

If you are looking for the procedures for 2014-15, please click [here](#).

University of Exeter

Handbook for Assessment, Progression and Awarding: Taught Programmes

2015/16

Chapter 1	Introduction	5
1.1	Handbook for Assessment, Progression and Awarding: Taught Programmes	5
Chapter 2	Setting and Submission of Assessments	7
2.1	Principles for Setting Assessment	7
2.2	Role of External Examiners	7
2.3	Timing	7
2.4	Information to be Made Available to Students	7
2.5	Methods of Assessment	8
2.6	Setting Re-assessments	8
2.7	Setting Examination Papers and Rubrics	8
2.8	Accessibility	9
2.9	Principles of Submission	9
2.10	Late Submission of Coursework	9
2.11	Non-submission and Non-attendance	10
2.12	Deferral	10
Chapter 3	Examinations	11
3.1	Failure to Attend an Examination	11
3.2	Late Arrival	11
3.3	Use of Calculators	11
3.4	Use of Dictionaries	11
3.5	Other Material	11
3.6	Invigilation	12
3.7	Safe Handling of Examination Papers and Examination Scripts	12
3.8	Contacting Academics during an Examination	12

3.9	Religious Holidays	12
3.10	Emergency Procedures	12
3.11	Dealing with Suspected Examination Offences.....	12
Chapter 4	Assessing Students with Disabilities.....	13
4.1	Overview	13
4.2	General Arrangements for University Examinations.....	13
4.3	Specific Arrangements	14
4.4	Alternative Examination Locations.....	14
4.5	Use of a Scribe.....	14
4.6	Use of Information Technology	14
4.7	Assessment Format.....	14
4.8	Hearing Impaired Students	15
4.9	Visually Impaired Students	15
4.10	Monitoring of Specific Assessment Arrangements.....	15
Chapter 5	Marking	16
5.1	Principles for Marking Assessments	16
5.2	Anonymity	16
5.3	Moderation and Sampling.....	16
5.4	Generic Mark Scheme.....	17
5.5	Undergraduate Students Taking Level 7 Modules	17
5.6	Postgraduate Students Taking Modules below Level 7.....	18
5.7	Marking Criteria	18
5.8	Scaling of Marks.....	18
5.9	Marking the Work of Students with ILPs or Diagnosed with Specific Learning Difficulties (where competence of language is not being assessed).....	18
Chapter 6	Feedback	19
6.1	Principles.....	19
6.2	Draft Assessments	19
6.3	Three Week Turnaround.....	20
6.4	Data Protection.....	20
6.5	Disclosure of Marks	20
6.6	Access to Examination and Other Assessment Scripts.....	21
6.7	Enquiries by Third Parties.....	21
6.8	Academic Appeals.....	22
6.9	Transcripts.....	22
Chapter 7	Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees	23
7.1	Introduction.....	23

7.2	Definitions	23
7.3	Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees – Terms of Reference	23
7.4	Membership.....	24
7.5	Meetings of Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees	24
7.6	Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee Agenda.....	25
7.7	College Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees – Terms of Reference.....	26
7.8	Membership.....	26
7.9	Meetings of College Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees	27
7.10	College Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee Agenda	27
7.11	Examination Committee for Flexible Combined Honours (FCH)	28
Chapter 8	Progression.....	29
8.1	Pre-undergraduate Programmes – Progression Principles	29
8.2	Pre-undergraduate Condonement	29
8.3	Undergraduate Programmes – Progression Principles	29
8.4	Undergraduate Condonement	30
8.5	Taught Postgraduate Programmes – Progression Principles.....	30
8.6	Postgraduate Condonement.....	30
Chapter 9	Classification of Awards	32
9.1	Pre-undergraduate, Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate Programmes Awarding Principles	32
9.2	Pre-undergraduate and Undergraduate Programme Stage Weighting.....	32
9.3	Rules for Classification of Bachelors and Integrated Masters Degrees	33
9.4	Rules for Classification of Foundation Certificates.....	33
9.5	Rules for Classification of Foundation Degrees	34
9.6	Rules for Classification of Graduate Awards.....	34
9.7	Taught Postgraduate Programme Stage Weighting.....	35
9.8	Rules for Classification of Taught Postgraduate Awards	35
9.9	Unclassified Undergraduate Awards.....	36
9.10	Unclassified Taught Postgraduate Awards	36
9.11	Aegrotat Pass and Aegrotat Awards for Taught Programmes of Study.....	36
Chapter 10	Mitigation.....	37
10.1	Principles.....	37
10.2	Information for Students	37
10.3	Application for Mitigation.....	37
10.4	The Mitigation Committee.....	38
10.5	Consideration of Applications	38

10.6	Appeals	39
Chapter 11	Consequences of Failure in Assessment.....	41
11.1	Introduction.....	41
11.2	Referral	41
11.3	Repeat Study.....	42
11.4	Consequences of Failure in Referred Assessments	42
11.5	Consequences of Failure in Deferred Assessments	43
Chapter 12	Managing Academic Misconduct.....	44
12.1	Introduction.....	44
12.2	General Principles	44
12.3	Definitions and Offences.....	45
12.4	Categories of Academic Misconduct.....	46
12.5	Poor Academic Practice	47
12.6	Academic Misconduct.....	47
12.7	Severe Academic Misconduct.....	47
12.8	Responsibilities for Partner Institutions	48
12.9	Responsibilities of the University	48
12.10	Responsibilities of Colleges	48
12.11	Responsibilities of Students.....	49
12.12	Delegation of Responsibility	50
12.13	Managing Academic Misconduct – Procedures for Examination Offences.....	50
12.14	Establishment of a Review Panel	51
12.15	Outcomes from a Review Panel for Examination Offences.....	52
12.16	Procedures at College Level for Dealing with Suspected Poor Academic Practice and Academic Misconduct	52
12.17	Procedure for Poor Academic Practice	53
12.18	Procedure for Poor Academic Practice and Academic Misconduct.....	54
12.19	Managing Academic Misconduct – Procedures at University Level for Dealing with Suspected Academic Misconduct.....	55
12.20	Appeals	56
Annexes	60

Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 Handbook for Assessment, Progression and Awarding: Taught Programmes

- 1.1.1 The Handbook for Assessment, Progression and Awarding: Taught Programmes consolidates a number of policies and regulations previously located in the Teaching Quality Assurance Manual (TQA). It covers the QAA requirements on assessment as laid out in Chapter B6 of the QAA, UK Quality Code for Higher Education.
- 1.1.2 The handbook provides staff and students with the University's regulations and guidance on assessment procedures from the setting of assessment to the classification of degrees. It should be consulted in conjunction with other relevant documentation, including:
- a) The Credit and Qualifications Framework.
 - b) The Quality Review Framework.
 - c) Initial Approval and Subsequent Amendment of Taught Programmes/Modules: Procedures and Requirements.
 - d) The Code of Good Practice for Managing Academic Misconduct.
 - e) Academic Regulations within the University Calendar.
- 1.1.3 The guidance within the handbook recognises that for good academic and pedagogic reasons disciplines will set different types of assessment and will both mark and offer feedback in different ways. However, underpinning each Chapter are generic principles that apply in all instances. These are:
- a) The equitable treatment of students.
 - b) Transparency.
 - c) Consistency.
 - d) Maintenance of the academic standards and integrity of University of Exeter awards.
- 1.1.4 To ensure that the expectations of Colleges, students and staff are clear the following verbs are adopted and highlighted in the text:
- a) **Must**: to indicate a regulation that **must** be adhered to in all circumstances. Exceptions to such regulations will only be granted by the Deans in exceptional circumstances. For example "Students **must** receive feedback on all assessed work".
 - b) **Should**: to indicate a regulation that **should** be adhered to unless sound pedagogical reasons prevent this. For example "Students **should** be provided with timetables at the start of each module indicating when coursework will be set, when it is to be submitted".
 - c) **May**: to indicate a regulation where action is discretionary but Colleges are expected to demonstrate that taking the action has been considered. For example "A standard template for student feedback **may** be developed to ensure consistency of feedback across all modules and assessment methods". **May** is used both as an indication of good practice and also in the permissive sense.

- 1.1.5 The Handbook for Assessment, Progression and Awarding: Taught Programmes is approved by Senate and will be updated and re-published on an annual basis. Changes from the previous edition will be clearly highlighted and explained.
- 1.1.6 College variations in practice that differ from the norms stipulated in this handbook must be recommended via the Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee system to the Dean of the Faculty of Taught Programmes for approval.

Chapter 2 Setting and Submission of Assessments

2.1 Principles for Setting Assessment

- 2.1.1 When designing assessments the following principles **must** be applied:
- a) The volume, timing and nature of assessments **must** be designed with the intention of enabling students to demonstrate the extent to which they have achieved the relevant intended learning outcomes.
 - b) All intended learning outcomes **should** be assessed.
 - c) Information to students about what is expected of them **must** be provided clearly and explicitly at the beginning of each module and/or programme.
 - d) Assessments **must** support student learning as well as measuring achievement.
 - e) Information on any arrangements for re-assessment **must** be made available to students at the beginning of each module.
- 2.1.2 When setting assessment(s) consideration **should** be given to the need to eliminate opportunities for academic misconduct.
- 2.1.3 There **should** always be more than one assessment for a module although it is permitted to have only one summative assessment element.
- 2.1.4 Guidelines on the use of assessment methods, criteria and feedback **should** be made available by Colleges to all staff involved in the assessment and feedback process.

2.2 Role of External Examiners

- 2.2.1 External Examiners **should** have an opportunity to comment on the methods of assessment, assessment criteria and feedback processes for all summative assessments and the content of prepared examination papers.

2.3 Timing

- 2.3.1 All undergraduate students **should** have an opportunity to undertake at least one assessment in the first six weeks of the commencement of their programmes.
- 2.3.2 Students **must** be informed of the submission dates of all assessments. This **should** be done by the end of the first week of the start of each module. Where this is not possible, students **should** be given at least four weeks' notice of the deadline for submission.

2.4 Information to be Made Available to Students

- 2.4.1 Students **should** have access to the marking criteria that will be applied to their assessment(s).
- 2.4.2 Information for students **should** make it clear to whom, and how submission takes place. In order to provide unambiguous evidence of the date and time of submission, the methods of submission **must** include a mechanism for recording the submission. It **should** also include a mechanism for asserting on the part of students that the work in question is their own.
- 2.4.3 Functions of Assessment

- a) Formative Assessment: An assessment item for which the mark does not contribute to the final mark for a module. Formative assessment **may** or **may not** be compulsory and penalties for non-completion **may not** apply. Formative assessment has a developmental purpose. It **should** indicate what is good about a piece of work and why this is good; it **should** indicate how the work could be improved.
- b) Summative Assessment: An assessment item for which the mark contributes to the final mark for a module. For summative assessments the module descriptor **must** indicate the percentage weighting of the final mark. Summative assessment is used to gauge the extent to which students can demonstrate attainment of the intended learning outcomes of a module or programme in relation to published marking criteria.

2.5 Methods of Assessment

- 2.5.1 Over the course of a programme of study a diverse range of areas of knowledge and skills should be assessed to mark achievement of a diverse range of intended learning outcomes, and utilising a diverse range of forms of assessment. When designing assessment(s), consideration **should** be given to the most appropriate method of assessment to support student learning and ascertain whether students have manifested attainment of intended learning outcomes. Advice on setting appropriate methods of assessment can be sought from the University's [Education Quality and Enhancement](#) team.

2.6 Setting Re-assessments

- 2.6.1 Students who have been referred in an assessment, or have been given permission to defer an assessment, **must** be assessed on the original syllabus.
- 2.6.2 Where there are practical reasons why the original form of assessment on a module cannot be replicated for referral or deferral purposes, an alternative form of assessment **must** be used. Examples of when this approach is justified include where the original assessment relied on fieldwork, group work, access to specialist equipment, or input from visiting staff; or where the process of assessment throughout the module was intricate, involving many assessments. The method of reassessment **should** address as many of the module's intended learning outcomes as is possible. The rationale for using alternative forms of assessment **should** be explained to students when their assessments are referred or deferred.
- 2.6.3 Where reassessment in the form of an exam is via the same format as the original assessment, any questions/ tasks set **should** be different.

2.7 Setting Examination Papers and Rubrics

- 2.7.1 Standardisation of the format and basic layout of examination papers and rubrics throughout the University provides clarity and consistency for students and supports the Examinations Office and its staff in preparations prior to and during examination sessions. Detailed notes on the presentation and preparation of examination papers and rubrics are found in [Annex A](#).
- 2.7.2 Examination papers **should** be prepared and stored only on computers which have physical and software security measures that are fit for purpose, i.e., it **should** be beyond reasonable doubt that examination papers have been kept secure at all stages of their preparation prior to use.
- 2.7.3 All examination rubrics **should** be available for students to view in advance of the examination.

- 2.7.4 Past examination papers must be made available via the library and students must be made aware of how to access these in the library archive:

<http://www.library.ex.ac.uk/exampapers/>

2.8 Accessibility

- 2.8.1 The Equality Act 2010 provides protection against discrimination, harassment, and victimisation on the grounds of disability. In this context, a disabled student is defined as someone with a physical or mental impairment that has a substantial effect on her or his ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities.
- 2.8.2 The Equality Act also contains the Public Sector Equality duty with which all public sector organisations must comply. This involves removing or minimising disadvantage suffered by people with a disability, and states that compliance with the duty **may** involve treating some people differently than others. The Equality Act 2010 continues the existing duty upon higher education institutions to make reasonable adjustments where students with a disability might otherwise be substantially disadvantaged.
- 2.8.3 The University has an anticipatory duty under the Equality Act (Amendment) Order 2012, which means that consideration **must** be given to how assessment(s) are made accessible to students with disabilities. This consideration forms an essential part of programme and module design, and review. It is the responsibility of all staff members to ensure that their teaching and the process of assessment is accessible. Staff **should** be aware of their anticipatory duty to make reasonable adjustments to any part of the teaching for students with a disability.
- 2.8.4 Adjustments and suitable adaptation to a student's specific needs **should** be made in dialogue with the student. An Individual Learning Plan (ILP) will often be agreed in collaboration with AccessAbility or the Wellbeing Service and includes advice on appropriate adjustments to meet the student's specific needs.

2.9 Principles of Submission

- 2.9.1 Deadlines for submission must be communicated to students; this communication **should** be clear, explicit and easily accessible;
- 2.9.2 The consequences of late or non-submission **must** be made clear to students;
- 2.9.3 Methods for the granting of extensions to the submission deadline for assessed work **must** ensure that all students are treated fairly and consistently.

2.10 Late Submission of Coursework

- 2.10.1 Late submission of an assessment up to two weeks beyond a submission deadline **must** receive a mark capped at the module pass mark unless an application for mitigation is approved. First submissions submitted later than two weeks after the deadline will receive a mark of zero. Referred coursework which is submitted beyond the submission deadline **must** receive a mark of zero, unless an application for mitigation is approved.
- 2.10.2 Colleges must publish the University penalty for the late submission of assessed work in the relevant programme, module or College handbook.
- 2.10.3 External Examiners **should** be informed where students' overall marks for modules have been affected because of penalties applied for late submission.

- 2.10.4 The scheduling of Mitigation Committees **should** allow for the consideration of applications for extensions to submission deadlines in advance of submission deadlines, either through scheduling ad-hoc meetings or through the delegation of such decisions.
- 2.10.5 For students experiencing disabilities there may be specific requests for exceptions to the above in relation to extensions or the spreading out of deadlines. These will either be detailed within the students' individual learning plans (ILPs) or through discussion at a Health, Wellbeing and Fitness to Study meeting.

