

EXAMINING BOARD NOTES OF GUIDANCE – June 2021

Student and Academic Services June 2021

Updated 14 June 2021

Contents

Introduction	page 3
Exam Board responsibilities	page 5
Field Board guidance	page 8
Award Board guidance	page 14
Information for international partner boards	page 15
Award Board – Uncapping	page 16
Award Board – Borderlines	page 17
Award Board – Retakes	page 19
Award Board – Masters differential awards	page 20
Award Board – Personal circumstances	page 21
Award Board – Condoned credit	page 25
Award Board – Aegrotat and posthumous awards	page 29
Award Board – Progression	page 30
Award Board - Reconvened Boards	page 31
Award Board – Accredited prior learning / accredited experiential learning	page 32
Award Board - Withdrawing students who have not engaged	page 33
Award Board - Award Board Reports	page 35
Award Board - Failed awards administrative guidance	page 39
Appendix 1 – Calculating Award Outcomes under force majeure regulations	page 41

INTRODUCTION

This set of guidance is designed to assist examining board personnel with the conduct of, and decision making processes for Field and Award Boards. Any queries regarding the UWE regulations in relation to the conduct of examining boards, or the content of this guidance should contact the Student Voice and Academic Policy Team:

Academic.Regulations@uwe.ac.uk

This document should be used in accordance with the [academic regulations](#) and the [Exam Board Code of Practice](#).

Student and Academic Services, June 2021

Summary of main changes to this version

Safety net approach

The safety net approach for the 2020/21 academic year has been devised in response to student concerns over what impact the Coronavirus pandemic and successive national lockdowns could have on their results. At the beginning of this academic year students asked the University for a safety net which could protect their academic performance before the pandemic. They wanted an approach which would reduce their fear of failure, enabling them to focus on performing to the best of their abilities in a challenging year and something that was simpler than the previous year's 'no detriment' approach.

Working together, the Students' Union, student representatives, Student and Academic Services and Faculty Associate Deans then developed the 'safety net' approach for use in the 2020/21 academic year. This approach has four strands:

- Updates to the academic regulations for example, the implementation of uncapped resits and retakes in 2019/2020.
- Where possible Programme Teams have adapted and reduced assessment.
- Reassuring students that Award Boards do consider each student's full mark profile and any required mitigations through our normal Award Board processes.
- Using an extra level of module mark moderation called 'safety net moderation' which will be ratified by Field Boards.

The aim of the safety net is to address student concerns using a method which is easy to communicate and is transparent. As such the approach must be applied consistently across the University (see page 10). The information which has been published to students is also available on the [alternative academic regulations web page](#).

Other updates

- Addition of an extra attempt for students who have failed a module – part of the 'safety net' approach (page 21)
- Revised excused credit limits (page 22)

EXAM BOARD RESPONSIBILITIES

The [Exam Board Code of Practice](#) sets out the full details of the operation and membership of examining boards. Examining board members should pay particular attention to the following:

Accountability

A6 The examining board is the sole body which may act on behalf of Academic Board in awarding credit, granting an award or amending a properly executed decision.

Membership

All members of the examining board should attend meetings of the board, remotely if attendance in person is not possible. In exceptional circumstances and by prior agreement from the Chair a nominee may act as a representative. Members may nominate a colleague to attend in their place provided that person is able to fully participate in the business of the board with regard to the module/s, award/s they are representing.

Quoracy

An examining board meeting is quorate if at least two-thirds of the members eligible to attend have engaged in person or virtually.

An examining board being conducted virtually must normally include an external examiner, in order to have the authority to grant credit or an award to students.

When a Field Board is considering results for a module, if the Module Leader has already confirmed the marks in writing and there are no other issues for discussion then at the discretion of the Chair, they are not required to attend the board. The Module Leader should then give their apologies to the relevant team in advance of the meeting and they will be excluded from the quoracy.

For example:

- A Field Board has 20 members overall (including the Chair, the Field Leader, UG/PG Director, External Examiners, Module Leaders etc).
- 5 Module Leaders have confirmed their marks in writing and there are no other issues for discussion. It is agreed they do not need to attend.
- The quoracy for this meeting goes down to 15.

- To maintain the two-thirds threshold, this means at least 10 members must attend in order that the Board is viable.

If a programme leader has already confirmed the student profiles in writing and there are no other issues for discussion **then at the discretion of the Chair**, they are not required to attend the Award Board and will be excluded from the quoracy.

In regard to all Boards, in order that an accurate list of attendees is prepared and quoracy is maintained it is important that members confirm their attendance/engagement virtually (or that of their nominee) to the relevant Student Administration Team in advance of the meeting/s. If a Chair has been approached directly by a Module Leader they should ensure that the relevant Student Administration Team are notified.

Avoiding potential conflicts of interest

No student shall be a member of an examining board or attend an examiner's meeting other than as a candidate for assessment. No member of staff who is enrolled on a module or registered for an award under consideration by the board shall be a member of the board whilst the module or award is under discussion.

Maximum amount of credit

Students on undergraduate programmes on a full time mode of delivery may normally enrol for a maximum of 150 credits in one academic year (as per **C3**). It is the responsibility of the Award Board to determine whether a student may be permitted to enrol on more than 150 credits at their next enrolment.

Review of assessment decisions

The quorum for a sub-committee of an examining board is five, and normally at least 3 members must have been present at the original meeting, one of whom should be the Chair or their nominee. The sub-committee will be convened virtually. Where possible an external examiner will be a member of the sub group, but if this is not possible an external examiner should be consulted. If the decision relates to an award, the chief external examiner should either be a member of the sub group or be consulted. The consent of an external examiner is required for any changes to the original decision of an examining board and written consent from the chief external examiner is required for any changes to the original award granted.

Examining Board minutes

Examining Board Chairs and Clerks are asked to ensure that a clear minute is recorded when decisions are made on individual students, including the rationale. Errors, procedural irregularities, or invigilator comments should also be recorded. Exam Board minutes will be referred to in the case of a student appeal/complaint.

The contribution of the external examiner for all boards of which they are a member of must be reflected in the minutes.

