

Examining Board Notes of Guidance 2024/25

Student and Academic Services

Updated May 2025

Contents

<u>Introduction</u>	page 3
<u>Exam Board preparation</u>	page 3
1. <u>Confirmation of marks</u>	page 3
2. <u>Adverse group circumstances - moderation of marks</u>	page 3
3. <u>Assessment Offences</u>	page 4
<u>Examining Board responsibilities</u>	page 4
1. <u>Membership and Quoracy</u>	page 4
2. <u>Avoiding conflicts of interest</u>	page 5
3. <u>Review of assessment decisions</u>	page 5
4. <u>Examining board minutes</u>	page 5
<u>International partner boards</u>	page 5
<u>Examining Board operations</u>	page 6
1. <u>Information available to the Examining Board</u>	page 6
2. <u>Exceptional Removal of a Mark</u>	page 6
3. <u>Progression</u>	page 7
4. <u>Compensation</u>	page 8
5. <u>Retakes</u>	page 10
6. <u>Exceptional Further Attempts</u>	page 10
7. <u>Maximum Registration Periods</u>	page 11
8. <u>Borderline criteria</u>	page 11
9. <u>Masters' differential awards</u>	page 12
10. <u>Aegrotat and posthumous awards</u>	page 12
11. <u>Accredited prior learning / accredited experiential learning</u>	page 13
12. <u>Sub-committees</u>	page 14
13. <u>Examining Board Reports and codes</u>	page 15
<u>Failed awards administrative guidance</u>	page 17
<u>Withdrawing students who have not engaged</u>	page 19
<u>Appendix 1 – Field Boards</u>	page 20

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this guidance is to assist examining board personnel with the conduct of, and decision-making processes for Examining Boards. Any queries regarding the UWE regulations in relation to the conduct of examining boards, or 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](#).

EXAM BOARD PREPARATION

Note – For programmes operating a two-tier examining board structure, a Field Board is responsible for confirming module marks, awarding module credit and reviewing the impact of adverse group circumstances. See [Appendix 1 – Field boards](#) for further details.

1. CONFIRMATION OF MARKS

The confirmation of the accuracy of marks is carried out prior to the meeting of the Examining Board. The [Assessment and Feedback Policy and Operational Guide](#) is used to inform the processes of internal marking, element and component moderation and agreeing the module aggregate mark. All Module Leaders will have the opportunity to flag up items to note for their module.

Students who have had an exceptional removal of a mark application accepted will have had their mark/s removed for the individual elements affected by their personal circumstances. The mark/s will have been replaced by a non-submission 'NS.'

2. ADVERSE GROUP CIRCUMSTANCES – MARK MODERATION

Module Leaders may propose that the marks for a cohort or sub 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 meaningful comparisons as to how students have fared on the module over a period of time. They then consider what, if any, action should be taken with a clear rationale for the proposal. This may be done in consultation with the external examiner.

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

3. 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.

- A zero and 'non-submission' signify different things and recording something as a non-submission 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 may prompt a review of the rationale for this.

EXAMINING BOARD RESPONSIBILITIES

ACADEMIC REGULATION D25

The Examining Board is the body which may act on behalf of Academic Board in awarding credit, granting an award or amending a properly executed decision. The responsibilities of the Examining Board are set out in the University's Examining Board Code of Practice.

1. MEMBERSHIP AND QUORACY

Membership and quoracy requirements are set out in full in the [Exam Board Code of Practice](#).

Summary

- An examining board meeting is quorate if at least two-thirds of the members eligible to attend are present. This includes engaging in the board virtually where appropriate.
- In exceptional circumstances, and if approved by 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.
- An examining board must normally include an external examiner, in order to have the authority to grant credit or an award to students.
- If a programme leader has already confirmed the student profiles in writing and there are no other issues for discussion, they are not required to attend the Examining Board and will be excluded from the quoracy.
- Regarding 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 and Programme Support 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 and Programme Support Team are notified.

2. AVOIDING POTENTIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

No student shall be a member of an examining board, and a student will only attend an examiners' meeting if they are 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.