2.11 Non-submission and Non-attendance

- 2.11.1 Students are expected to complete all assessments whether they are formative or summative. Failure to attend or submit a summative assessment **should** only be excused in the case of serious illness or exceptional personal circumstances. If a student is ill at the point of an assessment, they **should** still attempt the assessment where possible, and submit an application for mitigation. Applications for mitigation **must** be submitted within one working day of the assessment deadline. A medical certificate of illness **must** be provided in support of applications for mitigation on the grounds of ill health. Consequences of non-submission or non-attendance are:
- a) For non-submission or non-attendance with properly documented medical or other extreme personal circumstances refer to the Mitigation procedures (Chapter 10).
 - b) For non-submission or non-attendance with no reasonable explanation or properly documented evidence, a recommendation **may** be made to the College Dean or nominee to deem the student to have withdrawn from the University.
- 2.11.2 For students experiencing disabilities there **may** be specific requests for exceptions to the above, in relation to non-submission or non-attendance. These will either be detailed within the student's individual learning plan (ILP) or through discussion at a Health, Wellbeing and Fitness to Study meeting.

2.12 Deferral

- 2.12.1 If students are prevented from completing an assessment for a module (or modules), and mitigation has been approved, then deferral **may** be recommended. Deferred assessment(s) for undergraduates **should** be taken in the August assessment period. Deferred assessments for taught postgraduate students should be taken at the next available opportunity. As detailed in Chapter 2, a deferred candidate **must** be assessed on the original syllabus, but alternative methods of assessment **may** be employed in certain circumstances.
- 2.12.2 Where a student has successfully completed individual assessment components in a module, these marks **should** be retained and combined with the marks from any outstanding part(s) of the assessment process for which they have been deferred for the calculation of the final module mark.

Chapter 3 Examinations

3.1 Failure to Attend an Examination

- 3.1.1 Failure to attend an examination **should** only be excused in the case of serious illness or exceptional personal circumstances. Applications for mitigation **should** be submitted within one working day of the examination. Applications for mitigation on the grounds of ill health **must** always be supported by a medical certificate of illness. Consequences of non-attendance at an examination are:
- a) For absence from an examination with properly documented medical or other extreme personal circumstances, refer to the Mitigation procedures (Chapter 10).
 - b) For absence from an examination with no reasonable explanation or properly documented evidence, a recommendation **may** be made by the College Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee, to the College Dean or nominee to deem the student to have withdrawn from the University.

3.2 Late Arrival

- 3.2.1 Students arriving late for examinations will be admitted to the examination hall without question during the first half-hour of the examination period, but will not be allowed extra time in which to complete their examination. A note will be made by the invigilator and passed to the relevant College of any student arriving after this time.

3.3 Use of Calculators

- 3.3.1 Students **must** seek approval to use their calculator prior to the examination via the appropriate College office, and this will be signified by the application of a tamper evident label provided by the University Examinations Office.
- 3.3.2 It is the responsibility of students to bring calculators to the examination hall and to ensure that spare batteries are available.
- 3.3.3 With the exception of 'Open Book' examinations, calculators or electronic devices capable of carrying out the retrieval of stored numerical or textual information **must not** be used.
- 3.3.4 Students **should** be informed that failure to comply with these regulations will result in confiscation of the non-approved calculator or, in extreme cases, exclusion of the student from the examination.

3.4 Use of Dictionaries

- 3.4.1 The use of dictionaries in examinations is not permitted unless specific approval has been given by the students' College. Students for whom English is not their primary language **may** be permitted to use dictionaries in examination rooms provided they have obtained the relevant authorisation from their College Office. Electronic dictionaries **must not** be approved for use in examination rooms. Students **should** be advised that notes **must not** be written inside a dictionary, and if any such dictionary is found then it will be confiscated and further action **may** be taken.

3.5 Other Material

- 3.5.1 Colleges are responsible for publishing in advance advice for students on what is and is not permitted in examinations.

3.5.2 Mobile phones are not permitted in any examination.

3.6 Invigilation

3.6.1 Invigilation in all central examination venues during the main examination periods **must** be carried out by invigilators appointed by the Examinations Office. All invigilators are required to attend a training session prior to their first invigilation session.

3.7 Safe Handling of Examination Papers and Examination Scripts

3.7.1 All examination papers **must** be regarded as confidential documents prior to being taken by students and all appropriate measures taken to safeguard them at all stages. Distribution to colleagues, External Examiners and to the Examinations Office **must** be via secure means, password protected wherever possible.

3.7.2 Any paper copies of draft or final papers **must** be kept securely and any sent for disposal should only be done so carefully and confidentially. If a disposal system is unavailable for any reason then copies **should** be securely retained until it becomes possible or until the examination has been taken.

3.7.3 Any queries with regards to what constitutes secure means should be referred to the Examinations Office, who will also issue the necessary passwords.

3.8 Contacting Academics during an Examination

3.8.1 The academic member(s) of staff responsible for writing the examination paper **must** be contactable at all times while the examination is taking place or have appointed a deputy with knowledge of the paper content. It is the responsibility of the College to ensure that the main College Office is aware of the location of the academic(s) in question, and that contact numbers, e.g. mobile telephone numbers, are left with the office in case there are any queries about the examination paper.

3.8.2 In the event that an academic member of staff knows they will not be available then they **must** nominate an alternative who has full knowledge of the paper.

3.9 Religious Holidays

3.9.1 It is the responsibility of the student to inform the Examinations Office of any religious observance needs by completing the relevant form available on the Examinations Office website and submitting it no later than the published deadline. Every reasonable effort will be made to accommodate all such requests.

3.10 Emergency Procedures

3.10.1 Procedures to be adopted in the case of an emergency or a major incident can be found at [Annex B](#).

3.11 Dealing with Suspected Examination Offences

3.11.1 Suspected examination offences **must** be dealt with under the University's Academic Misconduct regulations as laid out in the [Code of Good Practice on Managing Academic Misconduct](#).

Chapter 4 Assessing Students with Disabilities

4.1 Overview

- 4.1.1 This Chapter is intended to support the application of consistent, equitable arrangements for the assessment of disabled students (and those with a temporary physical injury). In this context, a disabled student is defined as someone with a physical or mental impairment that has a substantial effect on her or his ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities.
- 4.1.2 It is the responsibility of students to inform the University if they have a disability, either during application, registration or following the subsequent onset of a disabling condition.
- 4.1.3 Students experiencing physical or mental impairment need to be assessed by AccessAbility or the Wellbeing Service. At this assessment the students', needs will be considered in relation to their courses and assessments, and individual learning plans (ILPs) and/or specific assessment arrangements will be put in place. ILPs will also detail the recommendations for reasonable adjustments detailed in the Disabled Students' Allowance (DSA) study needs assessment for particular students.

4.2 General Arrangements for University Examinations

- 4.2.1 Colleges, in consultation with AccessAbility or the Wellbeing Service where necessary, **should** comply with the ILP put in place for each individual student by the Wellbeing Service/AccessAbility. The Examinations Office will set a deadline for requests for specific arrangements and publish that deadline to the Wellbeing Service/AccessAbility, Colleges and individual students. Requests received after this deadline cannot be guaranteed to be met.
- 4.2.2 Students with short-term injuries/health issues, which are be supported by medical evidence, **may** be able to have specific examination arrangements if their injury or health issues have occurred for the first time since the examination deadline date. They would need to be assessed by or be in contact with AccessAbility or the Wellbeing Service. However these students **may** need to be deferred in their examinations if it is not possible for examination arrangements to be put in place.
- 4.2.3 Where arrangements cannot be carried out centrally, Colleges and other units within the University **may** be required to ensure that appropriate provision is offered, under guidance from the Examinations Office and/or Wellbeing Service AccessAbility as appropriate.
- 4.2.4 Where there is some dispute as to the recommended specific assessment arrangement, the case **should** be referred to the Dean of the appropriate Faculty. Liaison should then take place with Wellbeing Services/AccessAbility to ensure all issues are given due consideration.
- 4.2.5 Where the assessment is an examination administered by the Examinations Office, the Examinations Office **should** issue details to each candidate of the arrangements approved by the Examinations Office, together with any additional instructions, at least 15 working days before the relevant examinations commence.
- 4.2.6 Where the assessment is administered within a College, the Wellbeing Service/AccessAbility/and the Examinations Office (where necessary) **should**, be consulted in determining the specific assessment arrangement.

- 4.2.7 A disability that has not been declared prior to an assessment cannot be taken into account retrospectively, unless the student can provide a reasonable explanation and properly documented evidence for not having declared it (see also the University's procedures for Student Academic Appeals).

4.3 Specific Arrangements

- 4.3.1 Additional time allowance **may** be made for all methods of assessment. This will be written on the students' ILPs following assessments by Wellbeing Services/AccessAbility. The standard additional time allowance for timed assessments is 15 minutes per hour unless evidence received states otherwise (from Wellbeing Service/AccessAbility).
- 4.3.2 Where an examination lasts for more than four hours, an appropriate supervised rest period **should** be allowed. For shorter examinations, students **should** only be eligible for rest breaks if specified in their ILPs.
- 4.3.3 Where an examination lasts more than three hours, the students involved **should not** be required to take more than one examination in a single day. Where this is not possible, every effort **should** be made to ensure an adequate rest period between examinations, in agreement with the Wellbeing Service/AccessAbility, the Examinations Office and the College(s) involved.

4.4 Alternative Examination Locations

- 4.4.1 If required as part of a student's ILP, a location suited to the student's needs, and meeting appropriate examination conditions **should** be made available.
- 4.4.2 Exceptionally, a student **may** be allowed to take an examination in his/her place of residence, provided that an invigilator approved by the Examinations Office is present.

4.5 Use of a Scribe

- 4.5.1 In exceptional circumstances the use of a scribe **may** be permitted. In such circumstances, students **should** be given 10 minutes extra time per hour in addition to their agreed extended time allowance. Guidelines for use of scribes are available from AccessAbility or the Examinations Office.
- 4.5.2 The appointment of a scribe for the duration of an examination is subject to approval by the University's Examinations Office.
- 4.5.3 The cost for provision of a scribe for the duration of the examination only will be met by AccessAbility.

4.6 Use of Information Technology

- 4.6.1 In exceptional circumstances the use of IT **may** be permissible, offering a flexible approach to students with disabilities or injuries. The specific requirements will be written on the ILP following assessment at the Wellbeing Services/AccessAbility. Additional time allowance **may** be applied.

4.7 Assessment Format

- 4.7.1 In exceptional circumstances, the method of an assessment **may** be changed. This will be requested on the ILP following an assessment at the Wellbeing service/AccessAbility. The ILP will detail which time period and which modules require consideration for alternative assessment methods. Implementation will occur in

consultation with the External Examiner, the Dean of the Faculty of Taught Programmes, and the Examinations Office where appropriate.

4.8 Hearing Impaired Students

- 4.8.1 For hearing impaired students, arrangements for the use of an interpreter or lip speaker **may** be made. Alternatively, there **may** be support for pre-lingually deaf students upon arrangement and/or an additional time allowance **may** be granted.

4.9 Visually Impaired Students

- 4.9.1 Scripts **may** be made available in Braille or large print or questions and candidate answers supplied via audio-tape if practicable. Arrangements to use a reader **may** also be made.

4.10 Monitoring of Specific Assessment Arrangements

- 4.10.1 The Examinations Office will monitor specific assessment arrangements and ensure that the implementation of these procedures fit within the requirements of the law and the Equality Act 2010.
- 4.10.2 Any grievance or complaint regarding specific assessment arrangements **should** be made through the University's [Student Complaints Procedure](#).

Chapter 5 Marking

5.1 Principles for Marking Assessments

- 5.1.1 Colleges **should** develop an approach to marking assessment(s) that is consistent with the following principles:
- a) All marking **must** be based on the quality of students' work and be free from bias or prejudice (see 5.2);
 - b) No module's marking **should** rely solely on the judgement of one marker;
 - c) All summative assessment **must** be subject to moderation;
 - d) Where anonymity of candidates cannot be assured double blind marking **should** be applied to a sample;
 - e) All Colleges **must** publish marking criteria for all assessment;
 - f) The relevant marking criteria **must** be applied consistently;
 - g) Staff **must** be willing to use the whole range of marks when marking assessment(s). Where a marking scheme is introduced which does not use the full scale of marks this **must** be clearly communicated to students.

5.2 Anonymity

- 5.2.1 The most effective means of demonstrating that marking is free from bias or prejudice is to ensure that students' assessment is anonymous. All assessments **should** be anonymous. However, the University recognises that this is not always practically possible. Where assessment cannot be anonymous Colleges **must** ensure, and be able to demonstrate, that marking is fair, reliable, consistent and transparent. Students **must** be fully informed of the marking criteria and processes.

5.3 Moderation and Sampling

- 5.3.1 Moderation is the process used to assure that assessment outcomes are fair and reliable, and that assessment criteria have been applied consistently. Any moderation method **must** be proportionate to ensure fairness, reliability and consistent application of the criteria.
- 5.3.2 It is not always necessary for all work to be moderated. In many circumstances, it is sufficient for a sample of assessments to be moderated. Where multiple markers are used to mark a batch of assessments, sampling **should** be undertaken with regard to each marker rather than with regard to the whole batch of assessments. A number of approaches to moderation can be applied, all of which **may** be undertaken on a sample only:
- a) Double blind marking: where a piece of work is marked by two markers independently, who agree a final mark for the assessment. Neither marker is aware of the other's mark when formulating his/her own mark.
 - b) Double open marking: where a piece of work is marked by two markers, who agree a final mark for the assessment.
 - c) Check marking: where an assessment is read by a second marker to determine whether the mark awarded by the first marker is appropriate.

- 5.3.3 Where double marking or check marking is applied as the method of moderation the marking team **should** agree a final set of marks for the whole cohort and if they cannot agree a final mark, a third marker **should** be used to adjudicate an agreed mark.
- 5.3.4 These processes **should** also identify the marking patterns of individual markers to facilitate comparisons and identify inconsistencies.
- 5.3.5 Where model answers are agreed by staff marking assessments, it is allowable for these assessments not to be moderated. However, the model answer **must** be reviewed and agreed by at least two markers in advance.
- 5.3.6 Sampling: it is appropriate for sampling to be applied to all the methods of moderation set out above. Where sampling is employed, the following **must** be adhered to:
- At least 10% or a minimum of 10 (whichever is greater) of the submitted assessments **must** be moderated;
 - The sample **must** cover the full range of marks.

5.4 Generic Mark Scheme

- 5.4.1 The University has a generic mark scheme (that draws on QAA¹ and SEEC² guidelines) that characterises the level of complexity, demand and relative autonomy expected of students at each Level of the curriculum (as detailed in the Credit and Qualifications Framework). The generic mark scheme can be found [here](#).
- 5.4.2 All marking criteria **must** be consistent with the University's published percentage boundaries (see Chapter 9) for degree classification.

5.5 Undergraduate Students Taking Level 7 Modules

- 5.5.1 Where a student on an undergraduate programme is taking a module at Level 7 the module **must** be marked according to the normal postgraduate marking criteria for the module and the marking scheme for postgraduate modules, except in the following cases:
- A pass mark of 40% applies to Level 7 modules taken as part of an MEng programme in the College of Engineering, Mathematics and Physical Sciences for entry cohorts prior to 2012/3.
 - A pass mark of 40% applies to Level 7 modules taken as part of other integrated Masters programmes in the College of Engineering, Mathematics and Physical Sciences for entry cohorts prior to 2013/4.
- 5.5.2 The mark obtained **must** be used in the calculation of the credit-weighted mean for the programme as a whole (i.e., there **must** be no 'scaling' of marks).

¹[Quality Assurance Agency frameworks for higher education qualifications and credit](#)

² Southern England Consortium for Credit Accumulation and Transfer <http://www.seec.org.uk/academic-credit/seec-credit-level-descriptors-2010> Accessed 1 May 2011

5.6 Postgraduate Students Taking Modules below Level 7

- 5.6.1 Where a student on a postgraduate programme is taking a module at Level 6 or below, the module **must** be marked according to the normal undergraduate marking criteria for the module and the marking scheme for undergraduate modules. The mark obtained **must** be used in the calculation of the credit-weighted mean for the programme as a whole (i.e., there **must** be no 'scaling' of marks).