FIELD BOARD GUIDANCE

Information available to the Field Board

Type of report	Format	Use of report/s
Agenda, Membership, Terms of Reference and minutes	Uploaded to Sharepoint (link sent to staff) or circulated via Outlook	To provide clarity on the remit and authority of the Board.
Module Legend	Electronic for all members	Produced by the Student Administration Team, one for each field. Will include the running order and the modules which have been flagged for discussion.
Field Board report and statistics for individual modules	Electronic for all members	To be used when exploring / discussing module results in detail.
Field Board summary statistics There may be slight variances in the summary statistics in comparison to the record system data. This is because the summary statistics do not go down to element level. Therefore, these statistics should be viewed as indicators of performance. For example, to assist in the identification of outlying modules. The detailed results can then be referred to on the Field Board reports.	Electronic for all members	Provides oversight of module performance in order to stimulate quality related discussions regarding topics such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution of marks • Pass rates • Distinctive / interesting information about the results • Performance of different programme cohorts on the module • Good practice and success • Actions or developments for the future

Field Board actions

The confirmation of the accuracy of marks is carried out prior to the meeting using SharePoint. Where there are reasons why this prior confirmation cannot happen, for example, if there are adverse group circumstances, this will take place in the meeting.

All Module Leaders will have the opportunity to flag up items to note for their module. For example, highlighting areas of good practice, suggestions for actions and developments in the future or discussing the statistics for the individual module.

The meeting should consider the performance of modules, with particular attention being drawn to those in the following categories:

- Statistical outliers.
- Where there are comments from the Module Leader.
- On request from the Field Leader / Head of Department.
- Where there are adverse group circumstances affecting a cohort or sub-cohort of students. For example, any errors or disruptions causing problems with the assessment process.
- Where there are comments from the External Examiner.

Important note: Students who have personal circumstances accepted on the grounds of affected decision making or illness during an exam will have had their mark/s removed for the individual elements affected by the personal circumstances. The mark/s will have been replaced by a non-submission 'NS'.

Adverse Group Circumstances – moderation of module marks (standard process)

For the Summer 2021 Field Boards the normal adverse group circumstances process remains in place. Module Leaders may propose that the marks for a cohort may be adjusted by a percentage, or by a consistently applied addition or reduction in marks.

The Module Leader should consider how the group of students affected have performed on the module comparatively to previous cohorts using the time period statistics report. This will enable the Module Leader and the Field Board, to make meaningful comparisons as to how students have fared on the module over a period of time. They then consider what, if any, action they wish to suggest the Field Board takes with a clear rationale for the proposal. This may be done in consultation with the external examiner.

As per the terms of reference of the Board, it may take action based on evidence presented by the Module Leader.

Where one or more instances of adverse group circumstances have been recorded for a module run, a list will be generated automatically at the end of the Active Field Board Report showing details of each circumstance for each of the affected students.

Update Adverse Group Circumstances – moderation of module marks ('safety net' approach)

Due to the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on the 2020/21 academic year a benchmark will be determined for **all** modules which commenced on or after 01 September 2020.

The benchmark will be determined for each module based upon the average marks for the past four years.

- Where modules have run for four years, the benchmark will be calculated from the overall average from the 2019/20, 2018/19, 2017/18 and 2016/17 academic years.
- Where modules have run for less than four years, the benchmark will be calculated from the average mark for fields of study (groups of related modules) at the same level as the module in question from the 2019/20, 2018/19, 2017/18 and 2016/17 academic years.
- This average will be used as the benchmark for first sit and resit marks.
- This average will be used for partner modules and for small intakes and cohorts as this provides a significant comparator.

The benchmark is calculated only from students that have a first attempt, first opportunity mark, so will be unaffected by the marks of students that did not sit until the resit period.

Where the module average for 2020/21 has fallen below its benchmark, student marks will be moderated upwards by the difference between the two averages, up to a maximum of 10 marks provided the student has passed the module.

Fail marks will not be moderated (but see the note re. condoned modules below).

No further adjustments to marks should be applied after safety net moderation if a module mark is found to end with a '9'.

First sit and resit actions

Whatever action is applied at the first sit will be applied at the resit. This is because:

- we cannot say that students who submitted at the first sit or the resit have been affected differently by the pandemic.
- students have had the same teaching.


For example

- The average mark for the first sit of a module is two marks below the four year historical average - raise all pass marks by two.
- The average mark for the resit of the same module is nine marks below the four year historical average - raise all pass marks by two.

Example of a Field Board report showing the safety net moderation approach

In the following example of an M level module, Component A is pass / fail. Component B is percentage marked and so also becomes the module mark. However, **safety net moderation** has been applied to the overall result column and all passes have been uplifted by two marks. For example: a Component B mark of 65% has been uplifted to 67% in the overall result.

Active Field Board Report		Board:	CONTINUING CARE ADULT NURSING										UWE Bristol					
Meeting Date : 23 February 2021		Meeting :		CCAN FIELD BOARD														
Meeting Code : ZT-FEB21-1																		
Module : UZTRTU-40-M		NON-MEDICAL PRESCRIBING (INDEPENDENT AND / OR SUPPLEMENTARY PRESCRIBING)																
Module Run : 20SEP/12		Module Type : PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE																
Stidnt Nbr	Name	Primary Award	Primary Target	Stidnt Sits	Mdr of Att	Act Att	Ct Att	Opp Nbr	CW1 (50)	CW2 (50)	CC1 (FA) (1)	CC2 (1)	CC3 (1)	CC4 (1)	B Result (100)	A Result (0)	Overall Result	Predict Outcome
	Z-CPD-2	B99S42	ON	CA	1	1	1	1	76	54	P	P	P	P	65	P	67	P
	Z-CPD-2	B99S42	ON	CA	1	1	1	1	68	80	P	P	P	P	74	P	76	P
	Z-CPD-2	B99S42	ON	CA	1	1	1	1	62	30	P	P	P	P	46	P	46	TRALL
	B70W42	B70W42	ON	CA	1	1	1	1	58	60	P	P	P	P	59	P	61	P
	Z-CPD-2	B99J12	ON	CA	1	1	1	1	65	69	P	P	P	P	67	P	69	P
	Z-CPD-2	B99S42	ON	CA	1	1	1	1	61	64	P	P	P	P	63	P	65	P
	Z-CPD-2	B99S42	ON	CA	1	1	1	1	60	46	P	P	P	P	53	P	53	TRALL
	Z-CPD-2	B99S42	ON	CA	1	1	1	1	60	70	P	P	P	P	65	P	67	P
	Z-CPD-2	B99S42	ON	CA	1	1	1	1	58	(AO)G	F	P	F	F	29	F	29	ABDEC
	Z-CPD-2	B99S42	ON	CA	1	1	1	1	68	51	P	P	P	P	60	P	62	P
	Z-CPD-2	B99S42	ON	CA	1	1	1	1	54	67	P	P	P	P	61	P	63	P
	Z-CPD-2	B99S42	ON	CA	1	1	1	1	63	83	P	P	P	P	73	P	75	P
	Z-CPD-2	B99S42	ON	CA	1	1	1	1	65	68	P	P	P	P	67	P	69	P
	Z-CPD-2	B99S42	ON	CA	1	1	1	1	62	80	P	P	P	P	71	F	71	ABDEC
	Z-CPD-2	B99S42	ON	CA	1	1	1	1	58	70	P	P	P	P	64	P	66	P
	Z-CPD-2	B99S42	ON	CA	1	1	1	1	62	72	P	P	P	P	67	P	69	P
	Z-CPD-2	B70012	ON	CA	1	1	1	1	73	53	P	P	P	P	63	P	65	P
	Z-CPD-2	B99S42	ON	CA	1	1	1	1	60	59	P	P	P	P	60	P	62	P