3. REVIEW OF ASSESSMENT DECISIONS

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 prior to the board. If the decision relates to an award, the chief external examiner should either be a member of the sub group or be consulted prior to the board. The consent of an external examiner is required for any changes to the original decision of an examining board and consent from the chief external examiner is required for any changes to the original award granted.

4. 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. Records of Exam Board meetings 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.

INTERNATIONAL PARTNER BOARDS

International partner boards are not always managed by exception. In some instances, particularly where a partnership is new, all modules will be presented to the Field Board, and all student profiles will be presented to the Examining Board. Partnership SPS can advise where this will be the case.

The membership of an international partner board is the Chair, Partner module leaders (or nominee/s), Link tutor/s and 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.

EXAMINING BOARD OPERATIONS

1. INFORMATION AVAILABLE TO THE EXAMINING 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 and Programme Support Team to guide the order of the meeting.
Examining Board reports	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.

2. EXCEPTIONAL REMOVAL OF A MARK

ACADEMIC REGULATION D4(v)

There may be exceptional circumstances where a student has attempted an assessment task, but the mark is subsequently removed in agreement with the student. These include:

- Where a student is taken ill during an examination.
- Where there is clear evidence that a student has not been in a reasonable position to make an advance judgement of the impact of their personal circumstances (e.g. death of a family member) on their usual ability to engage in an assessment.

- It is possible that some student profiles will show a mark module level and have personal circumstances accepted. This indicates that an application for an exceptional removal of mark for one of the work items has been accepted.
- 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.

3. PROGRESSION

ACADEMIC REGULATION D9(iii)

- i) **A student cannot progress to the next level if they have failed more than 30 credits at the previous level.** This does not apply to students who registered on a programme for the first time which commenced before 1st August 2022.

Progression from a Foundation Year to an Honours Degree

The **normal** expectation is that students will successfully complete the full 120 credits of the foundation year before progressing to an honours degree. If, after the resit, a student has not passed all credits on the foundation year the Examining Board decides whether the student's achievement is sufficient to enable progression to the honours degree.

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

- The overall number of credits which have not yet been passed.
- If approved personal circumstances (via an exceptional removal of a mark application) is present for a module which has not been passed.
- Whether the student can be considered for compensation for the credit which has not been passed. (See Section 4)
- Whether progression be to the benefit of the student or if there is risk of further failure
- Whether there are any Professional and Statutory Body requirements / constraints
- A student who the Board agrees should not proceed at this point may still retake the level 3 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 not be permitted to progress onto an Honours Degree trailing a module/s.

4. COMPENSATION

IMPORTANT – Progression regulations take precedence over compensation.

A student cannot be considered for an offer of compensation if they have failed more than 30 credits at the level they are currently studying.

ACADEMIC REGULATION D8 (i)

Compensation is the process which can be applied to allow a student to progress at programme level, despite failure of a module. Credit can be awarded for the module where it can be demonstrated that the module's learning outcomes have been met elsewhere in the programme. Where compensation is agreed, a student can proceed without further reassessment.

ACADEMIC REGULATION D8(ii)

Compensation may be considered by an Examining Board where a student has failed a module and:

- Has achieved the necessary overall pass mark for the programme level (40% for Levels 3-6 and 50% for Level 7); and
- It can be demonstrated that the student has met the published learning outcomes for that module elsewhere in the programme; and
- It is permissible in the Programme Specification, including within the rules of any Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body. A student has achieved the necessary overall pass mark for the programme level (40% for Levels 3-6 and 50% for Level 7)

ACADEMIC REGULATION D8(iii)

Compensation can be permitted at first sit:

- for Levels 3 and 4, where it is deemed a student is sufficiently prepared to progress to the next level of study, based on achievement of the learning outcomes at first sits across the level.
- where compensating credit would allow a student to complete their target award.

In **all** other circumstances, compensation can only be applied at resit.