5.7 Marking Criteria

- 5.7.1 To ensure consistency all summative marking processes **should** be numerical, unless an alternative scheme has been approved by the Dean of the Faculty of Taught Programmes and has been clearly communicated to students.
- 5.7.2 External Examiners **must** have an opportunity to comment on the assessment criteria and model answers for all summative assessments.

5.8 Scaling of Marks

- 5.8.1 The purpose of scaling is to rectify anomalies in mark distributions that arise from unanticipated circumstances and **should** be used in exceptional circumstances only. Hence, the assessment criteria and practices for any module that has its marks scaled **should** be reviewed in order to reduce the chance that scaling will be necessary in subsequent years.
- 5.8.2 Where scaling is employed for adjusting agreed assessment marks within a module to correct abnormal group performance, the following rules **must** be adhered to:
- a) The raw marks, together with the rationale under which they were awarded, **must** always be made available to the Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee.
 - b) Scaling **must not** unfairly benefit or disadvantage a subset of students (e.g. failures). This means that any scaling function applied to a set of marks **must** be monotonically increasing, i.e. it **must not** reverse the rank-order of any pair of students. The definition of any scaling function used (its domain) **must** encompass the full range of raw marks from 0 to 100%. For example, 'Add 3 marks to all students' or 'Multiply all marks by a factor of 0.96' are both valid scaling functions. 'Add 4 marks to all failures and leave the rest unchanged.' is not acceptable because it would cause a student whose raw mark was 39 (a fail) to leapfrog a student who got 41 (a pass).
 - c) External Examiners **must** always be consulted about the process.
 - d) The rationale for scaling and the impact on marks **must** be clearly recorded in the minutes by the Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee.
 - e) The system used to identify modules as potential candidates for scaling **must** be transparent.

5.9 Marking the Work of Students with ILPs or Diagnosed with Specific Learning Difficulties (where competence of language is not being assessed)

- 5.9.1 For guidance on a range of accessibility issues, including dyslexia marking guidelines, refer to the [AccessAbility website](#).

Chapter 6 Feedback

6.1 Principles

- 6.1.1 Feedback is an essential part of the student experience, helping to promote learning and assuring academic standards and quality. It is essential that the University adopts assessment and feedback principles that are inclusive of all students irrespective of their backgrounds, experiences or study patterns and which are responsive to the diverse needs of the student population. Feedback can take multiple forms.
- 6.1.2 The University's approach to feedback is based on the following principles:
- a) Effective feedback on assessment is a fundamental part of the learning and teaching process and is not separate from it;
 - b) Feedback practices **should** promote effective learning and support the academic development of students;
 - c) All students **should** receive parity of treatment;
 - d) All feedback on assessment **should** be formative, ensuring that students are able to consider and digest comments on their work and are subsequently able to address weaknesses and build on their academic strengths;
 - e) All assessment and subsequent feedback **should** be rigorous, impartial and delivered in a timely manner;
 - f) Students **must** be informed about how and when they will receive feedback.
- 6.1.3 Module descriptors **must** contain information indicating how feedback will be provided to students following each piece of formative and summative assessment. Where feedback is not routinely provided on examinations students **should** have the opportunity to request feedback from their tutor.
- 6.1.4 Students **should** have the opportunity to receive feedback on their progress in a module before the final assessment elements of the module take place. This **may** be done as a collective exercise for a group of students.
- 6.1.5 Students **should** be asked a specific question within module evaluation about the appropriateness of the assessment and feedback on the module. The question **should** highlight the variety of forms that feedback may take.

6.2 Draft Assessments

- 6.2.1 Colleges **must** discuss and be clear about the rationale for any system they adopt for the provision of feedback and/or marks on draft assessments. Equality of approach within modules **must** be a particular objective, with special reference to projects and dissertations that can involve the participation of a large number of staff.
- 6.2.2 In developing such a system the following **should** be considered:
- a) The potential for inconsistency of practice between modules pitched at the same level and that require similar types of assessment **should** be addressed.
 - b) As a minimum, a consistent approach **should** be observed by all staff contributing to an individual module, including the amount of feedback that can be expected by students.

- c) Information **should** be made available to students on how and when they have opportunities to discuss their work with their tutors and to receive appropriate advice.
- d) Programme and/or module handbooks **should** indicate if feedback on drafts is provided, and what is required of students if they are to benefit.
- a) Clear deadlines **must** be identified for the submission of drafts attracting feedback.
- e) External Examiners **should** be made aware of College policy on the extent to which students are supported by feedback on draft assessments.

6.3 Three Week Turnaround

- 6.3.1 The University has adopted a policy that all students **should** receive feedback on all assessments within three weeks. Assessment schedules **should** be taken into account to ensure that students will have the opportunity to make improvements in future assessments on the basis of the feedback provided.
- 6.3.2 Colleges **should** record the maximum amount of time taken for assessment items to be returned, and this data **should** be used in annual module review and the Annual Student Experience Review. Additional guidance from the Dean of the Faculty of Taught Programmes on the three week turnaround policy can be found [here](#).

6.4 Data Protection

- 6.4.1 The disclosure to students of information about their performance enhances the learning experience, preparing them better for the intellectual challenges ahead both in their programmes of study and their future careers.
- 6.4.2 The Data Protection Act 1998 imposes a variety of obligations on holders of information including universities. The advice and procedures that follow take account of the Act, for which the general implications for the University are summarised through Exeter's Data Protection web site.
- 6.4.3 Results **may** be published by individual notification to students. It is good practice to send results by secure means directly to individual students. While students are informed under the Data Protection Act 1998 at registration that their results could be published, notices **should** be anonymous.

6.5 Disclosure of Marks

- 6.5.1 Marks for assessment **should** be made available by Colleges to students, once they have been agreed by the internal markers concerned. Where such marks form part of a final award or classification, disclosure **should** always be on the basis that they are only indicative, and have no formal standing until confirmed by the College Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee.
- 6.5.2 For examinations and other summative assessments undertaken towards the end of the academic year, marks **must** be made available to students once they have been confirmed by the College Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee.
- 6.5.3 Marks are most appropriately released through the home College. Marks for Flexible Combined Honours students **should** be released through the Flexible Combined Honours Office or its designated representatives.

- 6.5.4 Module marks **should** be disclosed as whole percentages, in line with approved University assessment procedures, except where an alternative scheme has been approved the Dean of the Faculty of Taught Programmes.
- 6.5.5 Student handbooks **should** contain reference to the status of marks released under this procedure. Students **should** also be informed that results will be available via the student portal and when this will happen.
- 6.5.6 All individual marks **should** be communicated directly the student, either in writing or by access to an individual space on the University portal, and not by public notice.

6.6 Access to Examination and Other Assessment Scripts

- 6.6.1 Under the Data Protection Act 1998 students may make a subject access request (for a fee of £10) to the University Data Protection Officer for copies of their personal data held by the University. This access extends to manual records (both existing and future) including comments entered by examiners on scripts or on cover sheets.
- 6.6.2 Students have no right of access to assessment scripts but they may make an access request under the Act. This right of access to information will also extend to examiners' report forms for theses and dissertations.
- 6.6.3 Colleges **should** review their processes for the marking of scripts, considering the language/ tone of markers' comments and how they are recorded. For instance, to save the copying of whole scripts as a result of a subject access request, it might be decided by a College that all remarks would be better confined to a cover sheet. Colleges will also want to advise their staff not to use defamatory or embarrassing language.
- 6.6.4 Examination marks are given a temporary exemption from the subject access provisions in the form of an extension, to ensure that students cannot use their subject access rights to discover their marks before they are actually announced. If a subject access request is received, the University is not obliged to respond until the earlier of (a) 40 days after the announcement of the results, or (b) five months from receipt of the request. Therefore, if the University takes longer than five months to process the examination results, it could be forced to make them available under the subject access rules.
- 6.6.5 Colleges **should** also be aware that raw marks fall within the terms of the Act. Therefore, for instance, in the case of unseen second marking, both initial marks would have to be reported if they had been retained within College records (held either within a College office or by an individual member of staff).
- 6.6.6 Colleges, while commended to heed the good practice suggested above, **should** note that they are under no obligation to retain scripts/remarks purely for the purpose of the Act. Once the usefulness of the scripts and remarks, for instance in the context of examiners' meetings, Academic Audit purposes or feedback to students, is past, they can be destroyed.

6.7 Enquiries by Third Parties

- 6.7.1 Results/marks **must** only be released to the student concerned and not to parents or any other third party unless one of the following conditions applies:
- a) Explicit written consent (which **may** be by email) has been obtained from the student;
 - b) The University is required by law or statutory instrument (as may be in the case of sponsors);

- c) Where required to prevent or detect crime;
- d) Where required to release to a third party who is sub-contracted by the University to process the data in a way that meets Data Protection Act 1998 regulations.

6.7.2 Sponsors could have agreements in place enabling the disclosure of a student's academic performance. This **should** be outlined in the Terms and Conditions for the Award Holders. If there is any doubt about disclosures please check with the Data Protection Officer, at dataprotection@exeter.ac.uk.

6.8 Academic Appeals

6.8.1 The procedures to be used when students wish to appeal against their academic results are detailed in the University Calendar at:

<http://www.exeter.ac.uk/staff/policies/calendar/part1/otherregs/appeals/>

6.9 Transcripts

6.9.1 A complete transcript, including marks for assessed modules at all levels, **must** be made available without charge to all students after the completion of their programme and approval of award. Further copies will be charged for. Transcripts will be issued by the University's Examinations Office or by the partner institution as appropriate.

6.9.2 Transcripts showing marks will only be made available to potential employers or other organisations at the student's written request.

Chapter 7 Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees

7.1 Introduction

- 7.1.1 In accordance with Ordinance 3, every assessment for a Degree, Diploma or Certificate of the University, whether taken at one sitting or in parts, is directed by an Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee.

7.2 Definitions

- 7.2.1 The University has a two tier system for Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees. The two tiers are:
- 7.2.2 Tier One: Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees whose primary responsibility is to safeguard academic standards for the particular programmes under consideration.
- 7.2.3 Tier Two: College Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees whose primary responsibility is to assure that academic regulations are applied consistently and equitably across disciplines within the College.

7.3 Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees – Terms of Reference

- 7.3.1 Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees are primarily responsible for safeguarding academic standards for the particular programmes under consideration.
- 7.3.2 To exercise this responsibility Programme/Discipline, Progression and Awarding Committees have the following terms of reference:
- a) To take an overview of the assessment processes that operate for the programmes and modules in the subject area, with a particular view to ensuring that principles of fairness and impartiality have been applied, including:
 - i) Setting examination papers, essay titles, and other assessments;
 - ii) Marking processes (including moderation, sampling, etc.);
 - iii) Application of regulations.
 - b) To ensure that appropriate and clear marking criteria have been set and applied to identify threshold standards and that classification boundaries are clear;
 - c) To ensure that marking criteria are applied appropriately and consistently;
 - d) To agree the results of assessments in modules. Exception reporting, (i.e., only noting non straightforward results) is acceptable;
 - e) To receive reports from Mitigation Committees;
 - f) To approve the progression of students, including the application of condonement where clear rules have been set out in advance of the meeting (see Chapter 8) up to a maximum of 30 credits per stage for undergraduates and 45 credits for taught postgraduates;
 - g) To make recommendations for awards and classification;

- h) To review statistics on academic performance and to comment upon the performance of cohorts in particular assessments and modules.

7.4 Membership

- 7.4.1 The Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee **must** be chaired by the Head of Discipline or Director of Education.
- 7.4.2 In accordance with Ordinance 3 paragraph 2, the membership of every Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee **must** include at least one member of the academic staff of the University and at least one External Examiner.
- 7.4.3 In accordance with Ordinance 3, paragraphs 3-4, Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees are appointed each year by the Board of the Faculty of Taught Programmes on behalf of the Senate. Membership **should** include all module leaders/convenors.
- 7.4.4 External Examiner(s) are expected to be present at any meeting of the Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee at which recommendations are made for the award of degrees, diplomas or certificates. Attendance in person is recommended, however, it is acceptable for Externals to attend by Skype, video conference link or conference call if necessary. When, exceptionally and for good reason, this is not possible, the External Examiner's absence **must** be approved in advance by the Dean of the Faculty of Taught Programmes. Under such circumstances, the Chair **should** ensure that the External Examiner has been fully involved in agreeing marks and that there is, at the meeting, a written record of the External Examiner's remarks and recommendations on classifications and failures.

7.5 Meetings of Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees

- 7.5.1 Only duly appointed members of the Committee and its Secretary **should** be present at a meeting of a Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee. However, with the approval of the Chair of the Committee, other members of University staff **may** be present for the purposes of administrative support or observation.
- 7.5.2 The quorum for the attendance of members at a meeting of a Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee **should** be observed as follows:
- The quorum for a meeting **must** be half the appointed internal members, rounded up, plus an External Examiner.
 - Colleges **should** decide on those staff involved in the assessment of a module/programme to be nominated for membership of a Committee.
 - The full Committee, at its principal meeting(s) **may** delegate subsequent action (such as confirmation of referred or deferred assessment, and dissertation marks) to a group smaller than the Committee. This group **must** involve relevant External Examiner(s).
 - Committee members not present at a meeting **should** make a contact point available.

7.6 Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee Agenda

- 7.6.1 Meetings of Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees **should** have the following agenda:
- a) Apologies for absence.
 - b) Terms of reference.
 - c) Declarations of interest.
 - d) Minutes of the previous meeting.
 - e) Matters arising on the minutes.
 - f) Receipt of a report of Chair's actions.
 - g) Receipt of reports of action taken as a result of External Examiners' reports from the previous year.
 - h) Receipt of a report from Mitigation Committee(s).
 - i) Receipt of condonement rules (agreed in advance of the meeting) for all programmes under consideration.
 - j) Approval of module marks, condonement (up to a maximum of 30 credits for undergraduates, 45 credits for postgraduates) and progression.
 - k) Recommendations on award and classification.
 - l) Consideration of assessment processes (e.g. an oral report on moderation, mitigation, and review of any assessment changes, or issues arising out of the marking process).
 - m) Delegation of powers (see 7.5.2 c above).
 - n) Receive an oral review by the External Examiners.
- 7.6.2 This agenda is not exclusive and further items **may** be added for a particular meeting as Committee business requires.
- 7.6.3 The External Examiner is expected to confirm the decisions taken by the Committee by either signing the final mark sheet or verbally in their report to the Committee with an appropriate minute made.
- 7.6.4 It is not the responsibility of a Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee to make recommendations about the consequences of failure; this is the responsibility of the College Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee. [This formulation reflects a legal judgement which requires that processes of academic assessment **must** be clearly separated from those concerning the consequences of failure.]
- 7.6.5 All Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees **must** keep formal minutes of their proceedings, recording results (as an attachment if more appropriate) and the reasons for recommendations relating to cases of condonement. (Template for minutes attached in [Annex C](#))

- 7.6.6 It is the responsibility of the Chair to ensure that all evidence relevant to any decision of the Committee is made available in documentary form. Mitigating evidence considered by a Mitigation Committee or equivalent **should** only be presented to the Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee, if relevant and with the explicit permission of the relevant student.

7.7 College Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees – Terms of Reference

- 7.7.1 The primary responsibility of College Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees is to ensure that academic regulations are applied consistently and equitably across disciplines. To exercise this responsibility College Committees have the following terms of reference:
- a) To receive approved marks for all students.
 - b) To receive decisions of Mitigation Committees and pay particular regard to matters of consistency across programmes/disciplines.
 - c) To receive recommendations of Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees for classification of awards and recommend these to Senate.
 - d) To ensure that Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees have applied pre-agreed condonement rules consistently.
 - e) To make decisions about the consequences of failure, including decisions on failed modules where more than the maximum permitted number of condonable credits is involved.
 - f) To ensure the consistent application of the Academic Regulations.
 - g) To monitor the performance of Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees.
 - h) To refer back any issues requiring action for the following year.
 - i) To identify and share good practice.