Active Field Board Report		Board: CONTINUING CARE ADULT NURSING																	
Meeting Date : 23 February 2021		Meeting : CCAN FIELD BOARD																	
Meeting Code : ZT-FEB21-1																			
Module : UZTRTU-40-M		NON-MEDICAL PRESCRIBING (INDEPENDENT AND / OR SUPPLEMENTARY PRESCRIBING)																	
Module Run : 20SEP/12		Module Type : PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE																	
Stant Nbr	Name	Primary Award	Primary Target	Stant Sits	Mds of Att	Act Att	Cl Att	Opp Nbr	CW1 (50)	CW2 (50)	CC1 (FA) (1)	CC2 (1)	CC3 (1)	CC4 (1)	B Result (100)	A Result (0)	Overall Result	Predict Outcome	
									Attempts:	18	18	18	18	18	18				
									Average Mark:	62.9	59.8								
									Standard Deviation:	5.5	19.9								
									Pass Rate:	100.0	83.3								
Module Statistics		Attempts	Average Marks	Pass Rate															
COMPONENT A		18																	
COMPONENT B		18	61.36	88.89															
MODULE		18	61.36	77.78															
<p>KEY</p> <p>~ Adverse group circumstances</p> <p>(FA) Final Assessment</p> <p>(T) Late work submission</p>																			

Retrospective moderation of modules which are condoned by an Award Board

Where **safety net moderation** has been applied to a module run and an individual student's module mark is subsequently condoned by an Award Board, their mark will then be uplifted and confirmed at a reconvened Field Board.

Condoned modules which are subject to safety net moderation will remain as condoned, irrespective of the new mark.

For example (Levels 0-3)

Module mark	Condoned	Uplift	New mark	Outcome
37%	Y	4%	41%	Remain as condoned
38%	Y	1%	39%	Remain as condoned

To note

- Students who are condoned are determined to have met the learning outcomes of the module and so become eligible for safety net moderation.

Field Boards and Assessment Offences

It is not within the remit of the Field Board to consider an alleged assessment offence, to determine whether an offence has occurred or to make a decision on an appropriate penalty. Please note: capping of a resit or retake is not a stated outcome of the Assessment Offences policy and so should not be applied if a student is uncapped.

Prior to the Field Board the [Assessment and Feedback Policy and Operational Guide](#) should have been used to inform the processes of internal marking, element and component moderation and agreeing the module aggregate mark.

Safety net moderation and assessment offences

Where students on a module have committed an assessment offence and are subject to a mark reduction to zero, these marks should remain as zeroes and not be changed to a 'non-submission' despite a possible impact on the module average.

Rationale

- A Zero and 'non-submission' do signify very different things and recording something as a zero when work has been submitted would impact on the integrity of the data in terms of correctly recording whether a student has engaged.
- Having an Assessment Offence flagged on an assessment which is also showing as a non-submission will be anomalous within the record and might call that record into question in the future.

AWARD BOARD GUIDANCE

Information available to the Award Board

Type of report	Format	Use of report/s
Agenda, Membership, Terms of Reference and minutes	Uploaded to SharePoint (link sent to staff) or circulated via Outlook	To provide clarity on the remit and authority of the Board.
Running order (where used)	Electronic for all members	Produced by the Student Administration Team to guide the order of the meeting.
Award Board reports and statistics	Available electronically prior to the meeting on SharePoint	To be used when discussing student results in detail. Annotated reports where specific decisions need to be made are presented to the board for discussion.

Award Boards and Assessment Offences

Where an assessment offence is found to have occurred in relation to two or more modules the Award Board may decide to:

- take no further action;
- vary the class of award recommended.

INFORMATION FOR INTERNATIONAL PARTNER BOARDS

Operation of the Boards

International partner boards are not managed by exception. All modules will be presented to the Field Board and all student profiles will be presented to the Award Board.

Quoracy

Page 4 of this guidance sets out the requirements for quoracy for UWE, Bristol Boards.

The membership of an international partner board is:

- Chair
- Partner module leaders (or nominee/s)
- Link tutor/s
- External Examiner/s

The [Assessment and Feedback Policy and the Operational Guide](#) provides further information regarding the additional processes in place for the setting and moderation of assessments at International Partners.

AWARD BOARDS – UNCAPPING

Capping no longer applies to any marks achieved at resit or retake if a student's first sit of the module enrolment took place on or after 01 August 2019 and they had not been previously capped (as per academic regulation **G3**).

- If a student's first sit took place on or after the 1st August 2019, their resit and any subsequent retakes will be automatically uncapped. This includes the first sit of any retake where the student is not already capped.
- Modules which were capped prior to the 2019/2020 academic year should remain capped.
- This does not apply to Taylor's University students or City School of Architecture students who are on variant regulations.

AWARD BOARD - BORDERLINES

Criteria for raising the classification / differential level of an award (academic regulation N4)

Any **overall** mark that is less than or equal to **0.5%** below a classification will automatically be uplifted to the next class or differential.

