

1. Introduction

1.1 Teaching and Learning Committee established an Academic Regulations Sub-Committee in November 2011 with a remit to review the University's examination and assessment regulations as part of the overall programme of work on portfolio review. The terms of reference and membership of the Sub-Committee are attached at **Appendix 1**.

1.2 The Sub-Committee has met on three occasions: in December (to scope out issues); in January (to consider draft proposals for revision to the existing assessment regulations), and in February, to consider feedback from School Teaching and Learning Committees on the draft proposals.

1.3 Members agreed a two-stage approach to the revisions of the assessment regulations: first the identification of matters of fundamental importance and higher level principles that are mission critical for approval by Teaching and Learning Committee and subsequent reporting to Senate in March. Second, to develop secondary rules and guidance on the application of the higher principles and to consult on any other outstanding matters, including programme-specific variations where there are Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body requirements to be taken into account, for approval in June.

1.4 In proposing the principles, the Sub-Committee has taken into consideration the following: the revised University Academic Framework (a draft of which is included at Appendix 2); institutional Portfolio Review aims and outcomes; the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (Chapter B6: Assessment of Students and Accreditation of Prior Learning); internal and external examiner feedback; and feedback from Schools and students.

2. Consultation

2.1 School Teaching and Learning Committees were invited to consider the higher level principles identified by the Sub-Committee at their February 2012 meetings.

2.2 The Academic Regulations Sub-Committee considered feedback from 9 STLC's at the meeting of 13th February. This was taken into account in preparing this final set of proposals.

2.3 Feedback from 2 STLC's (Psychology and Media, Film and Music) was received on 17th February and has subsequently been taken into account in preparing the final set of proposals.

2.4 Many Schools contributed detailed comments on specific aspects of the further development and implementation of the principles. Such feedback will be addressed in more detail in the second stage of the revision process.

3. High Level Principles: Undergraduate Assessment Regulations

3.1 Changes to the rules for progression

Principle 1. It is proposed that the University adopt sector norms and replace general credit with rules on condonement, compensation and trailing credit.

Principle 2: The application of condonement, compensation or trailing credit should be limited to a maximum cumulative total of 30 credits per stage.

A significant majority of Schools agreed with both principles subject to further consideration of the thresholds to be achieved and any PSRB requirements. There were some specific concerns associated with trailing credit.

3.2 Repeat year rules for failing students

Principle 3: A failing student may be entitled to a repeat year providing that they agree to and abide by the conditions set down in a formally approved learning agreement.

A significant majority of Schools agreed that failing students should be entitled to a repeat year subject to further discussion concerning the form and implementation of the Learning Agreement. A case was made to exclude students on some programmes (e.g. Foundation Years). **Do TLC wish to exclude such students automatically or to allow schools to deal with this within their learning agreements?**

3.3 Resit rules for honours

Principle 4: To allow resit for honours and to develop specific rules relating to the use of condonement and compensation at honours.

All Schools agreed that final year students failing to meet the criteria for the award of an honours degree should be offered a resit opportunity.

3.4 Resit rules for higher progression thresholds

Principle 5: A student who passes the module but who fails to meet the higher progression threshold will transfer onto the lower level award.

There was no clear agreement on this principle with very particular concerns from Schools offering Integrated Masters Programmes. It is not, therefore, proposed to adopt this principle until there has been further discussion with these Schools. **TLC is invited to discuss the practice (prior to discussion with Schools affected) of allowing resits to demonstrate higher level thresholds?**

3.5 Weighting of academic stages in the classification algorithm

The consultation with Schools included an open question about the merits of including Stage 1 in the award classification formula. Not all Schools responded to this question but, of those who did, the majority opposed changing the current general classification formula. **It is proposed that we continue to exclude Stage 1 from the classification formula. TLC is invited to discuss this further.**

4. High Level Principles: Postgraduate Taught Assessment Regulations

Principle 6: The University should adopt 50% as the module pass mark at Level 7 in keeping with emerging sector norms, and with key institutional partner practices.

The majority of Schools agreed that the pass mark **at level 7** should be changed from the existing 40% to 50%.

Principle 7: The University should adopt the 0-100 marking scale for postgraduate taught courses

Agreement from all Schools.