7.8 Membership

- 7.8.1 The College Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee **should** normally be chaired by the Associate Dean (Education) or, with approval of the Dean of Taught Programmes, an appropriate nominee.
- 7.8.2 Each Programme/Discipline Committee **must** be represented at the College Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee by at least one member.
- 7.8.3 Only duly appointed members of the Committee and its Secretary **should** be present at a meeting of a Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee. However, with the approval of the Chair of the Committee, other members of University staff **may** be present for the purposes of administrative support or observation.
- 7.8.4 As decisions relating to standards of awards (i.e., confirmation of marks and appropriate application of threshold and classification standards) are the responsibility of Programme/Discipline Committees, External Examiners are not expected to attend College Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees.

7.9 Meetings of College Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees

- 7.9.1 The quorum for the attendance of members at a meeting of a College Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee **must** be observed as follows:
- a) The quorum for a meeting shall be at least the Associate Dean (Education) or appropriate nominee, and one member of each Programme/Discipline Committee.
 - b) Any Programme/Discipline Committee not represented at a meeting **should** make a written report and ensure that a contact point is available.

7.10 College Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee Agenda

- 7.10.1 Meetings of College Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees **should** have the following agenda:
- a) Apologies for absence.
 - b) Terms of Reference.
 - c) Declarations of interest.
 - d) Minutes of the previous meeting.
 - e) Matters arising on the minutes.
 - f) Receive oral reports from Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees, to include:
 - i) Confirmation that all module marks (pass and fail) were approved.
 - ii) Incidences where the condonement rule was applied.
 - iii) Mitigation Committee decisions.
 - iv) Recommendations for awards and classification.
 - v) Major concerns expressed or recommendations made by the External Examiners. It is not expected that oral reports will include every decision but **should** draw the College Committee's attention to irregular occurrences or instances where University regulations were difficult to adhere to.
 - g) Discussion of common themes emerging from Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees and subsequent College actions.
 - h) Decisions on the consequences of failure.
- 7.10.2 The College Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee **must** be provided with all relevant information to enable appropriate decisions to be made. Evidence of mitigation considered by a Mitigation Committee or equivalent **should** only be presented to the Committee with the explicit permission of the relevant student.
- 7.10.3 This default agenda is not exclusive and further items **may** be added for a particular meeting as Committee business requires.
- 7.10.4 All College Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees **must** keep formal minutes of their proceedings, recording outcomes (as an attachment if more appropriate) and the reasons for recommendations relating to cases requiring

discussion, including reference to any documentary or other evidence as appropriate. The Chair of the College Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee **must** sign the minutes.

7.11 Examination Committee for Flexible Combined Honours (FCH)

- 7.11.1 The FCH Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee is nominated by the FCH Board of Studies and appointed by the Board of the Faculty of Taught Programmes on behalf of Senate.
- 7.11.2 The FCH Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee **must** be chaired by the FCH Director.
- 7.11.3 The FCH Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee consists of academic staff representatives from each subject area teaching FCH students. Other members of staff who are members of the Board of Studies **may** attend as observers without voting rights. The Chair of the FCH Board of Studies is an ex officio member.
- 7.11.4 FCH will have an External Examiner appointed by the Board of the Faculty of Taught Programmes on behalf of the Senate who will have experience of the operation of Modular/Flexible Combined Honours systems. The function of the External Examiner will be:
- a) To be a member of the FCH Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee;
 - b) To advise on the conduct of the FCH Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee and on the operation of the conventions;
 - c) To advise on the regulations and processes of the degree.
- 7.11.5 The FCH Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee processes confirmed final marks for modules. Hence Colleges **must** ensure that the marks recorded in SITS when the FCH Board meets is final and agreed by the relevant Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee. The mark will not be subject to revision at the FCH Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee. All such cases **should** be fully documented and minuted.

Chapter 8 Progression

8.1 Pre-undergraduate Programmes – Progression Principles

- 8.1.1 In order for a student to progress to the next stage or to classification of the award, the Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee **must** confirm that they have passed their current stage. In order to progress, students **must** have satisfied both of the following conditions:
- a) Registered for and participated in modules amounting to at least the normal total credit value as specified in the Tables of Main Higher Education Awards in the Credit and Qualifications Framework.
 - b) Achieved a credit weighted stage mean of 40%.

8.2 Pre-undergraduate Condonement

- 8.2.1 A Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee **may** award credit to an undergraduate student, to permit progression or award, despite failure to achieve a pass mark at a first attempt. Programme specifications **must** make it clear which modules are condonable. To allow condonement the Committee **must** satisfy itself that all of the following conditions apply:
- a) The total credit failed in a stage does not exceed 30 credits.
 - b) The student has achieved a stage mean of 40%.
 - c) None of the condoned credits are stipulated as non-condonable in the Programme Specification.
- 8.2.2 Condoned credit **must** be recorded as a “condoned fail” on the students record.
- 8.2.3 Failure of more than 30 credits implies that the student is failing the programme. If this is the case, or a student with up to 30 failed credits does not meet the above criteria, the Committee **must** refer the decision to the College Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee which will in turn refer to Chapter 11 on Consequences of Failure in Assessments.

8.3 Undergraduate Programmes – Progression Principles

- 8.3.1 In order for a student to progress to the next stage or to classification of the award, the Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee **must** confirm that they have passed their current stage. In order to progress, students **must** have satisfied both of the following conditions:
- a) Registered for and participated in modules amounting to at least the normal credit value per stage as specified in the Tables of Main Higher Education Awards in the Credit and Qualifications Framework.
 - b) Achieved a credit weighted stage mean of 40% (or 50% for stage 4 of an integrated Masters programme*).
- 8.3.2 The credit-weighted stage mean of 50% for stage 4 of an integrated Masters programme is applicable from the 2012/13 entry cohort for MEng programmes, and from the 2013/14 entry cohort for all other integrated Masters programmes. For student cohorts prior to these dates, a credit weighted stage mean of 40% applies.

8.4 Undergraduate Condonement

- 8.4.1 A Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee **may** award credit to an undergraduate student, to permit progression or award, despite failure to achieve a pass mark at a first attempt. Programme specifications **must** make it clear which modules are condonable. To allow condonement the Committee **must** satisfy itself that all of the following conditions apply:
- The total credit failed in a stage does not exceed a quarter of the total credit requirement for the stage as defined in the Credit and Qualifications Framework.
 - The student has achieved a stage mean of 40% (or 50% for integrated Masters stage 4).
 - None of the condoned credits are stipulated as non-condonable in the Programme Specification.
- 8.4.2 Condoned credit **must** be recorded as a “condoned fail” on the student’s record.
- 8.4.3 Failure of more than 30 credits implies that the student is failing the programme. If this is the case, or a student with up to 30 failed credits does not meet the above criteria, the Committee **must** refer the decision to the College Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee which will in turn refer to Chapter 11 on Consequences of Failure in Assessments.

8.5 Taught Postgraduate Programmes – Progression Principles

- 8.5.1 In order for a student to progress to the next stage or to classification of the award, the Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee **must** confirm that they have passed their current stage. In order to progress, students **must** have satisfied both of the following conditions:
- Registered for and participated in modules amounting to at least the normal credit value per stage as specified in the Tables of Main Higher Education Awards in the Credit and Qualifications Framework.
 - Achieved a credit-weighted stage mean of 50%.

8.6 Postgraduate Condonement

- 8.6.1 A Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee **may** award credit to a taught postgraduate student, to permit progression to the award, despite failure to achieve a pass mark at a first attempt.
- 8.6.2 To allow a condonement, the Committee **must** satisfy itself that all of the following conditions apply:
- The total credit failed does not exceed 45 credits per stage or, for the Postgraduate Diploma 30 credits or, for the Postgraduate Certificate 20 credits.
 - The failed modules **must** have a mark of between 40 and 49%.
 - The student has achieved a credit weighted stage mean of 50%.
 - None of the condoned credits are from core/compulsory modules and are stipulated as non-condonable in the Programme Specification.

- 8.6.3 Condoned credit **must** be recorded as a “condoned fail” on the students record.
- 8.6.4 If a student fails more than maximum number of credits required for the award, or does not meet the above criteria, then the Committee **must** refer the decision to the College Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee which will in turn refer to Chapter 11 on Consequences of Failure in Assessments.

Chapter 9 Classification of Awards

9.1 Pre-undergraduate, Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate Programmes Awarding Principles

9.1.1 This section **should** be read in conjunction with the University's Credit and Qualifications Framework. The College Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee will recommend that Senate grant the award and classify that award in accordance with the following principles:

- a) The award of an honours degree of the University is dependent on the successful completion of a programme which complies with the credit requirements detailed in the Credit and Qualifications Framework.
- b) Awards are determined by the College Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee based on the overall level of performance as indicated by the marks submitted to the Committee.
- c) All students **must** be treated equitably in the calculation of marks and classification and awards.
- d) In calculating an overall module mark, a calculation resulting in a decimal of 0.50 or above **must** be rounded up.

9.1.2 As an alternative to referral, or as a consequence of failure in referral, a lesser award can be made. This **must** be in accordance with the level and credit requirements of awards as specified in the Credit and Qualifications Framework and only if the student has completed any compulsory modules for the lesser award.

9.2 Pre-undergraduate and Undergraduate Programme Stage Weighting

9.2.1 The weighting of stages **must** contribute to the final weighted mark as follows:

One year Bachelors programmes, Graduate Diplomas, Graduate Certificates and Foundation Certificates	The credit-weighted mean of the stage
Two year Foundation Degree programmes	The credit-weighted mean of the first and second stages weighted 1:1
Two year Bachelors programmes	The credit-weighted mean of the first and second stages weighted 1:2
Three year Bachelors programmes	The credit-weighted mean of the second and third stages weighted 1:2
Four year undergraduate programmes with year out in stage 2 *	The credit-weighted mean of the second, third and fourth stages weighted 1:4:8
Four year undergraduate programmes with year out in stage 3 *	The credit-weighted mean of the second, third and fourth stages weighted 4:2:8
Four year undergraduate programmes with year out in stage 4 *	The credit-weighted mean of the second, third and fourth stages weighted 4:8:2
Four year programmes (integrated masters)	The credit-weighted mean of the second,

programmes)	third and fourth stages weighted 2:3:4
Five year programmes (integrated masters programmes) with year out in stage 3 *	The credit-weighted mean of the second, third, fourth and fifth stages weighted 2:1:4:6

* The term “year out” here includes a year abroad and other forms of study outside the University, such as industrial placements.

9.3 Rules for Classification of Bachelors and Integrated Masters Degrees

9.3.1 This section presents the conventions used to determine classification of undergraduate Bachelors and Integrated Masters awards. The rules are applied in descending order.

Qualifies for First Class Honours	A final weighted mark greater than or equal to 69.50% or A final weighted mark greater than or equal to 68.00% and modules to the value of at least 50% of stage weighted credits with a module mark greater than or equal to 69.50%
Qualifies for Upper Second Class Honours	A final weighted mark greater than or equal to 59.50% or A final weighted mark greater than or equal to 58.00% and modules to the value of at least 50% of stage weighted credits with a module mark greater than or equal to 59.50%
Qualifies for Lower Second Class Honours	A final weighted mark greater than or equal to 49.50% or A final weighted mark greater than or equal to 48.00% and modules to the value of at least 50% of stage weighted credits with a module mark greater than or equal to 49.50%
Qualifies for Third Class Honours	A final weighted mark greater than or equal to 39.50%
Pass / Fail threshold for the programme	The pass / fail threshold for the programme is a final weighted mark of 39.50%

9.4 Rules for Classification of Foundation Certificates

9.4.1 This section presents the conventions used to determine classification of Foundation Certificates. The rules are applied in descending order.

Qualifies for Distinction	A final credit-weighted mark greater than or equal to 69.50% or
---------------------------	--

	A final credit-weighted mark greater than or equal to 68.00% and modules to the value of at least 50% with a module mark greater than or equal to 69.50%
Qualifies for Merit	A final credit-weighted mark greater than or equal to 59.50% or A final credit-weighted mark greater than or equal to 58.00% and modules to the value of at least 50% with a module mark greater than or equal to 59.50%
Overall pass mark	A final credit-weighted mark greater than or equal to 39.50%
Pass / Fail threshold for the programme	The pass / fail threshold for the programme is an average of 39.50%

9.5 Rules for Classification of Foundation Degrees

9.5.1 This section presents the conventions used to determine classification of Foundation Degrees. The rules are applied in descending order.

Qualifies for Distinction	A final credit-weighted mark greater than or equal to 69.50% or A final credit-weighted mark greater than or equal to 68.00% and modules to the value of at least 50% with a module mark greater than or equal to 69.50%
Qualifies for Merit	A final credit-weighted mark greater than or equal to 59.50% or A final credit-weighted mark greater than or equal to 58.00% and modules to the value of at least 50% with a module mark greater than or equal to 59.50%
Overall pass mark	A final credit-weighted mark greater than or equal to 39.50%
Pass / Fail threshold for the programme	The pass / fail threshold for the programme is an average of 39.50%

9.6 Rules for Classification of Graduate Awards

9.6.1 This section presents the conventions used to determine classification of the award of graduate taught degrees of Graduate Diploma, Graduate Certificate and Ordinary Degrees for direct entry. The rules are applied in descending order.

Qualifies for Distinction	A final credit-weighted mark greater than or equal to
---------------------------	---

award	69.50% or A final credit-weighted mark greater than or equal to 68.00% and modules to the value of at least 50% with a module mark greater than or equal to 69.50%
Qualifies for Merit award	A final credit-weighted mark greater than or equal to 59.50% or A final credit-weighted mark greater than or equal to 58.00% and modules to the value of at least 50% with a module mark greater than or equal to 59.50%
Overall pass mark	A final credit-weighted mark greater than or equal to 39.50%
Pass / Fail threshold for the programme	The pass / fail threshold for the programme is an average of 39.50%

9.7 Taught Postgraduate Programme Stage Weighting

9.7.1 The weighting of all stages **must** contribute to the final weighted mark as follows:

One stage taught postgraduate programmes	The credit-weighted mean of the stage
Two stage taught postgraduate programmes (Master of Fine Arts)	The credit-weighted mean of the first and second stages weighted 1:1

9.8 Rules for Classification of Taught Postgraduate Awards

9.8.1 This section presents the conventions used to determine classification of the award of taught postgraduate degrees of Masters, Postgraduate Diploma and Postgraduate Certificate. The rules are applied in descending order.

Qualifies for Distinction award	A final credit-weighted mark greater than or equal to 69.50% or A final credit-weighted mark greater than or equal to 68.00% and modules to the value of at least 50% with a module mark greater than or equal to 69.50%
Qualifies for Merit award	A final credit-weighted mark greater than or equal to 59.50% or A final credit-weighted mark greater than or equal to 58.00% and modules to the value of at least 50% with a module mark greater than or equal to 59.50%

Overall pass mark	A final credit-weighted mark greater than or equal to 49.50%
Pass / Fail threshold for the programme	The pass / fail threshold for the programme is an average of 49.50%

9.9 Unclassified Undergraduate Awards

9.9.1 This section details those undergraduate awards that are unclassified (i.e. those awards that operate on a simple pass/fail basis). The pass / fail threshold for the programme is an average of 39.50%.

- a) CertHE (Certificate of Higher Education) (NQF4, 120 credits)
- b) DipHE (Diploma of Higher Education) (NQF5, 240 credits)
- c) Ordinary Degrees (NQF6, 300 (3 year) or 420 (4 year) credits)

9.10 Unclassified Taught Postgraduate Awards

9.10.1 This section details those taught postgraduate awards that are unclassified (i.e. those awards that operate on a simple pass/fail basis). The pass / fail threshold for the programme is an average of 49.50%.