Any **overall** mark that is greater than **0.5% and less than or equal to 1%** below a classification or differential will automatically be uplifted to the next class or differential if **50%¹ or more of the credits at the highest level required by the programme² have marks in the higher banding³.**

If there is AL credit or modules with a pass / fail outcome in the student profile, they are not included in the 50%

It is important to note that it is possible to pass some modules without submitting all of the required assessments. For example, where a module component has more than one element. Therefore, if a student has any accepted personal circumstances **for modules they had passed**, the Board should review the student's profile to consider whether an uplift would be appropriate.

Notes on raising the classification / differential level of award

- The criteria above can be used for all award types (e.g. Foundation / interims / Postgraduate).
- The application of the criteria will be subject to the requirements of any professional and statutory regulatory body accrediting a programme.
- Whilst an automatic uplift must be formally confirmed by the Board in its meeting, it is expected that all students who meet the criteria will have their classification / differential raised up without question.

¹ If there is AL credit or module/s with a pass / fail outcome present they are not included in the 50%. for example: 60 credit AL, 60 credit marks, so you only look at 50% of the modules which have marks.

² For example, for a foundation degree this would be level 2, for an honours degree this would be level 3, for a masters degree this would be level M.

³ This refers to 50% of the highest level credits contributing to the credit requirements of the individual award and NOT 50% of the marks counting towards the award calculation. E.g 50% of an honours degree would normally be 60 credits at level 3, 50% of a masters would normally be 90 credits at level M. However, this may vary depending on the structure of the award.

Please note: Should a student be eligible for an honours degree, but has passed level M modules, these may be included in the honours degree calculation. However, for the purposes of the calculation they will be weighted as level 3 modules.

As per regulation N4 an Award Board may award one classification (or other differential level of award) higher than that determined by the standard calculation methods by using the University's borderline criteria. However, if a student's pre-pandemic average is disproportionately higher than their mark profile suggests and for example, could move them up by two classifications or differentials, then the board may determine that such an uplift is not appropriate.

AWARD BOARD - RETAKES

- Students who are registered on standard, project and masters dissertation modules are permitted two automatic attempts (**academic regulation D1 – Module Types**).
- If the professional practice component of a Professional practice module has not been passed it may be re-assessed only if approved by the Award Board. Eligibility for a resit or retake remains an Award Board decision (**D1**).
- Students failing a module which is compulsory for a named award will have their registration for that award terminated by the University and may not register for another award for which that module is compulsory (as per **G2**). Furthermore, a student in this position cannot return to re-enrol in order to attempt to gain an interim award, even if they still have attempts remaining on other modules.

AWARD BOARD - MASTERS DIFFERENTIAL AWARDS

In order to be awarded a Masters Degree with merit a student must have achieved a weighted average mark at level M of not less than 60% across 120 credits.

In order to be awarded a Masters Degree with distinction a student must have achieved a weighted average mark at level M of not less than 70% across 120 credits.

The mark for the best 120 credits is weighted according to the size of the module.

For example. A student passes 180 credits on a Masters programme.

The Dissertation (or equivalent) module mark is indicated by an asterix.

Mark	Credit size	Mark x Credit Size
72*	60	4320
70	30	2100
70	30	2100
TOTAL	120	8520
65	30	Not included in the best 120 credits
61	30	Not included in the best 120 credits

Divide 8520 (weighted mark) by 120 (credit total) = 71

The student will receive a Distinction

Please note: If the best credit combination exceeds 120 credits (for instance if the best combination makes 135 credits) then credit will be calculated on a pro rata basis.

Please note that this method of calculation does not preclude consideration for an uplift. The Award Board is able to consider an uplift provided the student meets the required criteria.

AWARD BOARD - PERSONAL CIRCUMSTANCES

Please note the University has moved away from using 'personal circumstances' in relation to a student application process. However, it still has usage in relation to mitigating actions that an Award Board can take and so remains a term used in this guidance.

Consideration of excused credit and extra attempts for all eligible students.

After the 18th March 2020 students were advised they did not need to apply for personal circumstances for missed assessments*. This advice remained in place until the publication of the 2020/21 academic regulations on the 20th September 2020.

Update In addition England entered a national lockdown on the 4th January 2021.

As such, even where the students did not complete an individual personal circumstances application and a module **has not been passed** the board may:

- consider applying excused credit for students exiting with an award;
- grant any student a further attempt if their module outcome is 'FAIL';

In the majority of cases the notation 'ECA' will be added to the student's record during the pre-Award Board checking in order to enable the decision to be implemented. However, unless advised otherwise, a Board **can** still discuss the options above even where the notation 'ECA' is not showing on a student's Award Board report.

Where the notation is present this is enough to confer eligibility for consideration for a retake, the circumstances do not need to have solely impacted on a component which has not been passed.

***Update** The missed assessments process has been removed from the 2020/21 academic regulations because of the removal of module mark capping.

Exceptional Removal of a mark

Students may still submit their own request to remove a mark where:

- they fell ill during an exam / controlled conditions assessment;
- they did the assessment but their circumstances affected their judgement.

Students no longer need to provide evidence with their application, so where an application has been accepted on the basis of their explanation, the mark for the affected assessment will have been removed.

It is possible that some student profiles will show a mark at component or module level **and** have personal circumstances accepted. One reason may be where a component has more than one element. One of the elements may have been submitted and was unaffected by personal circumstances but another was not submitted and the student applied under the old missed assessments process or the exceptional removal of a mark process.

Please note: Whilst the Board will **not** be informed of the details of the student's circumstances the Chair may be advised of these confidentially if this is relevant to the decision making process. Board Chairs should ensure that the discussion which leads to the final decision is recorded in the minutes.

Use of excused credit by Award Boards

It is the Award Board's responsibility to consider and agree the best course of action for the student i.e. in this case whether excused credit can be offered to a student. This responsibility should not be delegated elsewhere.

Excused credit should only be applied by an Award Board at the point of granting the final award. It should not be applied at a progression point at the end of a level or an academic year. However, it may be used to grant an intermediate award where a student has stated in writing that they wish to withdraw and claim the intermediate award, or due to them failing a compulsory module/s they are no longer able to continue on the highest level of award.

When considering cases, boards should look at the whole profile of the student and determine whether they have sufficient evidence of academic achievement in all the key areas of study for the particular award and that there are no significant gaps in the knowledge base. If so, boards may excuse the credit including in cases where the student has a profile containing Prior Certificated Learning (Accredited Learning) and / or Prior Experiential Learning (Accredited Experiential Learning).

