very Poor	G1 G2	2 1	Attainment of intended learning outcomes markedly deficient in respect of nearly all intended learning outcomes, with irrelevant use of materials and incomplete and flawed explanation		
H			0	No convincing evidence of attainment of intended learning outcomes, such treatment of the subject as is in evidence being directionless and fragmentary		
CR	CREDIT REFUSED	Failure to comply, in the absence of good cause, with the published requirements of the course or programme; and/or a serious breach of regulations				

* The Secondary Band indicates the degree to which the work possesses the quality of the corresponding descriptor.

[†] This gloss is used because it is the lowest grade normally associated with the attainment of an undergraduate award. Postgraduate students should be aware, however, that an average of at least Grade C in taught courses is required for progress to the dissertation at masters level, and students should consult the appropriate degree regulations and course handbooks for the grade they may require to progress to specific awards.

SCHEDULE B

All Courses		Primary verbal descriptors for attainment of Intended Learning Outcomes relating to professional or clinical skills	Honours Class	BDS, BVMS, MBChB
Primary Grade	Aggregation Scores			
A	5	Exemplary and polished demonstration of the required skill(s), displaying underpinning knowledge, sound judgement and appropriate professional values, as evidenced by focussed sensitivity to the context, the needs of any subject, and the wider implications of the candidate's actions	First	Honours
B	4	Efficient and confident demonstration of the required skill(s), displaying underpinning knowledge, sound judgement and appropriate professional values, as evidenced by an evident appreciation of the possible implications of the candidate's actions, demonstrating initiative and flexibility of approach	Upper Second	Commendation
C	3	Clear demonstration of attainment of the required skill(s), displaying underpinning knowledge, good judgement and appropriate professional values, as evidenced by familiarity with how to proceed in a range of contexts	Lower Second	Pass
D	2	Adequate independent performance of required skill, displaying underpinning knowledge, adequate judgement and appropriate professional values, suitable to routine contexts	Third	
E	1	Presently inadequate independent performance of the required skill. Knowledge, judgement and professional values are at least sufficient to indicate an awareness of personal limitations	Fail	Fail
F	0	Not presently capable of independent performance of the required skill, lacking self-awareness of limitations, and prone to errors of judgement and faulty practice		

CR	CREDIT REFUSED	Failure to comply, in the absence of good cause, with the published requirements of the course or programme; and/or a serious breach of regulations
----	----------------	---

SCHEDULE C

The 16 point grade scale previously shown in Schedule C has been discontinued. Revised grade point values, which should be used for all programmes, are shown in Schedule A.

GRADE/GRADE POINTS PER CREDIT	
GRADE	GRADE POINTS PER CREDIT
A	16
B	14
C	12
D	10
E	8
F	6
G	2
H	0

SCHEDULE D

Credits	Levels 1 & 2	Levels 3, H and M
10	90 minutes	120 minutes
15	120 minutes	150 minutes
20	150 minutes	180 minutes
30	240 minutes	240 minutes
40	330 minutes	330 minutes
60	480 minutes	480 minutes

Notes on Schedules

1 Verbal Descriptors

Documentation relating to courses and programmes shall indicate where Schedule B verbal descriptors shall apply. The aggregation scores relating to Schedule B descriptors shall only be aggregated with others from the same Schedule.

2 Combining 22-point and 20-point Aggregation Scores

Aggregation scores of 19 and 20 derived from Schedule A prior to session 2005-06 require adjustment before being combined with scores from the 22-point scale.

Scores of 20 should be translated to 22, and scores of 19 translated to 20. Other scores should be combined without adjustment.

3 Discretion of Boards of Examiners for Classified Honours Programmes

a) Where the mean overall aggregation score (as determined in §16.36) falls within one of the following ranges, the Board of Examiners shall recommend the award stated:

- 18.0 to 22.0 first class honours
- 15.0 to 17.0 upper second class honours
- 12.0 to 14.0 lower second class honours
- 9.0 to 11.0 third class honours
- 0.0 to 8.0 fail

- b) Where the mean overall aggregation score falls between two of the ranges defined in 3 a), the Board of Examiners shall have discretion to decide which of the alternative awards to recommend:

17.1 to 17.9 either first or upper second class honours

14.1 to 14.9 either upper or lower second class honours

11.1 to 11.9 either lower second or third class honours

8.1 to 8.9 either third class honours or fail

Assessment of Study Abroad

[To be added to Standards Section of the Code]

- (a) A candidate may undertake a period of study at another institution as part of his or her degree programme provided that this has been approved according to the process established for that programme.
- (b) Grades achieved at, and reported by, that other institution must be converted into grades as set out in Schedule A or Schedule B (as appropriate) and taken account of in determining the candidate's final degree.
- (c) Before commencing the period of study at another institution candidates must be informed of the process by which their grades from that other institution will be converted as set out in (b) above and should normally be provided with a conversion table showing the equivalences between grades awarded at the other institution and the grades set out in Schedule A or Schedule B. The process must normally incorporate the possibility of the candidate making representations to the coordinator or committee which is charged with converting grades.
- (d) The processes adopted within each programme and the conversion tables must be notified to the appropriate College Dean(s) of Learning and Teaching.
- (e) In carrying out the conversion of grades the conversion table may be departed from in light of additional relevant information available to the coordinator or committee which performs the conversion.
- (f) The converted grades must be approved by the appropriate Board of Examiners.
- (g) Assessed work completed and assessed at another institution must not be reassessed at the University of Glasgow.
- (h) Appeals may be made following the Codes of Procedure set out in the Fees and General Information for Students section of the University Calendar.