Principle 8: The adoption of 60% – 69% for the achievement of merit and of 70% and above for distinction.

The majority of Schools agreed to the threshold for a merit being set at 60% and a distinction at 70% although there were some concerns about the range for distinction (70-100) being too great, particularly if the full range of the marking scale is to be used. The use of additional criteria at merit/ distinction level will be considered during the second stage of development.

5. Undergraduate Assessment Regulations - No Change

5.1 For completeness, Teaching and Learning Committee is invited to note that the following rules are unchanged for undergraduate programmes:

- The module pass mark remains at 40% for Levels 4, 5 and 6
- One sit and one resit is permitted in a single assessment cycle
- The module mark for a resit remains capped at 40%
- The marks for module taken in repeat years are not capped (new proposed trailed modules will have marks capped at 40%).
- The award classification divisions remain as now however, the use of additional criteria to avoid a very high mark in a single module skewing overall average and/or to assist in adjudicating borderline decisions, will be considered during the second stage of development..

Academic Regulations Sub-Committee

17th February 2012

Appendix 1

Teaching and Learning Committee Sub-committee on Academic Regulations

Membership

Pro-Vice Chancellor Teaching and Learning (Chair)
One Head of School
Three Directors of Teaching and Learning

One Exam Board Chair
One Director of Student Support
Faculty member from School involved with accreditation and placement
Student Development Co-ordinator – Academic Policy
USSU Education Officer
Academic Registrar
Head of Academic Services

Professor Clare Mackie
Professor Tom Healy
Dr Geert De Neve
Dr Claudia Eberlein
Dr Richard Follett
Dr Kevin Grant
Dr Liz Somerville
Cath Holmstrom
Cindy Newell
Poppy Firmin
Sharon Jones
Sam Riordan

Secretary: Carmel Oxley-King

Terms of Reference

1. To review UG and PGT examination and assessment regulations to meet the requirements of the Portfolio Review and the new structure of the Academic Year.
2. To remove general credit and propose suitable alternatives for achievement of progression and award at undergraduate level.
3. To ensure that any proposed changes are made within the context of national developments.
4. To make any other recommendations as appropriate.

Teaching and Learning Committee

Revision to Assessment Regulations for 2012/13 Implementation: Second consultation paper for School Teaching and Learning Committees, May 2012

1. Progress to date

1.1 The Academic Regulations Sub-Committee consulted with School Teaching and Learning Committees in the Spring Term on the higher level Assessment Regulatory Principles.

1.2 Feedback from the consultation was discussed at the Academic Regulations Sub-Committee and a report presented to Teaching and Learning Committee.

1.3 Teaching and Learning Committee approved the Principles at its meeting in February, with some minor amendments, prior to making a series of recommendations to Senate in March 2012.

1.4 Senate **endorsed** the Principles presented by Teaching and Learning Committee in March 2012, as follows, and is anticipating final proposals at the June meeting:

Principle 1: That the University adopt sector norms of **120 credits per year for progression** and replace general credit with rules on condonement, compensation and trailing credit.¹

Principle 2: The application of condonement, compensation or trailing credit should be limited to a maximum cumulative total of 30 credits per stage.

Principle 3: A failing student is entitled to a repeat year providing that they agree to and abide by the conditions set down in a formally approved learning agreement.

Principle 4: To allow resit for honours and to develop specific rules relating to the use of condonement and compensation at honours.

Principle 6: The University should adopt the 0-100 marking scale for postgraduate taught courses (previously Principle 7)

Principle 7: The University should adopt 50% as the module pass mark at Level 7(Masters) in keeping with emerging sector norms, and with key institutional partner practices. (previously Principle 6)

Principle 8: At postgraduate level, the adoption of 60% – 69% for the achievement of merit and of 70% and above for distinction.

¹ This represents a revision to the wording of the original Principle, making explicit the requirement to achieve 120 credit per year for progression (for undergraduate awards and integrated masters degrees), a clarification requested by Senate.

Senate noted that one further principle was undergoing continuing discussion which related to integrated Masters Programmes:

Principle 5: A student who passes the module but who fails to meet the higher progression threshold will transfer onto the lower level award.