- Excused credit cannot be applied retrospectively.
- Students will be written to with an offer and a deadline for reply. If there is no response, the default position is that the student is referred.
- Students have the right to refuse an offer and take up any remaining assessment opportunities for the module(s) in question, or to nominate another module when appropriate.

- Where ECA notation is present this does not have to be against the failed component.
- In advance of the Board if a student is identified as potentially being eligible, the Student Administration Team can produce a 'What If?' scenario from the record system, complete with a classification calculation omitting the excused module.
- If a student latterly returns to register on a higher level award after accepting a lower level award with credit exemption, they will be required to make up the credit which they had not passed at the lower level. For example, where a student is awarded a Foundation degree or a Dip HE with credit exemption but then wishes to return to work towards an honours degree they will also need to pass the exempted credit as it will still be showing as 'not achieved' on their record.

2020/21 excused credit update

Under the 2020/2021 academic regulations the amount of failed credit which Award Boards may accept is now limited to a maximum of 30 credits. However, in recognition that many students progressing to their final award at these boards will have been assessed under the force majeure regulations, where appropriate the previous '80% rule' may still be applied. This states that Award Boards may offer an award despite a credit shortfall, provided that the shortfall does not exceed 20% of the total credit requirements for the award and it is set against personal circumstances.

Award Board members should note that for a small number of programmes where the total credit requirement is between 60-90 credits (Certificate, Foundation Certificate, Graduate Certificate, PGCert and PGCE International and PGCE International Early Years), the 30 credit maximum may represent an acceptance of failure of up to 50% of the required credit for the award. The Board may wish to consider whether it is appropriate to excuse this much credit.

Use of 'ongoing' (student has passed the module)

Students have the notation 'EC' showing on their record.

- A decision of 'ongoing' should be recorded where the student has passed but personal circumstances have been accepted. As a result the notation 'EC' will appear next to the module at each future Award Board allowing it to be referred to at the point of consideration of the student's final award. **N.B. In this context it does not mean that the personal difficulties themselves are ongoing.**

- If the board wishes to adopt a default position of agreeing a decision of 'ongoing' to all students who fulfil this criteria, this should be stated at the beginning of the meeting. An accurate record may then be made in the minutes and the correct information input into the record system.

Exceptional removal of a mark and assessment offences

- If a mark is removed due to the exceptional removal of a mark process for an assessment where an assessment offence has been proven to have taken place, the record of the offence will remain.

AWARD BOARD – CONDONED CREDIT

Condoning failed credit

Award Boards are able to condone failed credit.

It is the Award Board's responsibility to consider and agree the best course of action for the student, i.e. in this case whether a module can be condoned. Condoning failed credit is not an offer to the student.

An Award Board can condone a marginal fail when:

- the overall module mark is 37% or above at levels 0 – 3/FHEQ levels 3-6; or 47% or above at M level/FHEQ level 7.
- the student has passed a minimum of 90 credits at the same level or above;
- the module learning outcomes have been met;
- the professional body allows it.

Additional note for Summer 2021 Boards The standard regulations for condonation are based upon module learning outcomes. However, the force majeure regulations provided more flexibility. As such, if a programme has clearly defined level outcomes and the student has achieved all of them the module can be condoned. This will not necessarily be an option for programmes where the learning outcomes by each level have not been specified. However, if a Board is seeking to condone an optional module and are confident that the student has otherwise met the programme learning outcomes, it may condone it. If variant regulations apply which do not permit condonation, these must still be adhered to.

It is the Award Board's responsibility to consider and agree the best course of action for the student, i.e. in this case whether a module can be condoned. Condoning failed credit is not an offer, and its application should not be negotiated with the student.

Condoned modules may contribute to the credit total for the highest level of interim award for which a student is eligible.

The permitted maximums of credit that may be condoned are;

- a maximum of 30 credits at level 0
- a maximum of 30 credits at level 1
- But overall a maximum of 30 credits can be condoned at levels 0 and 1
- a maximum of 30 credits at level 2

- a maximum of 30 credits at level 3
- But overall a maximum of 45 credits can be condoned at levels 2 and 3
- a maximum of 30 credits at level M

All decisions to condone are final. There can be no retrospective condonation of a failed mark even if the minimum credit requirements are met at a later examination board.

Chairs are asked to consider whether condoning failure is in the student's best interests taking the following into account:

- Whether the student has a resit or retake opportunity that could be taken (which will be uncapped, unless previously capped).
- The member of staff presenting the student's profile must be able to assure the board that the module learning outcomes have been met. If the learning outcomes cannot be met by other modules on the programme then the module should not be condoned.
- The Clerk to the Board should ensure that a full record of the discussion is minuted, including the outcome and whether assurance has been given that the learning outcomes have been met.
- Even if the module does not count towards the award overall it will still use up some of the maximum amount of credit that it is possible to condone.
- Condoning credit at a lower level may mean it is not possible to condone at a higher level if the overall maximum will then be exceeded.
- Whilst credit awarded as accredited learning / accredited experiential learning does count towards the credit total for an award, a Board may wish to consider carefully whether it condones a module for a student who has a profile which includes a significant proportion of this type of credit.
- Condoning module failure should not be considered on the basis of passed outcomes at a lower level than that of the failed outcome. However, performance at a higher level can be used in determining whether condonation can be considered.
- If a failed module is presented as an overall fail without resit or retake opportunity the Award Board is reminded that, providing the failed mark falls within the ranges specified by the regulations, a decision to condone failure will overturn the fail.

Component marks and condoned credit

There is no imperative for Award Boards to refer to individual component marks before making any decision to condone credit. Normally, any failed credit with a mark of 37% or greater (levels 0-3) or 47% or greater (level M) can be considered under the terms of the regulation.

Illustrative examples

In each example the module is level 0-3 and the weighting between component A and Component B is 25:75

Comp A = 75%, Comp B = 15%

Overall Mark = 30%, Decision = 1RB

This failure should not be condoned as the overall mark is less than 37%

Comp A = NS, Comp B = 100%

Overall Mark = 75%. Decision = 1RA

This failure could be condoned as the overall mark is greater than 37%

Comp A = 10%, Comp B = 75%

Overall Mark = 59% (rounded up). Decision = 1RA

This failure could be condoned as the overall mark is greater than 37%

Scenarios

A UG FT student who achieved 90 credits at level 1 in the previous year, retakes a level 1 module in the current year and obtains a mark of 39%. The student could be condoned.