- a) CAS (Certificate in Advanced Study) (NQF 7, 30 credits)
- b) PGCE (Professional Graduate Certificate of Education) (NQF6, 60 credits)
- c) PGCE (Postgraduate Graduate Certificate of Education) (NQF7, 60 credits)
- d) PCAP (Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice) (NQF7, 60 credits)
- e) MCLinRes (Master of Clinical Research) (NQF7, 180 credits)

9.11 Aegrotat Pass and Aegrotat Awards for Taught Programmes of Study

9.11.1 Where a student is prevented by illness or exceptional personal circumstances from taking a deferred assessment at any stage they **may** request that an Aegrotat pass or, at the final stage, the award of an unclassified Aegrotat degree **may** be considered under the terms of Ordinance 16.

Chapter 10 Mitigation

10.1 Principles

- 10.1.1 It is recognised that students can suffer illness or other adverse personal circumstances which affect their ability to complete an assessment. It is also recognised that the University measures students' actual achievement rather than potential achievement.
- 10.1.2 Students **must** attend or submit assessments unless an application to the Mitigation Committee has been approved. If, on the day of an assessment, a student is ill or affected by personal circumstances that have not been already been considered by the Mitigation Committee they **should** submit a mitigation application within one working day. In these circumstances the student **must** make a decision on whether to undertake the assessment or not with the knowledge that the Mitigation application **may** or **may not** be successful.
- 10.1.3 Students **should** be advised to take action during their studies if they are adversely affected by circumstances. If a student is ill at the point of an assessment, they **should** still attempt the assessment where possible, and submit an application for mitigation.
- 10.1.4 Interruption **should** be considered where mitigating circumstances become apparent during the course of the year. Students **should** be given clear guidance on how to seek advice from their personal tutors, the Student Finance Office, study skills advisers, AccessAbility or Penryn Accessibility Centre, or the Students' Guild (FXU in Penryn). Information **must** be made available to students on the University's Health, Wellbeing and Fitness to Study procedures.

10.2 Information for Students

- 10.2.1 Colleges **must** ensure that students are provided with information on the University's mitigation procedures and also the implications and likely outcomes of any mitigation application. Handbooks **should** stress that applications for mitigation are for extraordinary circumstances only and will be rejected if they are not accompanied by appropriate evidence. Emphasis **should** be placed on the most likely outcome of a mitigation application being deferral.
- 10.2.2 Colleges **must** publish procedures and clear guidance on how students can apply for mitigation and how these applications will be considered. This guidance **should** include examples of what circumstances will be considered acceptable, and what evidence the College will require. Examples are attached at [Annex E](#).

10.3 Application for Mitigation

- 10.3.1 Applications for mitigation **should** be made at or before the point of assessment. Applications **should** therefore be made on submission of the assessment or examination or within 1 working day.
- 10.3.2 Retrospective or late applications for mitigation **should** only be considered in exceptional circumstances, where there are compelling reasons why the application was not made at the time. Examples **may** include an emerging condition, the effect of which was not clear at the time of the assessment, or a condition such as severe clinical depression which affects a student's ability to understand or engage with the procedures.
- 10.3.3 Students are responsible for making applications for mitigation to the College responsible for the affected module. Where performance is believed to have been

affected in modules from more than one College the student **must** apply separately to each College.

10.3.4 Applications for mitigation **must** include all assessments in the period affected.

10.3.5 Students **may** apply for mitigation for more than one module where the same circumstances have affected more than one assessment. However, students **must** use the application form and be explicit in detailing:

- a) The circumstances which have affected them.
- b) Which assessments or modules have been affected.
- c) How these circumstances have affected their performance.
- d) Evidence to support their application.
- e) Reasons why they consider deferral or a coursework deadline extension in appropriate if the application is for consideration of circumstances impacting on performance. Appropriateness in this case will, however, be decided by the Mitigation Committee.

10.3.6 Students applying for mitigation **should** submit verifiable and/or independent evidence of the circumstances which have affected their performance. Where ill health has been sufficiently serious to have affected performance, the student **must** have consulted a medical practitioner.

10.4 The Mitigation Committee

10.4.1 Colleges **must** establish Mitigation Committees to oversee the process by which applications for mitigation are considered. These can be established for discipline areas or for the entire College. The membership of Mitigation Committees **should** be appropriately representative, qualified and experienced, and gender balanced as far as possible.

10.4.2 The procedure and/or scheduling of Mitigation Committees **should** also allow for the consideration of applications for the extension of submission deadlines in advance of submission deadlines, either through scheduling ad-hoc meetings or through the delegation of such decisions.

10.4.3 In the interests of confidentiality the number of members of Mitigation Committees **should** be kept to a minimum.

10.4.4 Where Mitigation Committees are established at College level it is appropriate to include a representative with experience of the teaching and assessment from each discipline.

10.4.5 Deans of Colleges **should not** sit on Mitigation Committees in order that they can consider any appeals arising.

10.4.6 External Examiners and the relevant Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee **should** have access to the recommendations of the Mitigation Committee

10.5 Consideration of Applications

10.5.1 The Mitigation Committee will consider the medical or other personal circumstances that may have impacted upon the students' performance. The consequences for classification of any adjustments will not be a factor in Mitigation Committees' consideration.

- 10.5.2 Where an application for mitigation is made on the basis of especially sensitive information this **should** be treated confidentially and the reasons for the application **may** be considered by the Chair of the Mitigation Committee only and not shared with the rest of the Committee. Examples of this type of sensitive information include being the victim of a serious personal assault or termination of pregnancy.
- 10.5.3 The Mitigation Committee **may** decide that there are no grounds for action either because one of the following conditions applies:
- a) The evidence presented does not support the claim that the student's performance may have been affected and no further action is required.
 - b) The application was made too late without compelling reasons for why the application was not made at the time of the effect on performance.
- 10.5.4 Where the Committee decides that action is required the following options **should** be considered the most commonly applicable outcomes:
- a) Deferral of the assessment. This can be recommended even where the assessment has been attempted if the Mitigation Committee decides that the student may have been effectively incapable of sitting the assessment.
 - b) Permitting an extension to the submission deadline.
- 10.5.5 In exceptional circumstances where deferral or an extension to the submission deadline are not appropriate the following **may** also be considered:
- a) Setting aside the assessment mark or module mark when considering progression, classification or condonement.
 - b) Substitution of a proxy mark for any affected assessment. This is appropriate where there is sufficient evidence of a student's performance in other assessments so that the Committee can have reasonable confidence in the validity of the proxy mark – e.g. by ranked performance in similar assessments in a similar subject. Where a proxy mark was derived largely from the student's performance in all the other modules in the same year (as opposed to information specific to that or similar modules) it **should not** exceed the student's stage average for that year.
- 10.5.6 The Mitigation Committee **must** clearly record every decision and the reasons for it. This includes decisions on extensions of time that have been delegated. All students **should** be informed of these decisions as soon as possible.
- 10.5.7 Decisions of Mitigation Committees **must** be reported to the Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee. These decisions are not then subject to change except where the Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee considers that a decision to defer an assessment is unnecessary for the purpose of classification, i.e., where the likely outcome of such a deferral will not affect the overall classification.

10.6 Appeals

- 10.6.1 Students have the right to appeal against the decision by a Mitigation Committee. Such appeals **must** be submitted within 10 working days of the outcome of the mitigation being communicated to the student and **may** be made only on the following grounds:
- a) Procedural error or evidence of bias or prejudice.

- b) Evidence of material circumstances which was not available at the time of the original consideration, but **ONLY** where it was not possible for the student to submit this evidence at the time of the original consideration.
- c) The decision reached is one which no reasonable body, properly directing itself, could have arrived at.

10.6.2 Appeals **should not** be considered on the following grounds:

- a) Dissatisfaction with the reasonable judgment of the Mitigation Committee.
- b) Late submission of an application for mitigation or late submission of evidence to support an application where there are no compelling grounds for the lateness.

10.6.3 Appeals will be considered through the University's [Student Academic Appeals](#) procedure.

Chapter 11 Consequences of Failure in Assessment

11.1 Introduction

11.1.1 Students failing more than the maximum credits that **may** be condoned are deemed to be failing the programme. The responsibility for making decisions about the consequences of failure for individual students who have failed more than the maximum credit that **may** be condoned for the programme (i.e., referral, deferral, repeat study or recommendation to withdraw) lies with the College Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee. This formulation reflects a legal judgment which requires that processes of academic assessment **should** be clearly separated from those concerning the consequences of failure.

11.1.2 Decisions on the consequence of failure **must** support the following principles:

- a) Equity and fairness of treatment for all students
- b) The maintenance of academic standards

11.2 Referral

11.2.1 Referral is a further attempt at a module assessment without the requirement to repeat any attendance.

11.2.2 Where a student fails a module for the first time, and the failure cannot be condoned the College Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee will automatically approve referral.

11.2.3 Where a student fails part of the assessment on a module, but passes the module as a whole, the module will be deemed to have been passed and referral will not be applicable (unless all elements of a module have to be passed for professional accreditation purposes).

11.2.4 Principles in the application of referral are as follows:

- a) Where assessments for part or all of a module are referred the whole module **must** be capped at 40% for undergraduate modules (except as defined in section 5.5.1a and 5.5.1b) and 50% for postgraduate modules.
- b) Referrals **should** be taken at the next scheduled assessment point for the module.
- c) Where there are practical reasons where parts of the assessment of a module cannot be replicated for referral purposes alternative forms of assessment **may** be employed but these **must** have already been communicated to students. Further guidance can be found in Chapter 2.
- d) Students **must** be referred in sufficient modules to obtain an overall credit-weighted average of the pass mark for the stage.
- e) Students have the right of referral on only one occasion per module.

11.2.5 Students who have failed to achieve the module pass mark after a referred assessment **should** have the higher of the two fail marks recorded on their transcript and for progression and classification purposes.

11.2.6 In cases where a referral is inappropriate, the College Committee **may** consider recommending a lesser award.

- 11.2.7 Students **must** be provided with information about the costs associated with sitting referred examinations. Details are available from the Examinations Office.

11.3 Repeat Study

- 11.3.1 The College Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee **may** recommend repeat study following failure of a module or stage in instances where mitigation has been approved or where there are external requirements by a Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body. In all cases:
- Students required to repeat a module or stage **should** do so with attendance.
 - The opportunity to repeat a stage or module **should** only be available once throughout a student's programme of study.
 - Modules that have been passed **must** only be repeated in cases of exceptional mitigating circumstances and with the approval of the Dean of the Faculty of Taught Programmes.
 - Partial and/or part-time repeat study **must** only be permitted where there are exceptional mitigating circumstances and with the approval of the Dean of the Faculty of Taught Programmes.
 - Where the requirements for an award have been met (despite the inclusion of failed modules in the final calculation) the award **must** be made. There will be no further opportunity for a student to resit failed elements in order to improve the final outcome.
- 11.3.2 Students repeating a stage **should** start at the beginning of the next academic year. Students repeating individual modules **should** start at the beginning of the next available delivery of the module(s). Students **must** make applications to the Dean of the Faculty of Taught Programmes through their College if they wish to delay their repeat study.

11.4 Consequences of Failure in Referred Assessments

- 11.4.1 Absence from referred assessment(s) will be treated as described in Chapter 3 on Examinations (3.1). Success or failure in a deferred referral will be treated as it would be for a referral.
- 11.4.2 Referred coursework which is submitted late, without any mitigating circumstances, will be given a mark of zero.
- 11.4.3 Where, after referral, a student still has failed to achieve a credit-weighted mean which permits progression to the next stage or to classification of the award, the College Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee can:
- Recommend an award commensurate with the results achieved, as defined in the Credit and Qualifications Framework;
 - Allow the student to proceed to an alternative award commensurate with results which can still be achieved, as defined in the Credit and Qualifications Framework;
 - In circumstances where mitigation has been approved or where there are external requirements by a Professional Statutory Regulatory Body repeat study **may** be permitted with the approval of the Dean of the Faculty of Taught Programmes (see 11.3).

- d) Recommend to the Dean of the Faculty of Taught Programmes withdrawal from the programme.

11.5 Consequences of Failure in Deferred Assessments

- 11.5.1 Absence from deferred assessments will be treated as described in Chapter 3 except that an Aegrotat pass or award **may** also be considered in relation to missed deferral as described in Chapter 9. Where, after deferral, an undergraduate student has failed to achieve a credit weighted mean, or sufficient credit, which permits progression to the next stage or to classification of the award the College Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee **may** recommend:
- a) Carrying a trailed module with referral at the next assessment point: This **may** be recommended where a student fails deferred assessment in August subject to a maximum of 30 credits.
 - b) In recommending a candidate to proceed to the next stage under these circumstances, College Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees **must** take into account the academic requirements of the programme at future stages. College Committees **must** be carefully advised over any implications for module choice, prerequisites at the next stage, assessment requirements, financial support and the wellbeing of the student. In addition College Committees **must** be satisfied that the candidate is able to pass the trailing modules while also studying (if full-time) for the 120 credits of the next stage.
 - c) Non-progression and referral at the next assessment period. This **may** be recommended where the failure exceeds 30 credits, or where the failure totals 30 credits or below but the College Assessment, Progression, and Awarding Committee is not satisfied that the student can progress to the next stage carrying a referral in the failed assessment(s). Such students **must** pass the referred assessment(s), at the next available assessment period, prior to progression.

Chapter 12 Managing Academic Conduct and Practice

12.1 Introduction

- 12.1.1 This Code is applicable for alleged academic misconduct by students only. It does not cover alleged academic misconduct by academic staff or students registered on research programmes who are covered by separate procedures, see Research Misconduct 2014/15. For guidance or advice on the procedure please contact the Student Cases Office on 01392 723112 or studentcases@exeter.ac.uk.
- 12.1.2 Students needing help with their own case **should** contact the Students' Guild Advice Unit on advice@exeterguild.com. Students based at the Penryn campus **should** contact the FXU advice unit on advice@fxu.org.uk.

12.2 General Principles

- 12.2.1 The University takes poor academic practice and academic misconduct very seriously and expects all students to behave in a manner which upholds the principles of academic honesty. Academic honesty is fundamental to the values promoted by the University and no student **should** be allowed to obtain for themselves, or for another candidate, an unfair advantage. Academic honesty means never falsifying the results of any work and always giving full credit for any other people's contributions to our own achievements.
- 12.2.2 The Student Cases Office, within Academic Policy and Standards, **must** have oversight of all cases of academic misconduct in order that they can carry out the University's reporting requirements. This will include responding to requests for information under the Freedom of Information and Data Protection Acts.
- 12.2.3 All decisions taken under this chapter shall take full account of natural justice, fairness and equity, and all penalties **should** be applied consistently within, and between, proceedings at College level and proceedings by the Student Cases Office.
- 12.2.4 When considering cases under this chapter the University will adopt the standard of proof 'on the balance of probabilities'.
- 12.2.5 This chapter shall apply to all currently registered students on taught programmes.
- 12.2.6 All students will be given the chance to submit a defence. This **must** be in writing to a Review Panel. This **may** be in writing or in person to a Committee of Academic Enquiry or proceedings for academic misconduct at College Level. Students cannot prevent any hearing from taking place through non-submission of a defence or non-attendance at a meeting, providing reasonable steps have been taken to give the student chance to attend or to submit a statement.
- 12.2.7 Students **should** be kept informed of the progress of any case they are involved in.
- 12.2.8 When considering an allegation of academic misconduct staff **should not** differentiate between formative and summative assessments.
- 12.2.9 Students found guilty of academic misconduct or severe academic misconduct **should** be penalised more severely than those who do not submit an assessment by the original deadline.
- 12.2.10 If, after investigation, no case of academic misconduct is found against a student, no record will be kept on the student's record held by the University's Student Records team. Where a student is found guilty, this will be placed on their record.