2. Second Consultation on the detail underpinning the agreed Principles

2.1 The Academic Regulations Sub-Committee has met on a further three occasions since its last report to Teaching and Learning Committee, on 5th March, 26th March and 26th April, to work on more detailed proposals associated with each of the Principles, **for 2012/13 implementation**. These proposals, for consideration by Schools, are given below.

2.2 Compensation, Condonement and Trailed Credit

Principle 1: That the University adopt sector norms of 120 credits per year for progression and replace general credit with rules on condonement, compensation and trailing credit.

Principle 2: The application of condonement, compensation or trailing credit should be limited to a maximum cumulative total of 30 credits per stage.

NB: (1) General Credit is not recognised by HEFCE and therefore Compensation will replace general credit from 2012/13. HEFCE do recognise mitigation therefore Condonement may be used at the discretion of the exam board for those students who do not qualify for Compensation. (2) The group have reopened discussion on Principle 2 as trailing credit may be needed for the new elective system if a student takes a module outwith their comfort zone (as we are trying to encourage) and fails badly with little chance of retrieval (see trailed credit proposals below).

2.2(a) Compensation

	2012/13 Proposals
Currently the exam board has discretion to give up to 30 general credits at each stage provided that the programme learning outcomes have been met and a mean across the stage of 40% has been achieved (general credit cannot be given for mandatory courses).	Compensation with a threshold is recognised by HEFCE. In order for credit to be given via compensation it is proposed that a threshold mark of 35% is achieved on the module and the stage mean (including the failed module) is 40% or above.
Currently progression summer exam boards give a Resit for a capped mark of 40% to be taken in September, and only consider giving general credit where the Resit has been failed at the Resit exam board. (Finalist boards already give general credit in the Summer).	It is also proposed that credit is given automatically where the criteria are met (i.e. it will not be discretionary and will automatically be included in the marks array) and that where the threshold mark is met in July a resit for 40% will not be given for September, unless a resit is specifically requested by an individual student. The results notification will indicate such students have the right to apply to take a resit.

2.2(b) Condonement

	2012/13 Proposals
<p>Currently summer exam boards have discretion to set aside assessment element/s within a module for progression and finalist students as a result of mitigation (on modules that have been passed or failed) and an entire failed module for finalist students, up to a maximum of 30 credits.</p> <p>Currently Resit exam board in September gives a Resit where the Sit has not been passed (or a further Sit if there is further mitigation).</p>	<p>The practice of setting aside marks will no longer be permitted for students with mitigation. Instead all such students will be offered a Sit for 100% at the next assessment opportunity thereby allowing student to demonstrate their potential.</p> <p>It is also proposed that where the Sit has not been passed at the Resit exam board, and the student has not qualified for compensation (35% threshold not met), then exceptionally the board may award up to 30 credits provided the Course learning outcomes have been met. No threshold applies to condonement to allow the Board maximum discretion to decide on each individual case. (The mark achieved will stand). The results notification will indicate such students have the right to apply to take a resit instead.</p>

NB: These rules will ensure that the pass mark has been achieved on 90/120 credits with a threshold mark of 35% on remaining 30 credits given by automatic compensation (exceptionally credit will be given by condonement (no threshold) at the discretion of the Board).

2.2(c) Trailed Credit

	2012/13 Proposals
<p>Currently, at the discretion of the subject examination board, a student may be offered the opportunity to progress to the next stage while trailing a failed module(s) for one further resit. The opportunity to trail a module(s) will normally only be offered where there is good evidence that the student will be able to succeed at the next assessment opportunity.</p> <p>The student may decline the offer of a trailed resit and choose to repeat the module(s) the following year.</p>	<p>It is proposed to continue with the current arrangements such that exam boards will have the discretion to allow one module to be trailed per stage where the progression requirement has not been met (up to a maximum of 30 credits). This is in addition to a maximum of 30 credits that can be given by compensation and/or condonement.</p> <p>It is also proposed that exam boards can:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • exceptionally offer an alternative elective/option (subject to timetabling) • not allow any trailed assessments to be carried into the final stage • offer a repeat of the module instead where student declines the offer of a trailed assessment.

2.3 Repeat Year

Principle 3: A failing student is entitled to a repeat year providing that they agree to and abide by the conditions set down in a formally approved learning agreement.