A UG PT student passes 60 credits at stage 2.1, takes 60 credits at stage 2.2, but only passes 30, achieving a mark of 37% in the second module. They could be condoned for the remaining 30 credits.

Please note:

- Students who have committed an assessment offence and have received a penalty may still be considered for condonation should their profile suggest this is possible.
- Students are not permitted to submit an appeal in order to request condonation.

FAQ	Condoned credit	Excused credit
Does the student need to have personal circumstances accepted?	No	Yes
Does the student have to achieve a minimum <u>module</u> mark?	Yes Normally 37% at levels 0-3 Normally 47% at level M	No
Does the student have to achieve a minimum <u>component</u> mark?	No	No
Does the student need to have passed a minimum number of credits elsewhere?	Yes. At least 90 credits at that level or above even if it has been accumulated over more than one academic year.	Update Yes. Only 30 credits maximum can be excused (with exceptions under the force majeure regulations).
Is there a maximum amount of credit which can be considered?	Yes (see p. 22)	30 credits (exceptions as above)
Is the mark included in the calculation of the degree classification?	No	No
Is the credit included in the award credit total?	Yes	No

AWARD BOARD – AEGROTAT AND POSTHUMOUS AWARDS

Occasionally an Award Board may be required to consider making an award to a student who was unable to complete because of illness or incapacity or because they are deceased.

M1. Aegrotat awards

A student may be granted an unclassified aegrotat award where illness or a similar cause has meant they cannot complete the required assessments and there is evidence from previously submitted work that, had they been assessed, they would have achieved the necessary standard for the award.

An aegrotat award is not classified neither is it awarded with merit, distinction or other differential level.

Except in the case of posthumous awards, the student must have signified that they are willing to accept the award and understand they waive the right to be assessed.

M2. Posthumous awards

A deceased student may be granted a normal* or aegrotat** award posthumously if registered at the time of death and where there is sufficient evidence from previously submitted work that, had they been assessed, they would have achieved the necessary standard for the award.

A report should be submitted to Academic Board as and when aegrotat and posthumous awards are made.

*A normal award is made where a student has completed all modules (or **could** be awarded credit for example, excused credit), so it can be classified.

**A posthumous aegrotat degree should be awarded with honours, but is unclassified. Students should be granted their target award irrespective of the duration they were registered for, or how much of the programme had been completed. For example, a student on level 1 of an honours degree should be awarded a degree, a student on a Masters award should be awarded the full Masters rather than a PG Cert or PG Dip.

Students on a named award which would normally confer professional body accreditation or registration should be granted the default award.

AWARD BOARD – PROGRESSION

Progression to level 1 from level 0

The **normal** expectation is that students will successfully complete the full 120 credits at level 0 before progressing into level 1.

The Terms of Reference of an Award Board, stated within the [Examining Board Code of Practice](#) states that it is the Award Board's responsibility to determine 'the progression of a student to further study on an award'. Therefore, if after the resit, a student has not passed all credits at level 0 the Award Board should determine whether the student's achievement is sufficient enough to enable progression to level 1.

Award Boards are asked to consider whether allowing progression is in the student's best interests taking the following into account:

- The effects of moving to online learning and of alternative assessments.
- The overall number of modules which have not yet been passed.
- If approved personal circumstances are present for a module which has not been passed.
- Whether the student has a mark in the condonable range for a module which has not been passed.
- Would progression be to the benefit of the student or is there risk of further failure?
- Students on undergraduate programmes on a full time mode of delivery may normally enrol for a maximum of 150 credits in one academic year.
- Are there any Professional and Statutory Body requirements / constraints?

A student who the Board agrees should not proceed to level 1 at this point may still retake the level 0 modules they have not passed in the normal way with a view to progressing in the future (provided they are eligible for a retake).

Progression from a Foundation Degree to an Honours Degree

Students registered on a Foundation Degree but who have not completed it, should normally not be permitted to progress onto an Honours Degree trailing a module/s between the two awards.

RECONVENED BOARDS

Reconvened examining boards

If an examining board is required to review a decision after the full meeting, the authority may be delegated to a sub-committee to act on its behalf (known as a reconvened board) with terms of reference limited to the review in question. [The Examining Board Code of Practice](#) states:

The quorum for a sub-committee of an examining board is five, and normally at least three members must have been present at the original meeting, one of whom should be the Chair or their nominee. The sub-committee will be convened virtually.

Where possible an external examiner will be a member of the sub group, but if this is not possible an external examiner should be consulted. If the decision relates to an award, the chief external examiner should either be a member of the sub group or be consulted.

The consent of an external examiner is required for any changes to the original decision of an examining board and written consent from the chief external examiner is required for any changes to the original award granted.

ACCREDITED PRIOR LEARNING AND ACCREDITED EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING

Accreditation of prior learning or accredited experiential learning

Where an examining board records the award of AL or AEL, and the credit will be identified as such on the student's certificate of credit, it will need to ensure the two-thirds rule has been adhered to.

Re-using credit towards a higher level qualification

Where AL or AEL or a combination of the two contribute to the credit requirements of an award of the University, this must not exceed two-thirds of the total credit requirements for the award. This limit does not apply to AL credit which has been achieved under the University's own academic regulations where the student is proceeding towards a higher award (as per **E7**.)

Where a student fails to meet the requirements of their award they may be eligible to receive a lower level award. In such cases, the two-thirds maximum will become directly proportional to the overall number of credits required.

For example:

Non honours degree (300 credits required)

Student has 240 AL credits so they will need to pass 100 taught credits.

Ratio: 200 AL credits: 100 taught credits.

Diploma of higher education (240 credits required)⁴

Student has 240 AL credits so they will need to pass 80 taught credits.

Ratio: 160 AL credits: 80 taught credits.

Credit awarded for AL will not:

- carry marks or grades awarded by another institution;
- carry marks achieved under the University's own academic regulations;
- be used to gain an award in its entirety;
- be shown on the student's Notification of Credit and Assessment Marks;
- be used in the calculation for honours or other differential level of award.

⁴ In practice it is likely that this will be most commonly used for non honours degrees interims.

WITHDRAWING STUDENTS WHO HAVE NOT ENGAGED

Update The University may withdraw a student from their programme of study where there is no evidence of engagement and all efforts to secure their re-engagement have failed (as per **C7**).