- 12.2.11 Information on proven cases of academic misconduct will be available to staff who are asked to provide references for students.
- 12.2.12 All cases of academic misconduct shall, in the outcome sent to the student, be termed as either 'poor academic conduct', 'academic misconduct' or 'severe academic misconduct'. In the case of Examination Offences the outcome shall be termed as 'examination misconduct' or 'severe examination misconduct'.
- 12.2.13 The University provides guidance on the appropriate penalties. Each body which imposes a penalty has the discretion to vary the penalty it can impose within its set limitations, but **must** provide clear reasons as to why they have varied the penalty.
- 12.2.14 In all cases of academic misconduct the penalty **may not** be just limited to the module, piece of coursework or examination in which the offence took place.
- 12.2.15 Second offences of academic misconduct which occur in different assessment periods, will normally be treated more harshly than a first offence. Where it appears there is a case of suspected academic misconduct, Colleges should where possible check all available assessed work.
- 12.2.16 In general, the University will not consider mitigation in cases of academic misconduct. Students who are unable to complete an assessment, through illness or other personal circumstances, **should** apply for mitigation through the appropriate channels at the time that the circumstances and/or illness occurs, and such circumstances cannot be considered as an excuse for academic misconduct.
- 12.2.17 Students who commit academic misconduct in module components are subject to the normal programme rules for progression, i.e. these modules maybe condoned.

12.3 Definitions and Offences

- 12.3.1 Academic misconduct is defined as an act or failure to act that gives, or aims to give, an advantage if undetected or any behaviour which may deceive those setting, administering and marking a piece of work. Academic misconduct can take a number of forms including but not limited to:
- a) The use or possession of unauthorised books, notes, software, electronic devices or other materials in an examination (unless specifically permitted).
 - b) Obtaining an examination paper ahead of its authorised release.
 - c) Attempting to impersonate or impersonation of another individual, due to be sitting a specific assessment.
 - d) Collusion, i.e. the unauthorised working with another person on a piece of work, and producing a single piece of work, in whole or in part, which is then submitted as part of a piece of coursework, without acknowledgement of the others contribution. This differs from plagiarism where the owner of the work does not knowingly allow the use of their work.
 - e) Fabrication, i.e. the creation of false data or other aspects of research or assessed work, including but not limited to documentation and participant consent with the intention of deceiving the marker to the benefit of the student.
 - f) Falsification, i.e. the inappropriate manipulations and/or selection of data imagery and/or consents with the intention of deceiving the marker to the benefit of the student.

- g) Plagiarism, i.e. the act of representing work or ideas as one's own without appropriate acknowledgement or referencing. There are four main types of plagiarism, which could occur:
- i) Direct copying of text, or illustrations, from a book, article, fellow student's essay, handout, thesis, web page or other source without proper acknowledgement.
 - ii) Claiming individual ideas derived from a book, article etc. as one's own, and incorporating them into one's work without acknowledging the source of those ideas. This includes paraphrasing a source, or altering the material taken from the source so it appears to be one's own work.
 - iii) Overly depending on the work of one or more others without proper acknowledgement of the source, by constructing an essay, project etc. by extracting large sections of text from another source, and merely linking these together with a few of one's own sentences.
 - iv) The re-submission or re-use of the student's own work in another assignment whether this was submitted at the University of Exeter or any other academic institution worldwide. (This is not intended to prevent a student from developing an academic idea over the period of a course, for example stating an argument in an essay for a particular module and then developing this argument in a dissertation, but to prevent the counting of credit twice for the same piece of work, however this operates at the discretion of the Panel considering the offence).
- h) Misrepresentation including, but not limited to, misrepresenting data, or misrepresenting the work of someone else as your own, in whole or in part.
- i) Coercion, this is where a student puts pressure on another student or member of staff to act in a particular way, or attempts to do so, with the intention of gaining an academic advantage.

12.3.2 Colleges **may** extend these definitions for specific subject areas and provide students with examples as appropriate. The correct referencing system for making quotations used within assessed work explicit **should** be made available in the College/Discipline handbook, and clarification **should** be available from Personal Tutors, as well as through induction sessions within the College/Discipline.

12.3.3 Throughout this chapter, an examination is defined as an assessment within a formal examination room, subject to invigilation and a fixed time period for the candidate to complete the required work.

12.3.4 Throughout this chapter, a piece of coursework is defined as any assessed work which is not an examination. The term coursework applies equally to formative and summative work.

12.4 Categories of Academic Misconduct

12.4.1 The University has developed three levels of severity for such offences, determining what category an offence falls into is an exercise of academic judgement. Where an offence is identified, then the College or the Student Cases Office **must** ensure that it is correctly categorised. There are three categories:

- a) Poor academic practice.
- b) Academic misconduct.

- c) Severe academic misconduct.

12.5 Poor Academic Practice

- 12.5.1 Poor academic practice may arise from lack of understanding of academic protocols or a misunderstanding of expected academic conventions of the discipline.
- 12.5.2 It would not be acceptable to consider a case as “poor academic practice” where either of the following conditions applies:
 - a) There is any indication that the student intended to gain an unfair advantage or had the intention to deceive the marker.
 - b) The student had already been found guilty of an offence, a similar offence of poor academic practice, in a similar assessment, and could therefore be reasonably expected to have familiarised themselves with the academic practice of the discipline.
- 12.5.3 Poor academic practice cases are handled at College level.

12.6 Academic Misconduct

- 12.6.1 Academic misconduct involves behaviour which, if not detected, would have deceived those setting, administering and marking the coursework and/or could have obtained advantage on the part of the student. Examples include:
 - a) An assignment including text which is either inadequately paraphrased or directly quoted without speech marks and not referenced.
 - b) An assignment which fails to provide a reference in the text for ideas that are not the student's own.
 - c) An assignment which contains text, tables etc. which are identical, or almost identical, to that of another student or source.
 - d) An assignment which is identical or closely related to one submitted by the student at an earlier point and for which a mark has been received.
 - e) Where the student uses data which they have not collected or produced themselves and this is not referenced.
- 12.6.2 Academic misconduct cases are normally handled at College level.

12.7 Severe Academic Misconduct

- 12.7.1 Severe academic misconduct may be a second offence, or involve evidence of extensive plagiarism or cheating, or clear evidence of behaviour which is designed to deceive those setting, administering and marking the assessment and/or behaviour designed to obtain advantage on the part of the student. Examples include:
 - a) Taking notes into or using any unauthorised device in an examination.
 - b) Impersonating another person during an examination or arranging for another person to impersonate any individual during an examination.
 - c) An assignment that includes extensive, or otherwise significant quantity, of un-attributed or incorrectly attributed copying.
 - d) Any case where a student has previously been penalised for Academic Misconduct.

- e) The use by a student of essay sites that may involve a commercial transaction, with or without the authors consent.
- f) Misconduct within a dissertation or thesis of a taught postgraduate programme. Owing to the level of study, this would be automatically placed within this category, unless the amount was very minimal and considered to be poor academic practice.
- g) Where the College suspects that any of the underlying data used by the student has been either falsified or fabricated.

12.7.2 Suspected severe academic misconduct cases **should** be initially investigated by the College, and referred to the Student Cases Office.

12.8 Responsibilities for Partner Institutions

12.8.1 All partner institutions delivering programmes validated by the University of Exeter are required to follow the procedures below, except that Associate Dean (Education) shall be taken to mean the head of the academic unit concerned, who shall keep the Principal of the partner institution and the Academic Partnership Team at the University of Exeter (partnerships@exeter.ac.uk) informed.

12.9 Responsibilities of the University

12.9.1 The University will ensure that all procedures and policies relating to academic misconduct are fit for purpose and widely available to both staff and students.

12.9.2 The University will ensure that all staff involved in handling academic misconduct cases have access to suitable training and development opportunities on academic misconduct, which they should have attended.

12.9.3 The University will support Colleges in developing methods to reduce the incidences of academic misconduct (particularly in the design of assessment and administering of examinations) and will provide staff with the appropriate tools to detect cases of plagiarism in a timely manner.

12.9.4 The University will ensure that students have access to appropriate levels of information, advice and guidance to help avoid academic misconduct, and to support students if academic misconduct is proven against them.

12.9.5 The University will provide appropriate online training for students in how to avoid academic misconduct.

12.9.6 The University will keep records of all cases of academic misconduct, providing annual reports to Faculty Boards and Senate.

12.10 Responsibilities of Colleges

12.10.1 All Colleges will ensure that they have appropriate arrangements in place in order to comply with the requirements set out in this Chapter. All Colleges will follow the procedures as laid out in this Chapter, when handling cases of suspected academic misconduct, including making sure that staff handling academic misconduct cases have had appropriate training

12.10.2 All Colleges will ensure that they have an appropriate named contact that an academic can contact if they suspect academic misconduct when marking.

- 12.10.3 Each College will appoint as many Academic Misconduct Officers as required to ensure that each of its Disciplines or Programmes have a named member of staff who is the point of contact for any initial queries concerning Academic Misconduct. Academic Misconduct Officers should be members of the academic staff of the College. Academic Misconduct Officers will:
- a) Provide information and guidance within their College on dealing with cases of suspected academic misconduct as well as being the primary College-based source of advice on preventative measures.
 - b) Conduct Poor Academic Practice meetings.
 - c) Attend College-level plagiarism hearings and act as an expert and source of advice in these matters.
 - d) Attend Committees of Academic Enquiry as committee members.
 - e) Academic Misconduct Officers should not also be the Senior Tutor or a member of staff responsible for pastoral support for the Discipline so as to prevent any conflict of interests or confusion on part of students.
 - f) From amongst the nominated Academic Misconduct Officers the College will appoint a Senior Academic Misconduct Officer, and may appoint up to two Senior Academic Misconduct Officers. Senior Academic Misconduct Officers should have an overview of all academic misconduct cases within the College.
- 12.10.4 All Colleges will provide students with training and guidance on what constitutes academic misconduct, alongside subject-specific information on appropriate referencing, during the induction process (for all stages of entry, i.e. including those who enter mid-year or directly into the second year). This information **should** be reinforced as appropriate throughout a student's studies.
- 12.10.5 All Colleges will inform students at the start of their programme that they are required to complete the ELE (Exeter Learning Environment) module 'Academic Honesty and Plagiarism'. All students **should** have completed this prior to the Submitting of their first piece of work.
- 12.10.6 All Colleges will provide students with assessment cover sheets for written work, or the opportunity to agree to a declaration for electronic submission, which certifies that their submitted work is entirely their own and appropriately referenced.
- 12.10.7 All Colleges will ensure that College/Discipline handbooks provide guidance on academic misconduct, and links to relevant University regulations on academic misconduct.
- 12.10.8 All Colleges will have appropriate mechanisms to detect academic misconduct and will provide College-specific guidance for all staff on what to do if they suspect academic misconduct when marking a student's assignment.
- 12.10.9 All Colleges will consider the issue of academic misconduct when designing assessments in order to minimise opportunities for academic misconduct.

12.11 Responsibilities of Students

- 12.11.1 Students will adopt the University's culture of academic honesty and encourage academic honesty in others.

- 12.11.2 Students will familiarise themselves with the University procedures relating to academic misconduct and their College/Discipline specific guidance on referencing and how to avoid academic misconduct. Ignorance of these procedures and guidance will not be considered to be an excuse for academic misconduct.
- 12.11.3 When submitting work for assessment, each student will certify the extent to which the work is their own.
- 12.11.4 Each student will complete the ELE (Exeter Learning Environment) module 'Academic Honesty and Plagiarism' this should be completed prior to submitting their first piece of work, and will seek guidance from their Personal Tutor if further advice is required.
- 12.11.5 Students **should** regularly re-evaluate their own understanding of the principle of academic honesty, seeking additional support if required from their Personal Tutor or other relevant staff as indicated by the College in their College/Discipline Handbooks.
- 12.11.6 Each student will participate in any additional training recommended by their College, such as the academic writing course or tutorial support offered through INTO.

12.12 Delegation of Responsibility

- 12.12.1 Where the procedures refer to University officers and members of staff, it is standard practice that such procedures **may**, where appropriate, be handled through an appropriate person nominated by the stated officer/staff member to act on their behalf.
- 12.12.2 In the cases below where the Student Cases Office is referenced, they are acting on the delegated authority of the Director of Academic Services.
- 12.12.3 Where reference is made to the Student's Guild Vice President Education, this can mean any elected sabbatical officer of the Guild, acting as the nominee of the Vice President Education.
- 12.12.4 Where reference is made to a Dean of the Faculty, this **should** be taken to mean the Dean of the Faculty of Taught Programmes, or the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate Research, acting on behalf of the Dean of the Faculty of Taught Programmes. Where neither Dean is appropriate, as both Deans have had contact with the Student, then the Dean **must** delegate their role to an Associate Dean (Education), who is not connected to the student or the student's College.
- 12.12.5 Where reference is made to the Assistant College Manager for Education, this **may** mean either the Assistant College Manager for Education, or a dedicated nominee who is responsible for academic misconduct and maintains a strategic overview of academic misconduct cases within the College.
- 12.12.6 Formal responsibility for academic misconduct, within Colleges, lies with the Associate Dean (Education) and the Assistant College Manager for Education.

12.13 Managing Academic Misconduct – Procedures for Examination Offences

- 12.13.1 This procedure applies to both formal examination organised by the central exams teams, and any in class tests which are run by Colleges under examination conditions.
- 12.13.2 In cases of suspected examination misconduct discovered during formal examination conditions, the Invigilator **should** complete a report to be countersigned by all other invigilators who were witness to the suspected examination misconduct.

- 12.13.3 This report, together with any accompanying evidence, **should** be sent without delay to the Student Cases Office who will inform the student in writing that they have been reported for suspected examination misconduct. The Student Cases Office shall copy the Invigilator's report to the College responsible for the module under examination.
- 12.13.4 In cases where unauthorised materials were found on the student or connected with the student, then the Student Cases Office will ask the College to complete a report to state whether the material was relevant to the examination in question. Once the Student Cases Office receives the report they will ensure it is provided to the student.
- 12.13.5 If it becomes apparent after an examination has finished (for instance when the work is being marked) that a student may have cheated during that examination, then the same procedures are to be followed. In such cases the report shall be submitted by the College responsible for the module under examination to the Student Cases Office.
- 12.13.6 In any case where a meeting of a Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee is imminent, the College shall ensure that the Chair of the Committee receives a copy of the report which was sent to the Student Cases Office. The Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee shall consider the examinee's programme assessment profile purely on the marks available to it. Once the Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee has reached its decision the Chair shall then inform the Committee of the receipt of a report regarding suspected examination misconduct for that candidate. The Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee shall not include the name of any candidate in respect of whom it has received such a report, on any class or pass list until the Chair of the Committee is notified of the outcome of the case.
- 12.13.7 Upon receipt of a report of a case of alleged examination misconduct the Student Cases Office shall appoint an Investigating Officer. If the Investigating Officer determines that the offence constitutes examination misconduct, then the Student Cases Office will send a warning letter to the student, copied to the College. The letter will be copied to Registry where a note will be made in the student's electronic record. Any such warning letter will count as an examination misconduct offence and as such a first offence.
- 12.13.8 If the Investigating Officer determines that there is a case of suspected severe examination misconduct, the Student Cases Office will complete the first half of the Student Allegation Form setting out the nature of the alleged offence.
- 12.13.9 The Student Allegation Form will be sent to the student for the remainder of the form to be completed. They will also be sent a link to the Assessment Handbook, a copy of the Invigilator's report, and a copy of any supporting evidence. The student will complete the form providing a statement of their version of the events plus details of any circumstances relevant to consideration of the alleged offence. The form **should** be returned to the Student Cases Office within seven days from the date on the accompanying letter.
- 12.13.10 A Review Panel will then be established. If the student fails to return the form within the seven day period the Review Panel will proceed to consider the case and make a decision without representations from the student.