	2012/13 Proposals
<p>Currently undergraduate resit exam boards can offer a repeat year on an exceptional basis where the student fails to meet the criteria to progress and there is evidence of engagement and/or underachieved academic potential.</p> <p>At the discretion of the subject examination board, a student may be offered the opportunity to progress to the next stage while trailing a failed module(s) for one further resit. The opportunity to trail a module(s) will normally only be offered where there is good evidence that the student will be able to succeed at the next assessment opportunity. The student may decline the offer of a resit and choose to repeat the module(s) the following year.</p>	<p>It is proposed that the entitlement to a repeat year is confined to stage 1 students, that repeat of stage 2 (or 3 for 4-year degrees) is at the discretion of examination boards, and that repeat of the final stage is prohibited (as currently).</p> <p>It is proposed that there is a standard University learning agreement for students repeating stage 1, with individual agreements set up by the School for subsequent stages. Standard Agreement to include requirement for 80% attendance and requirement for one meeting per term with Academic Advisor. Students not abiding by Learning Agreement would be withdrawn from the University and prohibited from taking assessment.</p> <p>It is proposed that Directors of Student Support are responsible for monitoring adherence to the Standard Learning Agreement and setting in place individual agreements for stage 2 and stage 3 of a 4 year Course.</p>

Schools are invited to comment on these proposals, which are also being referred to Directors of Student Support via the Mitigating Evidence Committee.

2.4 Resit for Honours

Principle 4: To allow resit for honours and to develop specific rules relating to the use of condonement and compensation at honours.

	2012/13 Proposals
<p>Currently exam board can only give a resit at the next assessment opportunity for an Ordinary degree.</p>	<p>It is proposed that the rules around credit given via compensation and condonement apply to students in the final stage i.e. compensation credit will be given in the Summer where criteria are met and students with mitigation will be given a Sit for 100% at the next assessment opportunity (followed by the application of compensation or condonement credit if the Sit is failed and the threshold met for the former, condonement or a resit for Honours if the threshold is not met). The maximum cumulative total is 30 credits per stage. Where credit is given by Condonement the results notification will indicate such students have the right to apply to take a resit. The mark achieved will stand.</p>

2.5 Resit for Higher Progression Threshold ((HPT)

Principle 5: A student who passes the module but who fails to meet the higher progression threshold will transfer onto the lower level award.

	2012/13 Proposals
Currently a number of examination boards offer a resit for modules passed but failing to achieve the Higher Progression Threshold (HPT), in order for student to continue on the degree registered for (normally an Integrated Masters Degree)	It is proposed that students who pass the module (at 40%) but do not meet the HPT across the stage transfer onto a lower level award. Exceptions to this will be considered on a Course-by-Course basis, and will normally be approved only where a requirement is prescribed by the PSB.

2.6 Postgraduate/Level 7 pass mark and marking criteria

Principle 6: The University should adopt the 0-100 marking scale for postgraduate taught courses

Principle 7: The University should adopt 50% as the module pass mark at Level 7 in keeping with emerging sector norms, and with key institutional partner practices.

	2012/13 Proposals
PG pass mark for 2011/12 is 40%.	Schools to revise marking criteria in line with revised PG pass mark for 2012/13.

2.7 Postgraduate Award Criteria

Principle 8: At postgraduate level, the adoption of 60% – 69% for the achievement of merit and of 70% and above for distinction.

	2012/13 Proposals
Currently additional criteria related to achievement on final project/dissertation for Distinction and Merit vary across Schools.	It is proposed to change to: Distinction: mean mark of ≥ 70 + 50% of credits at ≥ 70 ; Merit: mean mark of ≥ 60 + 50% of credits at ≥ 60 . This requires the student to achieve 50% of credit at the level of classification and will not necessarily include the dissertation/final project.
Distinction and Merit not currently available on all PG Dip and PG Cert entry awards.	It is proposed that the Distinction and Merit classifications are available on PG Dip and PG Cert entry awards only, where the criteria set out above have been achieved. Therefore, these classifications will not be available where a PG Dip or PG Cert is awarded as an exit award where the main award has not been achieved.