The Student Administration Team will mark up students who have not submitted work for any of their resits with yellow sticky notes.

Student Support Advisers will then look at:

- whether there was any engagement since 1st January 2020 in MyEngagement (learner analytics)
- checking Info Hub as to whether there had been any appointments the student may have attended since 1st January 2020
- any other issues which may have brought the student to our attention via the Serious Concerns Line since 1st Jan 2020.

The Advisers will turn the sticky note blue and add the note 'Student record checked. Student has engaged with studies/support' if they find evidence that a student has made efforts to engage.

If there is no sign of engagement nothing is edited on the Board report.

The SAT teams will make this information available to Programme Leaders. They will have an opportunity to add any further information.

All of these details will then enable the Board to make an informed decision as to whether a student should be withdrawn.

Students will still be able to come back to the Student Support Advisers with further information. This may lead to their reinstatement. For those who do not respond, the original decision to withdraw due to non engagement will be upheld. However, these students will still be able to appeal.

This process does not apply to students studying at a partner colleges as the same level of data is not available.


Please note: Students may also be withdrawn during the Academic year once the following monitoring processes and checks have been completed.

- Student is showing as non-engaged on MyEngagement and Student Advice have escalated to try to re-engage
- Student has not engaged with support – for example, no appointments with Student Advice, Disability Service or Student Money Service
- Student is NS (non-submission) for all modules across the whole year to date (SAT)

These withdrawals cannot be overturned by the Award Board. But SAT will take the list of students who have been withdrawn to the Award Board for noting.

AWARD BOARD REPORTS

Award Board report example

Award Board Report		Faculty:	HEALTH AND LIFE SCIENCES							
Meeting Date : 15 February 2008		School:	LIFE SCIENCES							
Meeting (Jurisdiction Name) :		Board (Jurisdiction Name) :	B90032:B90032							
B90032:B90032:B90032/1		Award Board Meeting:	S-FEB08-MSC ENV HEALTH							
		Primary Award:	MSC/PGDIP ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH							
Student Name	Number	Reg Status	REG					Total credits gained		
								120		
Secondary Type		Award Level	Outcome Type	Award Code	Certificate Title			Overall Mark	Predicted Outcome	
Primary Target Details:		MDEG	MSC	B90032	ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH			39.3	REFER	
Secondary Award Eligibility: INTERM		PDP	PGD	B90032PGD	ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH			52.5	PD	
Level 3	USSJFE-10-3 FOOD&H INV	USSJFH-10-3 PBLnPHA	USSJFK-10-3 PBLnPHB					Ave mark (Level 3)	35.7%	
Agg	64	57	47					Total Level 3 Credits:	30	
Credits	10	10	10							
Level M	UBCLH3-10-M	USSJB4-10-M PUBLIC HS	USSJB5-10-M HOUSING RE	USSJB6-10-M (EC) FOCAMS	USSJBF-10-M EH LAW&COM	USSJBG-10-M (EC) WSMOH	USSJBJ-10-M NOON	USSJBK-10-M (EC) MscPollMan		
COMPA										
COMPB										
Agg	50(66)*	52	52	50(63)*	60	52(67)*	65	50(58)*		
Credits	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10		
Level M	USSJCA-60-M Project	USSJCB-10-M (EC) RiskManEHZ							Ave mark (Level M)	39.3%
COMPA									Total Level M Credits:	90
COMPB										
Agg	20(ECA)	50(63)*								
Credits	1RALL	10								
Credits Attempted Summary		120 + 60(NA)					180			

The shaded modules have already had board outcomes in the past so it is only the unshaded module marks that are looked at unless it is a completing profile.

The board consider marks and outcomes at an individual student level. Credit totals and overall marks are shown here

Key to Award Board Reports

MODULE OUTCOMES	
1RA, 2RA, 3RA	Referred in component A on first/second/third attempt of module.
1RB, 2RB, 3RB	Referred in component B on first/second/third attempt of module.
1RALL, 2RALL, 3RALL	Referred in all components on first/second/third attempt of module.
1F, 2F, 3F	Failed module on a first/second/third attempt, student is already eligible for further attempt. No further action required (unless there are accepted personal circumstances to consider).
2F+	Failed module on the second attempt and has used up an exceptional retake awarded by an Award Board. Eligible for a further attempt. No further action required (unless there are accepted personal circumstances to consider).
PERSONAL CIRCUMSTANCES CODES	
UZSNMQ-30-2 (EC)	Previous personal circumstances exist for this module which have already been considered by an Award Board meeting and have been flagged as "ongoing" – i.e. their effect could have a bearing on the board's ultimate decision about the student's award outcome.
EC(A)	Current component or module with PC accepted.
EC(R)	Current component or module with PC rejected.
EC(P)	Current component or module with PC pending.
FAILED MODULES	
Fails	
FAIL	Failed module, not eligible for a retake unless there are accepted personal circumstances to consider.
FAIL (2)	Failed module on a second attempt, not eligible for exceptional retake.

FAIL?	Failed module, eligible for exceptional retake if agreed by an Award Board.
F+	Failed module on an exceptional retake, not eligible for a further exceptional retake as they have previously had one awarded.
FAIL(2)?	Failed module on a second attempt, eligible for exceptional retake if agreed by an Award Board.
AWARD BOARD DECISIONS (ABDEC)	
These occur on professional practice modules – and any further opportunity to resit / retake is agreed by the examination board. N.B. The decision is prefixed by the module run enrolment attempt number and module run enrolment sit number. The number after the ABDEC shows the number of fails.	
1_1_ABDEC 1	Award Board Decision on professional practice module, first sit, first attempt.
1_2_ABDEC 2	Award Board Decision on professional practice module, second sit, first attempt.
2_1_ABDEC 3	Award Board Decision on professional practice module, first sit, second attempt.
2_2_ABDEC 4	Award Board Decision on professional practice module, second sit, second attempt.