12.14 Establishment of a Review Panel

- 12.14.1 A Review Panel **should** comprise the Investigating Officer (as nominee for the Director of Academic Services), the Student's Guild Vice President for Academic Affairs and the

Dean of the Faculty. They will consider the evidence and agree on an appropriate outcome according to the tariff in Section 12.16.

- 12.14.2 The Review Panel will only consider written evidence. There will be no right of attendance in person for either the student or staff concerned. The Review Panel therefore **may** agree to meet virtually to decide the outcome.
- 12.14.3 The Review Panel will address the case as a strict liability offence. This means that where a student is found to have taken unauthorised materials or an electronic device to their desk, the student is guilty of an offence, irrespective of that student's intent either to deceive or gain advantage.
- 12.14.4 The tariff sets a default penalty and if, for any reason, the panel wishes to impose a different penalty, clear reasons for this decision **should** be specified in the written decision communicated to the relevant parties. Further penalties **may** be given in addition to the default penalty if it is felt necessary, e.g. undertaking remedial work.
- 12.14.5 The Investigating Officer will ensure that a written record of the deliberations and outcome of the Review Panel is kept.

12.15 Outcomes from a Review Panel for Examination Offences

- 12.15.1 This section **should** be read in conjunction with the tariff set out in Section 12.21 Tariff of Penalties. The Review Panel has the power to impose any of the Tariffs from A to G from the Tariff of Penalties
- 12.15.2 For all penalties a record **must** be kept on the student's file both in Registry and the relevant College.
- 12.15.3 If the allegation is proven, one of the penalties set out in Section 12.16 will be applied. The Review Panel **should** consider the impact of the penalty and ensure that the outcome is not disproportionate to the offence committed.
- 12.15.4 The student shall have the right to Appeal any decision taken by a Review Panel as set out in Section 12.20.

12.16 Procedures at College Level for Dealing with Suspected Poor Academic Practice and Academic Misconduct

- 12.16.1 In cases where evidence of suspected poor academic practice or academic misconduct is found, the Senior Academic Misconduct Officer for the College concerned shall deal with the matter internally in the first instance. Where there is a case of suspected academic misconduct, all previous summatively assessed **should**, where possible, be re-checked for academic misconduct. For final year students this must include all summative work in the previous years.
- 12.16.2 Should the marker of an assessment suspect Academic Misconduct then they **should** report any concerns about a piece of academic work to the named contact within their College responsible for academic misconduct.
- 12.16.3 The named person within the College must determine what steps are required to investigate the suspected offence. In cases of Plagiarism, or Collusion it may just be necessary to convene a meeting with the student. However in cases of suspected Fabrication or Falsification of data it may be necessary to appoint an Investigating Officer, who may possess specialist knowledge of the subject area, required to investigate the suspected offence.

- 12.16.4 After the Investigation is complete, the Senior Academic Misconduct Officer and the named person will consider all of the material gathered by the Investigation. They will then determine whether this is a case which will be heard by the College under 12.17 or 12.18, or whether it should be referred directly to the Student Cases Office under 12.19.
- 12.16.5 The student will be advised by a written letter (normally within ten working days of the case being reported to the named person) of the nature of the suspected offence. In this letter the Senior Academic Misconduct Officer will indicate which of the following procedures will apply:
- a) Poor Academic Practice: in cases of poor academic practice, the normal procedure is for the Senior Academic Misconduct Officer to consider. This should be in accordance with the procedure outlined in 12.17.4 below.
 - b) Poor Academic Practice and Academic Misconduct: in these cases, the procedure is for the College to convene a formal meeting with the student to discuss the case, which should be chaired by the Senior Academic Misconduct Officer. This should be in accordance with the procedure outlined in 12.18. below;
 - c) Severe Academic Misconduct: in cases of severe academic misconduct where the College believes that severe academic misconduct has occurred in the student's piece of work then the college, should refer the case directly to the Student Cases Office, in accordance with the procedure outlined in 12.19 below.

12.17 Procedure for Poor Academic Practice

- 12.17.1 Where the Senior Academic Misconduct Officer refers a case of Poor Academic Practice to an Academic Misconduct Officer then the Academic Misconduct Officer should take the following steps. Staff should be proactive in addressing Poor Academic Practice to ensure that the students have the necessary information to improve their academic practice.
- 12.17.2 The Academic Misconduct Officer should invite the Student to come and meet with them to discuss the alleged Poor Academic Practice, to ensure that the Student is aware of why their academic practice is not meeting the discipline's requirements. This invitation should be sent 5 working days prior to the meeting, and include notice of the allegation and a copy of the assessment concerned.
- 12.17.3 The Academic Misconduct Officer should meet with the Student along with an Administrator, who will take notes of the meeting. The Academic Misconduct Officer will discuss the alleged offence with the student. The student may be accompanied by a person who should normally be a member of the University such as a staff member, a member of the Guild of Students (or FXU), or another student. The purpose of this person is to assist the student during the course of the meeting, and they may take a written record on the student's behalf. The use of electronic audio recording equipment will not normally be allowed.
- 12.17.4 After meeting the student the Academic Misconduct Officer may apply a penalty from the Tariff of Penalties, or may find the student not guilty of the offence. If the Academic Misconduct Officer wishes to apply a penalty, then they may apply up to and including penalty B from the Tariff of Penalties in Section 12.21.
- 12.17.5 The Academic Misconduct Officer should notify the student of the outcome of the meeting within 5 days of the meeting having occurred, and include a copy of the notes of the meeting with this notification.

- 12.17.6 Students are entitled to appeal the decision of the Academic Misconduct Officer per section 12.20.

12.18 Procedure for Poor Academic Practice and Academic Misconduct

- 12.18.1 When a meeting with the student is convened it should be chaired by the Senior Academic Misconduct Officer, the panel of three will include at least one other academic member of staff of the College or another academic misconduct officer and either another Academic Misconduct Officer or the Assistant College Manager for Education or nominee. The Committee must nominate a secretary (who may also be a Panel member) who will be responsible for taking a written record of the meeting, a copy of which must be sent to the student following the meeting.
- 12.18.2 Colleges may replace the 'one other academic member of staff with a student, these students will be termed Student Academic Misconduct Officers. However it is not permitted to have two Student Academic Misconduct Officers on the College Academic Misconduct Panel.
- 12.18.3 The staff on a College Academic Misconduct Panel must not include those who are responsible for setting, marking or supervising the assignment to which the allegation refers.
- 12.18.4 All relevant documentation should be made available to the student five working days prior to the meeting. The student may make a written statement to the Committee and may also call witness of his/her own.
- 12.18.5 This student may be accompanied by a person who should normally be a member of the University such as a staff member, of the Guild of Students (or FXU), or another student. The purpose of this person is to assist the student during the course of the meeting, and they may take a written record on the student's behalf. The use of electronic audio recording equipment will not normally be allowed.
- 12.18.6 The student must provide the College with their written statement at least one whole working day ahead of the meeting along with confirmation of whether or not they will be attending. The student must state if they intend to call any witness and whether they will be bringing someone with them.
- 12.18.7 The student shall be entitled for the duration of the meeting. However, the Panel may ask the student and their representative to withdraw, whilst reaching a decision.
- 12.18.8 The Panel may call the marker of the piece of work or the module convenor, to further explain the offence or report they have made.
- 12.18.9 If the College appointed an Investigative Officer, then their report should be made available to the Student as part of the relevant documentation sent to the student five working days. The College Academic Misconduct Committee may call the Investigative Officer to present their findings.
- 12.18.10 The College Academic Misconduct Panel should then determine whether an offence has taken place. The College Academic Misconduct Panel should determine the exact offence the student has committed and whether this constitutes either poor academic misconduct or academic misconduct.
- 12.18.11 If it is determined that an offence has taken place, the student shall be informed in writing of the decision and the penalty to be imposed within five working days of the meeting, in accordance with 12.18.12 below. The letter should include, as a minimum, the

information laid out in the template letter B in annex 1. The letter must be copied to the Student Cases Office for record keeping.

- 12.18.12 Should the College Academic Misconduct Panel conclude that there has indeed been a case of either poor academic conduct or academic misconduct, then they should impose a penalty from the tariff contained in Section 12.21. Colleges may impose up to and including Tariff D. Colleges cannot impose Tariff E or G.
- 12.18.13 The tariff or penalties for application by Colleges is set out in the table in section 12.21, when determining the sentence below Colleges should give regard to the level of advantage which would have been gained by the student if the act or failure to act had not been detected.
- 12.18.14 If the College considered that none of the penalties available to them in section 12.21 are appropriate then they may also refer the case to the Student Cases Office (see section 12.19). The College shall write to the student to indicate this. The letter should include, as a minimum, the information laid out in the template letter C in annex 1.
- 12.18.15 The student has the right to appeal against any decision taken by the College as set out in Section 12.20. The student cannot appeal the College's decision to refer them to the University stage of this procedure, as they are entitled to appeal the decision of the University Committee of Academic Enquiry.

12.19 Managing Academic Misconduct – Procedures at University Level for Dealing with Suspected Academic Misconduct

- 12.19.1 In cases referred to the Student Cases Office after consideration at College level under Sections 12.17 and 12.18 the College must, submit a report to the Student Cases Office. At the same time the student must be informed of the fact that he/she is being reported to the Student Cases Office if the student is being reported for suspected academic misconduct. If the student is suspected of plagiarism or collusion then the report should clearly indicate (by cross-referencing) what sections of text have been plagiarised and from what source.
- 12.19.2 A Committee of Academic Enquiry will be convened as soon as possible following receipt of the College report. The Committee shall comprise a Dean of the Faculty as Chair and two members drawn from nominated Academic Misconduct Officers. The Committee of Academic Enquiry will not include any members from the College of the student in question.
- 12.19.3 Exceptionally (in cases where the scale of offence does not warrant a Committee hearing), on receiving a report from a College, the Director of Academic Services may, in consultation with the Dean of the Faculty, direct the College to deal with the suspected case as set out in section 12.18 of these procedures.
- 12.19.4 The Student Cases Office shall inform the student in writing of the Committee's meeting which he/she is invited to attend. Not less than five working days ahead of that meeting, the Student Cases Office shall provide the student with a copy of the report from the College, along with any other supporting evidence and a copy of these procedures. The student may make a written statement to the Committee and may also call witnesses of his/her own, the details of which must be provided to the Student Cases Office not later than one whole working day ahead of the Committee's meeting.
- 12.19.5 The student shall be entitled to attend the Committee meeting for the duration of the hearing (except as detailed in 12.19.8 below). The student may be accompanied by a person who should normally be a member of the University (with any variation to this principle at the discretion of the Chair), such as a staff member, a member of the Guild

of Students, FXU, or another student. The purpose of this person is to assist the student during the course of the meeting, and they may take a written record on the student's behalf. However the use of electronic audio recording equipment will not normally be allowed. With the permission of the Chair, s/he may take a role in the cross-examination of any witnesses on behalf of the student and may make summative remarks following the student's concluding statement. The student should indicate at the start of the hearing whether they wish the accompanying person to take an active role in the proceedings. The student may direct questions to the College representative (and any witnesses called) directly in an appropriate manner. Proxies or substitutes for the student will not be permitted.

- 12.19.6 The College will be invited to send a Representative to attend for the duration of the meeting (except as detailed in 12.19.8 below) and present the case to the Committee and shall have the right to call other witnesses to appear before the Committee. The Student Cases Office shall be notified of these witnesses not later than one whole working day ahead of the Committee meeting. The College representative may also call the student as a witness and may then direct questions to the student directly, in an appropriate manner, at the Chair's discretion.
- 12.19.7 Should a student decide not to exercise his or her right of attendance, the hearing will proceed in the student's absence. Should the student subsequently, within five working days, present mitigating circumstances explaining their absence to the Chair's satisfaction, the Committee may be reconvened to reconsider the case with the Student in attendance. The Student will be given 5 working days' notice of the Committee being reconvened. A student should, be given the opportunity to address the panel in the absence of the College representative. The panel may recall the College representative following the student's statement, should the need arise. Following this the Committee shall retire to consider their decision.
- 12.19.8 If the Committee determines that an offence has taken place, it shall inform the student and the College in writing of its decision and the penalty to be imposed, in the first instance this maybe a summary of the Committees deliberations, sent within 5 working days of the meeting, with the full report and formal outcome letter following in due course. A record of the Committee's decision will be kept both on the University's central records and by the relevant College.
- 12.19.9 If the allegation of academic misconduct is proven, one of the penalties from the tariff of penalties contained in section 12.21 shall be applied, the Committee of Academic Enquiry can impose any penalty from A to G. For all penalties, a record must be entered on the student's file by Student Records.

12.20 Appeals

- 12.20.1 A student shall have the right of appeal against any decision taken either at College level, by a Review Panel or at a Committee of Academic Enquiry. The appeal must be received by the Student Cases Office within ten working days of the date on the letter informing the student of the decision. The student should submit the appropriate [appeal form](#), to the Student Cases Office (studentcases@exeter.ac.uk), indicating the grounds of the appeal with reference to any appropriate evidence.
- 12.20.2 Students should note that an appeal against a decision taken at either College level, at a Review Panel or a Committee of Academic Enquiry will only be accepted if:
- a) There is evidence of procedural irregularity.
 - b) There is evidence of bias.

- c) The decision reached is one that no reasonable body (properly directing itself, and taking into account all relevant factors) could have arrived at.
 - d) The student submits further material circumstances which could not reasonably be expected to have been submitted for consideration when the original decision was made.
- 12.20.3 A Student Cases Officer, in consultation with the Dean of the Faculty (who will not have had any previous involvement with the case) will establish whether there is a *prima facie* case for considering the case before a Senate Appeal Committee.
- 12.20.4 If no *prima facie* grounds for appeal are found, the appeal will be dismissed and the student informed, in writing, of the reasons. There is no further right of appeal against such a decision. See section 12.20.12.
- 12.20.5 If it is decided that there is a *prima facie* case for an appeal, a Senate Appeal Committee shall be convened. The Senate Appeal Committee has the power to confirm, to set aside or to vary the penalty imposed by the College-level hearing or the Review Panel or the Committee of Academic Enquiry. There shall be no further internal right of appeal against the decision of the Appeal Committee.
- 12.20.6 A Senate Appeal Committee shall comprise three members (including a student representative) of the Senate. The Student Cases Office will appoint the Chair from that number. No person shall be entitled to be a member of the Appeal Committee who is also associated with the appellant's Discipline(s) or who has previously been involved in the appeal.
- 12.20.7 The appellant shall be informed of the date of the meeting of the Senate Appeal Committee not less than ten working days in advance. He/she may choose to appear before the Appeal Committee but the Committee may also hear a case in the absence of the appellant. The appellant shall be entitled to attend the Committee meeting for the duration of the hearing, but will be required to withdraw whilst the Committee reaches its decision. Proxies for appellants shall not be allowed. The student may be accompanied by a person who should normally be a member of the University (with any variation to this principle at the discretion of the Chair), such as a staff member, a member of the Guild of Students, or another student. The purpose of this person is to assist the student during the course of the meeting, and they may take a written record on the student's behalf. However the use of electronic audio recording equipment will not normally be allowed. With the permission of the Chair, s/he may take a role in the cross-examination of any witnesses on behalf of the student and may make summative remarks following the student's concluding statement. The student should indicate at the start of the hearing whether the accompanying person was expected to take an active role in the proceedings. The student may direct questions to the College representative (and any witnesses called) in an appropriate manner.
- 12.20.8 The Appeal Committee shall call either a College representative or the Investigative Officer and shall be empowered to call other members of the University or partner institution.
- 12.20.9 The Appeal Committee, having considered the evidence, may uphold or reject the appeal, such a decision being final.
- 12.20.10 The Appeal Committee shall minute its deliberations and decisions and submit a report to Senate. If the Committee's report includes a recommendation requiring action before the next meeting of the Senate, it shall be for the Vice-Chancellor to authorise action and then report to the Senate retrospectively.