3. Other proposals associated with regulatory student progress or assessment matters

3.1 Recording of marks

	2012/13 Proposals
Currently conflated module marks and stage mean and grand mean marks are shown to 2 or 3 decimal places.	It is proposed that all such marks be rounded to nearest whole mark i.e. $n \geq 0.5 = n+1$; $n \leq 0.49 = n$. This is common practice elsewhere in the sector.

3.2 Late Submission Policy

	2012/13 Proposals
Currently students can submit up to 24hrs for 5% penalty, 7 days for 10% penalty and up to Final Submission Opportunity (FSO) for a capped mark.	Proposal to remove FSO so that students cannot submit beyond 7 days and are instead given a resit opportunity by the examination board.

3.3 Temporary Withdrawal (TWD)

	2012/13 Proposals
Currently TWD allowed at any point prior to start of end of year assessment period, with re-entry usually at the beginning of the non-completed term.	It is proposed that TWD is possible at any time prior to the start of an assessment period with re-entry at the beginning of the non-completed term. Effectively, this reduces the number of entry points for undergraduate students to two, the start of the Autumn or Spring Terms, and, in some instances (for example where there are 'long thin' year-long modules of 30 credits) may mean a single entry point at the start of the Autumn Term.

3.4 In-Year Transfers (Year One Undergraduates only)

	2012/13 Proposals
Currently start of year transfers for Year One students are completed by end of week 2 in Autumn Term (for immediate transfer), and by the end of week 2 in Spring Term for in-year transfers (effective at the start of the Spring Term).	It is proposed that such transfers are completed by end of week 3 of Autumn Term, for immediate transfer, or at end of Autumn Term for in-year transfers, with an expectation that a full 60 credit load of teaching and assessment must be completed for transfer to be effective at the start of the Spring Term. Where programme design prevents completion of 60 credit, transfer will not be possible. (NB: Transfers may be subject to student number control.) No change is proposed to end-of-year transfers.

4. The following regulations have been reviewed but no change is proposed at the current time:

- Classification criteria and stage weighting for undergraduate awards, including 4 year degree courses
- Higher Progression Thresholds for Integrated Masters

5. Further work will be required over the coming months and a FULL and FINAL set of Assessment Regulations will be considered for approval at the meeting of Teaching and Learning Committee currently scheduled for 4th September 2012. Items for consideration include:

- Borderline Criteria for Undergraduate Awards
- Policy and procedures for marks assurance and feedback to students associated with mid-year assessment
- Policy on anonymity

6. Implementation

Revised Regulations are for 2012/13 implementation and will apply to the 2012/13 entry cohort. Application to earlier years will be on a no detriment basis.

Feedback should be submitted **to Carmel Oxley-King (C.Oxley@sussex.ac.uk)** no later than **5.00 pm Monday 21st May 2012**. A further report, informed by School feedback, will be presented to the University Teaching and Learning Committee on 30th May.

*Academic Regulations Sub-Committee
May 2012*

School responses to the second consultation presented to School Teaching and Learning Committees in the summer term (May 2012)

Principles 1 and 2:

Compensation

It was proposed that the compensation criteria included a threshold mark of 35 and a stage mean of 40% and that compensation would be applied automatically where the criteria had been met.

Condonement

It was proposed that no marks would be set aside as a result of mitigation (either an element of assessment within a module or the whole module) and that instead a Sit for 100% given. It was also proposed that where a Sit/Resit had not been passed in September and the student did not meet the criteria for compensation the exam board could exceptionally give the credit via condonement (no threshold mark requirement).

Trailed Credit

It was proposed that credit could continue to be trailed into the next stage where the progression criteria had not been met. One module of up to 30 credits could be trailed (except beyond the final stage) in addition to up to 30 credits that could be given via compensation/condonement. (Exceptionally an alternative module could be taken; the student could repeat the failed module; credit could not be trailed into the final stage).

School comments:

- concern about trailed credit (BMEc, Global) and others in favour (English, LifeSci);
- some support for condonement (EngInfo) and some concerns (Global, MPS);
- some support re discontinue setting aside (English); some against (Life Sci, MPS, SAG (proposed continue to set aside up to 20% on mandatory year abroad);
- some support for compensation (Life Sci), and some against (MPS, EngInfo re PSB requirements).

General support for proposals: HAHP, LPS, Psychology.