OTHER CODES			
30 (C)	Previously condoned module.		
AO	Assessment Offence		
Exempt	Exempt has no value		
DECISION CODES			
NYE	Not yet eligible (i.e. passed all modules taken).		
Refer	Student is required to resit / retake a module/s.		
RW	Required to Withdraw.		
CLASSIFICATION CODES			
1	First	MP	Masters Pass
U2	Upper Second	MM	Masters Merit
L2	Lower Second	MD	Masters Distinction
3	Third		

TYPES OF CREDIT GAINED	
120	Standard credit gained normally
40(AL/AEL)	Standard credit gained by means of AL or AEL
20(Exc)	Standard credit not gained but "excused" for award purposes as a result of personal circumstances
140(NA)	Standard credit attempted but not achieved (failed or referred)
20(NC)	Non-counting credit

CAPPING AND ASTERIXES

USSJBA-10-M
RES METH
45
45(ECA)*
1F

This mark has been capped from a previous board, but has still not been passed. Personal Circumstances have been submitted and accepted for this opportunity

USPJCL-20-1
RDM1
44
35*
39
1F

This is a resit attempt - This module would have partial capping from the previous board, if the student had passed. The weighting of the components is A:40 B:60

USSJBB-10-M
RES REVIEW
50(65)*
10

The module mark is capped, the full mark is the number in brackets. This capping has been imposed from a previous board and so has an asterisk

- To indicate where a previous Award Board has already granted an Exceptional Retake the module will be suffixed with a '+'.
- To indicate where a failed module has been attempted more than once the failed decision will be suffixed with the number of actual attempts e.g F(2) or F(2)?

FAILED AWARDS – ADMINISTRATIVE GUIDANCE

Introduction

This guidance is intended to assist with the management of the student record in the event that a 'Failed Award' (FA) or 'Failed Target' (FT) decision is recorded at an Award Board.

1. Failed Award no resits available

In the event that a Failed Award decision is reached by an Award Board and the student has no outstanding resits on any modules they are enrolled on, then the decision of 'FA' should be recorded on the record system.

The student cannot re-enrol on the award.

2. Failed Award with retakes available

In the event that a Failed Award decision is reached by an Award Board regardless of the fact that the student still has the potential to take the module again, the decision of 'FA' should be recorded on the record system.

The student cannot re-enrol on the award.

3. Failed Award with resits available

If a student fails a compulsory module but has outstanding resits on other modules they have the right to engage with any outstanding resit within that academic year.

The decision of 'FT' (Failed Target) is used to record the Award Board outcome. This will result in a failed decision outcome being published to the student, but will allow the Primary Award registration to continue as 'registered' in order for the student to resit modules and potentially improve an interim eligibility.

The student may undertake their resits within the same academic year, but cannot re-enrol on the award in order to complete any outstanding retakes.

Once the resit outcomes are known and have been presented to the appropriate Board the student will then be subject to a Failed Award decision ('FA') which will have the effect of closing down the whole registration.

The resit opportunities will be presented as contributing to the existing 'failed award', but will be shown on the pre-Award Board paperwork as having a registration status of 'RW' against the 'Reg Status' (example shown below). This denotes that the student has already been subject to a failed target decision and that the new decisions are being presented to complete the resits available and note any change in interim award eligibility.

Student Name	Number	Reg Status	Current Time Out			
		RW				
Primary Target Details:	Secondary Type	Award Level	Outcome Type	Award Code	Certificate Title	On
		DEGHONS	BSC	H200	CIVIL ENGINEERING	0
Secondary Award Eligibility:	INTERIM	CERT	CERTHE	H20013CHE	CIVIL ENGINEERING	57

4. Failed Target regardless of whether resits or retakes are available

In the event that a Failed Target decision is reached by an Award Board, regardless of whether the student has outstanding resits or retakes for any modules they are enrolled on, then the decision of 'FT' should be recorded on the record system.

If the student wishes to register on an alternative award then they must go through the transfer process.

Successful appeal of an FA or FT decision

In the event that an FA or FT decision is overturned on appeal and the student has been transferred to a new award or virtual award, the new award should be withdrawn using withdrawal code '29 - Registered in Error' and the student re-instated in the original award. This will allow the new registration to be ignored for monitoring purposes and will avoid high withdrawal statistics.

APPENDIX 1 - CALCULATING AWARD OUTCOMES UNDER THE FORCE MAJEURE REGULATIONS

For examination boards operating under the force majeure regulations, the University will operate a 'No Detriment' approach. This means that where a student meets the requirements for an award, Award Boards will ensure that where permitted by the award algorithm the overall level calculation for the **best 100 credits** at the highest level of study attempted in 2019/20 is at least as high as the weighted average mark of all assessments with a deadline up until 18th March 2020.

Illustrative examples

Level M Masters student

Weighted average for the level (pre 18 th March)	Weighted average presented at the Award Board at which the award is completed	Weighted average used in final calculation
62	58	62 (Merit)

Level 3 UG student

Weighted average for the level (pre 18 th March)	Weighted average for the level at the Award Board	Weighted average used in final calculation
63	65	65
63	61	63

Level 2 UG student

Weighted average for the level (pre 18 th March)	Weighted average for the level presented at the Award Board at which the award is completed	Weighted average used in final calculation
55	49	55

Where a student is taking modules from more than one level, or where they are taking one module to complete a level, then it is the weighted average mark for the highest level of study that will be compared with the pre 18th March 2020 weighted average mark. Please note that the weighted average mark for the highest level of study may include marks which were achieved in a previous academic year.

Weighted average for the level (one or more modules pre 18th March)	Weighted average presented at the Award Board at which the award is completed - could include modules from the previous academic year)	Weighted average used in final calculation
55	75	75

Board members are advised that when reviewing Award Board reports, these display the weighted average of **all** credits taken at the level. Therefore, this mark should not be used as the comparator against the pre-18th March mark because it may be more or less than 100 credits (but see note below).

Please note: in the July 2020 boards it was found that not all student profiles had 100 best credits that could be used for comparison with the pre-pandemic average (e.g. students taking only one or two modules, or enrolled on programmes with structures which did not require 100 credits). In such cases, Boards may decide to use the final outcome as predicted by the standard method of calculation **if** the pre-pandemic average is not representative of the student's full marks profile.

Update Final year students who were on placement in 2019/20 and did not take any theory modules

If student submitted a level 2 or level 3 practice / work based learning module in 2019/2020, which was explicitly linked to the placement then any impact due to the pandemic should have already been taken into account in terms of their individual module outcome.

We cannot provide a pre-pandemic average if students were not enrolled on any theory modules in 2019/2020. However, if a student took a practice / work based learning module which was explicitly related to their 2019/2020 placement during 2020/21 then any disruption should be taken into account in terms of their individual module outcome.

The final award will then be calculated as per the standard regulations.