12.20.11 The Secretary of the Committee shall notify the appellant in writing of the Appeal Committee's decision, giving the reasons for it.

12.20.12 There are no other University appeal procedures beyond those stages detailed above. If, in the opinion of a student, an appeal remains unresolved after the exhaustion of the appropriate processes, application may be made to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) for Higher Education. For further details see <http://www.oiahe.org.uk>.

12.21 Tariff of Penalties

Guidance notes

The description of offences is not intended to be an exhaustive list of each specific offence to which that tariff can be applied, but is considered to be an illustrative summary of particular offences for which the University considered the tariff to be appropriate. Academic Misconduct Officers, College Academic Misconduct Panels, Examination Review Panels, and Committees of Academic Enquiry are encouraged to consider the case before them, and how characteristics within their case match up to the description of the offence column, to reach the appropriate penalty. Where two penalty options are given the Panel or Committee has the discretion to select the most appropriate penalty. Academic Misconduct Officer may impose up to and including penalty B (shown in blue) College Panels may impose up to and including penalties from Tariff D (shown in Green), Review Panels and Committees of Academic Enquiry may impose any tariff.

Tariff	Description of Offence	Penalty to be imposed
A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Misunderstanding of the academic conventions of the discipline. Minor Exam Misconduct. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Student will be issued a warning letter. This warning letter will remain on file. May also recommend action such as taking the ELE Module, on Academic Honesty.
B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minor amount of poor academic practice within the piece of work such as incorrectly referencing or not following the referencing conventions of the discipline concerned. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The student will be formally reprimanded and asked to resubmit the piece of work with the poor academic practice removed. The mark for this resubmission will not be capped.
C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant amount of poor academic practice within the piece of work. For example, this could be large amounts of unattributed material which has been incorrectly referenced, or not reference Minor amount of academic misconduct within the piece of work. Minor inappropriate manipulation of data or source material to support the piece or work. Exam Misconduct, where the student has breached the guidance for candidates, but it is deemed they have not gained an advantage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The student will be formally reprimanded and asked to resubmit the piece of work with the poor academic practice or academic misconduct removed. The mark will be capped at the pass mark. Failure to remove the poor academic practice or academic misconduct to the satisfaction of the marker will result in a mark of zero being applied. In the case of Exam Misconduct this cap will be imposed either at the pass mark or the actual mark achieved for the exam during the first attempt, whichever is the lower. This is to prevent a student from gaining an advantage from committing misconduct.
D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant amount of Academic Misconduct detected within the piece. For example, whole sentences are plagiarised. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The student will be formally reprimanded. The student will be given a mark of Zero for the piece of work concerned. There will be no right

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data has been used by the student to support critical parts of their piece of work and this has not referenced Inappropriate manipulation of data or source material to support the piece of work. Severe Exam Misconduct, where the student has breached the guidance for candidates, and it is deemed they have gained an advantage. 	<p>of referral for this piece of work. (This will not affect the Student's right to reassessment of the module where the module is reassessed by way of one 100% examination; however the student will only be able to be awarded the marks equal to the component where no misconduct was detected. i.e. the student has received a mark of zero in 1 essay worth 40% of the module, therefore would be entitled to 60% of the marks from any reassessment of the entire module)</p> <p>Or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The module concerned will be given a mark of zero, and the student has a right of referral for the pass mark.
E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Severe Academic Misconduct detected within one piece of work, or across several pieces of work. The underlying data supporting the piece of work has been fabricated, or the results of experimentation have been falsified. Severe Exam Misconduct, where the student has breached the guidance for candidates, and it is deemed they have gained a clear advantage. 	<p>Or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The module concerned will be given a mark of zero with no right of referral. Mark of zero for the year concerned with a right of referral, the referral will be capped at the pass mark.
F	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Severe Academic Misconduct, detected within either one piece of work or within several pieces of work occurring within significant areas of the piece(s), or throughout a dissertation or large scale research project. The underlying data supporting the piece of work has been fabricated, or the results of experimentation have been falsified. Severe Exam Misconduct, where the student has breached the guidance for candidates, and it is deemed they have gained a significant advantage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mark of zero for the year in question with no right of referral. Credits gained from previous years are unaffected, and may be counted towards an award from the University.
G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Severe Academic Misconduct, across several assessments, occurring in critical parts of the pieces of work. Widespread amounts of plagiarism or fabrication within a dissertation or large scale research project. Evidence that the entire essay has been purchased and submitted by the student. Severe Exam Misconduct such as impersonation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expulsion from the University with no credit received.

Examination Papers and Rubrics

Standardisation of the format and basic layout of examination papers/rubric throughout the University aids both Invigilators and Examinations Office staff in their preparations prior to and during examination sessions. The required format is also clear for students sitting examinations. The font for use in cover and body text of examination papers is Arial 12 point, where appropriate.

For camera-ready copy, please note the following.

1. The front page (rubric) should only contain information about the examination for students, invigilators and Examinations Office staff. Any requests for additional materials, e.g. photographs, graph paper or textbooks (specifying tabs if permitted), answer sheets/MCQ's, multiple answer books **must be noted** on the bottom under the heading 'Materials to be supplied'. Details of permitted calculators must also be noted, i.e. 'Approved calculators permitted'. Please also give details of the module convenor. Please see example rubric. It is vital that this information is provided on the rubric to ensure that all requirements are met. Any requests **not** contained on the rubric **may not be actioned**.
2. The front page should state whether the paper is open, closed or restricted note*.
3. All examination papers must be submitted electronically as password protected .pdf files. Passwords are changed yearly and can be obtained from the Examinations Office. All pdf files are to be sent to i.j.morgan@exeter.ac.uk only.
4. All individual pages must be numbered and include the module code in the footer. The **final** page should carry the identifier 'End of Paper'. To cut down on paper wastage all papers are printed doubled-sided, however, if you require a specific page to be single sided please insert a blank page.

Please note that only essential information should be noted on the rubric. If other instruction is required please keep it as brief as possible.

Please look at any additional information you have traditionally put on the front cover and re-assess whether this is really necessary/helpful.

Late re-submission of examination papers for minor amendments may result in your College having to incur the costs of reproduction. Please ensure that **all** papers have been checked thoroughly before submission to the Examinations Office**, paying particular attention to formulae, which do not always convert successfully when pdfing documents; once submitted, papers will be treated as camera-ready copy and **will not be proof read by the Examinations Office**. Please ensure that once the examination paper has been pdf'd that it is printed and proof read, paying particular attention to formulae, which have in the past not converted correctly. If changes need to be made to a paper once the Examinations Office has had it reproduced then these should, wherever possible, be made through the use of an erratum slip, only major changes will be considered for paper reprinting at College's expense.

* **Open note**: students are allowed the use of hand written/typed notes, course hand-outs or reference books. **Closed note**: no materials are permitted. **Restricted note**: only specified materials permitted, which must be clearly identified on the rubric of the examination paper. Please note electronic devices such as iPads/tablets/laptops are never allowed to be used in examination halls even for open note examinations.

** This proof reading by the Academics setting the papers is **vital** as errors found during examinations are not only detrimental to the performance of the students sitting the relevant paper but also to other students in the hall especially should the error require the use of an announcement.

Please make sure that papers print out correctly after they have been converted to PDF files, as errors sometimes occur in the process specifically relational to formulae. If you are concerned that errors might occur then you are welcome to submit paper copies directly to the Examinations Office but these must be in addition to the pdf version.

Examination major incident procedures

This procedure relates to examinations managed by the central Examinations Office at the Streatham and Penryn Campuses. If a major incident is experienced by a College hosting their own examination, the College will take steps to contact the Examinations Office as a matter of urgency and the following procedure can be followed if deemed appropriate.

A major examination incident is classified as: *an event which requires the abandonment of an examination due to environment disruption (such as a fire alarm or other total evacuation of the venue), an issue with the examination paper which (with College advice) has rendered the entire examination void or other exceptional disruption which has affected the entire cohort sitting the examination (see Step 1 below).*

Note: Arrangements agreed for students affected by a major incident resulting from environmental causes (i.e. disruption within a specific venue) will not be applied to students taking the same examination in an alternative venue.

Step 1

Major Incident takes place affecting the entire cohort/substantial number of students of a summative examination (over 10% towards the final mark).

Step 2

Students are advised verbally in/outside the examination hall/venue of the termination of an examination (if students have to leave the hall) or if they are all affected by an incident in the hall they will be told that this will be considered by their College and they will be advised of next steps.

Step 3

The Examinations Office immediately following the examination send a holding email (or texts as appropriate) to the affected students (pulling data on those attending in the affected venue) advising them that an incident has happened in the venue for examination ** which will be reported to the College and this will be taken into account when assessing work completed during the examination.¹

Students should be advised that a decision relating to the incident will be communicated to students within 3 working days. Email copied to Guild, VP Academic Affairs (or equivalent in Penryn), ACM for Education and ADE in affected College(s), Dean of the Faculty of Taught Programmes, Director of Academic Services, the Director of Operations for Campus Services, Head of Student Services (or the Registry Officer in Penryn).

Step 4

A copy of the incident report is scanned and emailed immediately to the Faculty Dean's office, the VP Academic Affairs, ACME and ADE for affected College(s), the Director of Operations for Campus Services, Head of Student Services (or the Registry Officer in Penryn).

Step 5

The Faculty Dean's Office arranges a case conference to take place within 24 hours and no more than 2 working days following the examination. Attendees to include, Guild, VP Academic Affairs², the module convenor, ACME, Dean or Faculty rep. Video-link to Penryn if required. Minutes taken by the Faculty/Deans Office and the outcome is communicated to attendees.

Step 6

Colleges advise the affected student cohort of the decision of the case conference within 3 working days of the examination taking place.

¹See Below for template

²The VP Academic Affairs has responsibility for representing the affected students at this meeting and liaising on this basis in advance of the date.

Template email:

Dear Student,

We apologise that there was disruption to your examination CODE** TITLE***** which took place today at TIME**** in VENUE****.

The disruption to your examination: (BRIEF DESCRIPTION) has been classified as a major incident which has seriously affected your ability to satisfactorily sit your examination and as such resolution on this matter will be determined by your College in consultation with the Dean and Students' Guild (or FXU). You will be notified of the outcome of this decision within 3 working days (at the latest) of your examination having taken place. Your College Office will notify you of the decision as soon as it has been confirmed. The decision made will ensure that you are able to meet the academic requirements of your degree to the best of your ability.

Annex C – Programme/Discipline Committee

1. Name of College

Name of Committee

A meeting of the **Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee** for (*discipline/programme*) was held on (*date*), in (*room*)

Present: Chair:

Names and positions/titles (should be consistent with the details already provided to the Faculty Office and ensure quoracy)

Apologies:

Other staff present: minute taker, observer etc.

1. Terms of Reference

2. Declarations of Interest

3. Minutes of the previous meetings:

The minutes of the meeting(s) held on were received and noted as correct.

4. Matters arising from the previous minutes

5. Report on Chair's Action

6. External examiners' reports and associated correspondence / action from previous year.

The reports and associated correspondence were received. Note any action taken as a consequence.

7. Receipt of a report from the Mitigation committee

8. Receipt of the condonement rules for all programmes under consideration

9. Final year students: to recommend awards and classification to the College APAC

The Committee considered the schedule of results, noted decisions of the Mitigation Committee and agreed the marks, condonement (up to agreed limit) and classifications, subject to the following comments in individual cases (by student *number* only):-

E.g. **Classics:**

Student no xxxxxxxx: Programme xx

Student has an Alleged Academic Offence on module XX so mark and classification are on hold.

Student no xxxxxxxx: Programme xx

Due to an error in module selection, the student has taken too many credits at level 1 to be able to graduate. Dean of the Faculty of Taught Programmes approval will be sought by the Chair to recommend the award to the College APAC.

Failures above the condonement limit are referred to the College APAC as follows:

10. Progression lists, referrals/deferrals, stages 1 and 2 (and 3 for 4 year programmes) i.e. non finalists student lists

The Committee considered the schedule of results, noted decisions of the Mitigation Committee and agreed the pass and progression recommendations, subject to the following comments in individual cases:

Failures above the condonement limit are referred to the College APAC as follows:

11. **Consideration of Assessment procedures**
12. **Oral report by the External Examiner**
The following oral comments were made by External Examiners:-
13. **Post- examination disclosure of marks advice can be found at the following website:**
<http://www.admin.ex.ac.uk/academic/tls/tqa/disclos4/htm>
14. **Referred examinations**
Members were reminded of the dates for referred examinations from xx August – xx August 20xx, marking deadlines to be advised.
15. **Any other business**
E.g. Prizes/Deans Commendations

The Chair concluded the meeting with thanks to the Members of the Committee for their support and input.

.....CHAIR

2. Name of College

Name of Committee

A meeting of the **College Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee** for
(*discipline/programme*) was held on (*date*), in (*room*)

Present: Chair:

Names and positions/titles (should be consistent with the details already provided to the
Faculty Office and ensure quoracy)

Apologies:

Other staff present: minute taker, observer etc.

1. Terms of Reference

2. Declarations of Interest

3. Minutes of the previous meetings:

The minutes of the meeting(s) held on were received and noted as correct.

4. Matters arising from the previous minutes

5. Receive oral reports from Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees including:

- i. Confirmation that all module marks (pass and fail) were approved.
- ii. Incidences where the condonement rule was applied.
- iii. Mitigation Committee decisions.
- iv. Recommendations for awards and classification.
- v. Major concerns or recommendations made by the External Examiners.

6. Discussion of common themes emerging from Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee and subsequent College actions.

7. Decisions on the consequences of failure

Individual cases listed by student number only.

E.g. **Classics:**

Student no xxxxxxxx: Programme xx

Student has failed more than 30 credits. Condonement of 30 and trailing 30 credits approved.

Student no xxxxxxxx: Programme xx

Student failed to achieve 360 credits for Honours degree. Awarded Ordinary degree with 300 credits.

8. Any other business

The Chair concluded the meeting with thanks to the Members of the Committee for their support and input.

.....CHAIR

Mitigation - Examples of circumstances which may be considered to have significantly affected a student's performance

These are normally exceptional circumstances, outside your control, that may have prevented you from either demonstrating or acquiring the skills, knowledge, competencies required to meet the learning outcomes associated with an assessment that contributes to the qualification for which you are studying.

A non-exhaustive list of examples of commonly accepted grounds / reasons:

1. Bereavement – death of close relative / significant other.
2. Serious short term illness or accident (of a nature which in an employment context would have led to an absence on sick leave).
3. Evidence of a long term health condition worsening.
4. Significant worsening in any adverse personal / family circumstances.
5. Other exceptional factors for which there is evidence of impact.

Examples of circumstances which may not be considered to have significantly affected a student's performance: a non-exhaustive list of examples of commonly rejected grounds/reasons:

1. Alleged statement of a medical condition without reasonable evidence (medical or otherwise) to support or a condition supported by 'retrospective' medical evidence – that is, evidence that is not (contemporaneous) in existence at the same time as the illness, e.g. a doctor's note which states that the student was seen (after the illness occurred) and declared they had been ill previously.
2. Alleged medical circumstances outside the relevant assessment period or learning period for which extenuating / special circumstances have been applied for.
3. Minor illness or ailment, which in a work situation would be unlikely to lead to absence from work.
4. Long term health condition for which student is already receiving reasonable or appropriate adjustments
5. If there is a reasonable case that circumstances relied on were foreseeable or preventable, i.e. the following will commonly not be accepted:
 - a) Holidays
 - b) Financial issues
 - c) Personal computer problems or poor practice e.g. no back up of electronic documents
 - d) Printer problems
 - e) Lack of awareness of submission dates /times and examination date / times
 - f) Poor time management
6. Late disclosure of circumstances on the basis that students 'felt unable - did not feel comfortable' confiding in a staff member about their extenuating / special circumstances.