Principle 3: Repeat Year

Senate had already agreed to the entitlement of a repeat year. Schools were asked if the entitlement should be restricted to stage 1 with repeats on subsequent years being discretionary, with the exception of the final stage which would be prohibited. It was also proposed that there be a standard learning agreement for stage 1 with a requirement regarding attendance and a meeting with the academic advisor, to be monitored by the DoES. **The majority of Schools agreed with the proposal but there were concerns about the resource for the monitoring of the learning agreement. The PSB for ESW requires a repeat of the final stage, MPS not in favour of repeat to foundation year and prefer CWK submission requirement to attendance requirement.**

Principle 4: Resit for Honours

It was proposed that the rules on compensation and condonement also applied to students in the final stage, following the opportunity to resit for Honours. **The majority of Schools either agreed or did not comment with the exception of Engineering (the PSBs would not permit a resit for honours).**

Principle 5: Higher Progression Threshold (HPT)

Currently Engineering and Chemistry students who fail a module on a degree with a HPT are given resits for the HPT. **Engineering agreed that any students failing to achieve the HPT transfer to the associated BSc. Further consultation still had to take place with Chemistry.**

Principle 8: PG additional award criteria

Senate has agreed to the adoption of a 60% threshold for a merit and a 70% threshold for a distinction. Schools were asked to consider requiring students to achieve 50% of credits ≥ 70 for distinction and ≥ 60 for merit, which would not necessarily include the dissertation/project, in addition to achieving the threshold mark. **Most Schools either agreed to or did not object to the proposal.**

Report from third consultation with Schools on 28th August 2012 regarding principles governing the revised examination and assessment regulations

Present at the morning session:

Clare Mackie (Chair), Kevin Grant, Duncan Mackrill, Cath Holmstrom, Julian Dunne, John Carroll, Tom Healy, Richard Follett, Liz Somerville, Claudia Eberlein, Janice Winship, Robin Bannerjee and Carmel Oxley-King (secretary).

Present at the afternoon session: Clare Mackie (Chair), Kevin Grant, Trevor Hopper, Cath Holmstrom, Paul Newbury, Des Watson, Matthew Dimmock, Heather Keating, Liz Somerville, Barry Garraway, Janice Winship, John Drury. and Carmel Oxley-King (secretary). Peter Clifton was in attendance.

Maria da Silva, Indi Hicks, Cindy Newell, and Owen Richards were in attendance for both sessions.

1. AM session: consultation with Directors of Teaching and Learning following first two rounds of TLC consultations.

The Chair reported that general agreement had to be reached on the proposed regulations in order that the Directors of Student Experience (DoSE) who were attending in the afternoon could consider necessary changes to regulations related to mitigating circumstances. Following the meeting today the revised assessment regulations will be considered by Teaching and Learning Committee on 4th September with final approval at a specially convened meeting of Senate on 18th September.

- (i) Members noted paper 1 the report from the Academic Regulations Sub-Committee (ARSC) to Teaching and Learning Committee in February 2012 following consultation with School Teaching and Learning Committees in the spring term.
- (ii) Members noted paper 2 the second consultation that had been presented to Schools and to Teaching and Learning Committee in May 2012.

The ARSC had met following the receipt of the majority of feedback to the second consultation from School Teaching and Learning Committees in the Summer term but had been unable to progress business significantly prior to the exam boards.

In particular it was noted that feedback had not been in favour of giving credit via condonement where a threshold mark had not been met on a failed module. In addition, restricting the entitlement to a repeat year to stage 1, with a repeat of subsequent years offered at the exam board's discretion, was supported.

- (iii) Members noted the revised University framework (paper 3) that had been presented to Teaching and Learning Committee in April 2012. It was noted that the maximum periods of registration needed to be revised. Members were reminded that under the new framework modules would be core, option or elective and that as students had to achieve 120 credits per year the adoption of mandatory modules was not required.
- (iv) Members discussed in great detail Paper 4 the Revised Principles and application to assessment regulations. The suggested amendments to the regulations have now been tracked following the meeting (Appendix 1). Particular points discussed included:

(a) Timescale for use of compensation and trailed credit

Compensation and trailed credit to be given at September exam board following any vacation resit opportunity (except the final stage where compensation could be awarded in the summer). Letter from SPA following the summer exam board to advise student that if they have already met the criteria for compensation this will be given at the September exam board should they decide not to take the resit opportunity.

(b) Compensation

Allowing compensation to be applied at the discretion of the exam board was not considered to be equitable to all students and therefore it was agreed that it should be automatic where the criteria were met (35% threshold mark, 40% stage mean). It was noted that the 39n rule would no longer be available. Mandatory modules would not be required.

(c) Marking criteria

ARSC had previously proposed that schools included 35% in their marking criteria. The conclusion at the meeting was that this would shift the pass mark to 35%.

(d) Trailed credit

The previous consultation had proposed that this was restricted to one module of up to 30 credits and that credit could not be trailed into the final stage. This had been reviewed in paper 4 in order to promote equity, by allowing more than one module up to a maximum of 30 credits to be trailed, allowing the trailed module to be a core and allowing credit to be trailed into the final stage. Also it had been proposed in paper 4 that students could have a full resit cycle on any trailed credit i.e. a sit and a resit but that the marks for both attempts would be capped at the pass threshold.

During discussion it was agreed that credit could also be trailed into the final stage, including where the final stage was preceded by a year abroad. Failed trailed credit could be compensated where the compensation criteria had been met.

It was noted that SPA would need to ensure that the resit opportunity was set up for students taking a trailed assessment.

It was noted that supplementary information would assist exam boards making decisions about trailed credit. This could include information on attendance but should not include information on flagged students as any appropriate adjustments would already have been made.

Post meeting note: it is further proposed that trailed credit can only be given where a stage mean of 40% has already been achieved.

(e) Condonement

After some discussion it was agreed that exam boards may need to condone a shortfall in credit at the final stage where the criteria for compensation had not been met, which may be as a result of failed trailed credit. It was agreed that this should be exceptional, be restricted to a maximum of 30 credits in the final stage, be dependent upon the achievement of course learning outcomes and that there should not be a threshold mark and that it was not linked to mitigation. It was agreed that it could be used for credit from stage 2 which had been trailed into the final stage. Therefore the options available regarding failed finalist students at the summer exam board would be compensation, resit for Hons, condonement or a repeat year.

Post meeting note: it is further proposed that condonement credit can only be given where a stage mean of 40% has already been achieved.

(f) Higher progression thresholds (HPTs)

Engineering agreed that where pass mark had been achieved but threshold mark not achieved student will not be given opportunity to resit for threshold mark and will instead transfer to BSc.

(g) MABs and PABs

The Module Assessment Board (MAB) assures marks for the module, as currently undertaken by the Stage 1 exam board. However, the board membership would include faculty from all schools with students that have taken the module. It was noted that this board could be held at the end of the first term, where appropriate.

The School Progression and Awards Board (PAB) progresses and classifies candidates as currently undertaken by the Stage 2 exam board.

Providing exam boards with named arrays at the PAB was discussed as all marks are assured at the MAB.

(h) Deviation from the University regulations

Requests for derogation from the standard university regulations, in order to meet a PSB requirement, need to be submitted to the University Teaching and Learning Committee for approval by the School Teaching and Learning Committee. These will be scrutinised by a UTLC sub-committee.

(i) Repeat stage

It was noted that paper 4 proposed that a discretionary repeat of the final stage would be permitted and that this should be clear in the regulations. The regulations should clearly specify that a repeat of a stage can only be considered where the stage has been failed. It was suggested that allowance should be made for exam boards to offer a repeat year at the summer exam boards where it may be inappropriate to offer all modules at resit in the vacation.

(j) Resits

The regulations should clearly specify that a resit can only be given where the first attempt has been failed.

(k) External Examiners

In future the university needs to publish to students the names of external examiners and they will be restricted by the QAA to two appointments.

(l) Rounding of marks

The proposal to round marks up (0.45) and down (0.44) at module, stage mean and grand mean was agreed.

(m) Borderline

It was noted that as a result of rounding marks up and down that students with a grand mean of at least e.g. 69.5 would be rounded up to the higher classification automatically and that students with a grand mean of at least e.g. 67.5 would be rounded up to 68 and into the borderline zone. It was agreed that students should normally achieve at least 50% of the credit in the higher class in order to be awarded the higher class.

Post meeting note: It is proposed that as a result of the rounding rule that the borderline zone is reduced to 1%, thereby only allowing students with an unrounded mean mark of at least n8.5 to be considered for the higher classification as such a mark would be rounded to n9 i.e. borderline, rather than allowing students with an unrounded mean mark of n7.5 to be rounded to n8 and become borderline.

2. PM session: consultation with Directors of Student Experience following morning session.

The afternoon session considered how exam boards would deal with students with mitigation within the new regulations.

Mitigating circumstances principles

- a) Students shall be given a Sit at the next opportunity upon the submission of appropriate evidence to substantiate a claim of extenuating circumstances, where they have opted not to take the assessment, in order that they have a fair opportunity at the assessment and to ensure a level playing field for all students.
- b) Only unforeseen, unavoidable and serious illness/personal crises will be considered. Students registered with the Student Support Unit for disability-related support may make a claim if the case is not directly related to the disability for which they receive support, or if there is a sudden exacerbation of the condition.
- c) Evidence should refer to the affect of an individual's academic performance in their assessment resulting from their circumstances, and relate to the relevant timeframe. Guidance will be issued to indicate what types of circumstance warrant a robust claim.
- d) Marks will not be set aside as a result of a claim and extensions to deadlines will not be given.
- e) Students may submit a claim against assessments weighted over 10% of a module, including lateness penalties, non submissions and absence from in-person assessments/examinations.
- f) The Final Submission Opportunity on written coursework is generally 15 days, reflecting the turnaround of marking and feedback to students, and marking the last date at which any late submission may be accepted. Thus, no claims for late submission should now refer to a period of longer than 15 days.
- g) It is the students responsibility to seek support regarding reduced capacity to study and attend classes with temporary withdrawal from study being a consideration.

Submission of claims

- h) All claims must be lodged in a timely fashion and will be handled with the minimum of delay, to give students an indication of the decision. There is no appeal against mitigating circumstances decisions.
- i) Students continue to use the online form to register a claim but this should be prior to the submission deadline or scheduled examination date, or within 24 hours of this date, rather than afterwards as currently, unless the student's incapacity is such that this is impossible (e.g. hospitalisation/accident/sudden catastrophe). The supporting

evidence must be submitted within 5 working days of the original deadline or examination date, in hard copy, to the student's school office, or within 5 working days of their return to study.

Post meeting note: It is further proposed that claims for mitigation are made at the assessments level so that exam boards can easily establish the cumulative weighting of assessments that have been affected by mitigation at module level.

Exam boards and mitigation

- j) It will no longer be possible to claim for 'impaired' academic performance on an assessment that has been submitted/taken and consequently impairment will no longer be a consideration for borderline students.
- k) Students may submit evidence regarding late submissions, non-submissions and absence from in-person assessments and where this is condoned the lateness penalties will be lifted or a Sit opportunity given (no assessments will be set aside).
- l) Exam boards will offer a Sit as follows:
 - Less than 10% weighting of module – MC submission not permitted
 - 10-50% weighting of module - School may set assessment for failed/non completed assessment at relevant weighting (to be approved by the DTL and reported to STLC in the interim, with the intention that all resit modes are reviewed in the future).
 - More than 50% weighting of module – 100% sit at next opportunity
- m) Late diagnoses of SpLD, e.g. dyslexia, will be flagged to the exam boards with dates that confirm when disability support was in place and thus indicates marks that may not be secure. Exceptionally, and at the exam board's discretion, there may be a justified reclassification of the award if there has been a marked improvement in academic performance and marks in the higher class appear to reflect the effects of disability support.

Post meeting note:

It is proposed that there are separate UG and PG sections to the assessment handbook with a combined handbook for assessment and examination processes and policies.

PG additional criteria had been included in consultation 2 with the majority of schools agreeing or not commenting upon the criteria (60% for merit and 70% for distinction had already been agreed but it had been proposed that students also achieved at least 50% of the credit in the higher class as well.

The planned implementation of the assessment regulatory changes will be on a no detriment basis to returning students and therefore some transitional arrangements will have to be considered by TLC for the small number of students affected.

Carmel Oxley-King
31/8/12 (revised 3/9/12)