ACADEMIC REGULATION D8(iv)

Where compensation is permissible, the Examining Board may offer to award the remaining credit to the student. The student will retain the numerical mark they have achieved in that module assessment/s resit.

ACADEMIC REGULATION D8(v)

An exam board can compensate as follows:

- To a maximum of 30 credits at Level 3.
- To a maximum of 30 credits at Level 4.
- To a maximum of 45 credits at Level 5 and 6 combined.
- To a maximum of 30 credits at Level 7

Compensation – Further information

- If a student has previously had credit condoned, this counts towards the credit that can be compensated.
- Compensation can be applied retrospectively to modules taken to previous boards if the timing of assessment boards has potentially caused a student to be disadvantaged.
- In line with the Academic Conduct Policy and Misconduct Procedures, where an assessment offence is found to have occurred in relation to one or more modules the Examining Board may take these into account when considering decisions on whether or not to apply compensation.
- Compensation may be used to grant an interim award where a student has stated in writing that they wish to withdraw and claim the interim award, or due to them failing a compulsory module/s they are no longer able to continue on the highest level of award.
- The Clerk to the Board should ensure that the discussion is recorded, including the outcome and assurance that the learning outcomes have been met.

Retrospective compensation

Retrospective compensation can only be considered for modules that are being assessed in the same examination period, where the timing of examining boards has potentially disadvantaged a student in terms of their eligibility for compensation.

Example:

- The taught modules for a Masters' student are taken to the examining board in August. The student has failed 30 credits, but they have met the learning outcomes for the module elsewhere in the programme. However, they cannot be considered for compensation because their level average is below 50%.
- The students' dissertation is taken to the examining board in October. Passing the dissertation gives the student a level average over 50%, so the failed module from August can now be compensated. This will avoid the need to resit and enable the student to graduate with their cohort.

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

- 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 compensate.
- Compensating credit at a lower level may mean it is not possible to compensate at a higher level if the overall maximum will then be exceeded.
- Compensating module failure should not be considered based on passed outcomes at a lower level than that of the failed outcome. However, performance at a higher level can be used in determining whether compensation can be considered.

- If a failed module is presented as an overall fail without resit or retake opportunity the Examining Board is reminded that, providing the failed mark falls within the ranges specified by the regulations, a decision to compensate failure will overturn the fail.

Students can refuse an offer and take up any remaining assessment opportunities for the module(s) in question, or to nominate another module when appropriate.

- Students are not permitted to submit an appeal to request compensation.
- Students will retain the numerical mark(s) for the compensated credit, and it is included in the award credit total.
- Students will be sent written confirmation that they are being offered compensation with a deadline for reply if they want to opt out. If there is no response to the communication, the default position is that the compensation will be applied to the student record.

5. RETAKES

- Students are permitted two automatic attempts at modules.
- If the professional practice component of a Professional practice module has not been passed it may be re-assessed only if approved by the Examining Board. Eligibility for a resit or retake remains an Examining Board decision (D5(iii))
- A student will normally be withdrawn from the programme if they fail the resit opportunity of a compulsory or core module retake (D8 (iii)). Furthermore, a student in this position cannot return to re-enrol to attempt to gain an interim award, even if they still have further attempts remaining on other modules.

6. EXCEPTIONAL FURTHER ATTEMPTS

ACADEMIC REGULATION D7(v)

A student will only be eligible for consideration of a further attempt on an exceptional basis, for example, where their personal circumstances have affected their studies and contact has been made with the University support services, or equivalent.

The Infopoint Team receive the request for an exceptional further attempt request applications from students and make a recommendation whether to grant or decline.

A recommendation for an exceptional further attempt cannot be declined by an Examining Board unless there are professional suitability concerns or other professional, statutory or regulatory body requirements to consider.

7. MAXIMUM REGISTRATION PERIOD

ACADEMIC REGULATION B3(ii)

(ii) For students registering on a programme for the first time ON or AFTER 1st August 2022 there is a maximum registration period. The maximum registration period for each taught programme will be determined by the specific assessment regulations for that award, including any Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body requirements.

(iii) For students registering on a programme for the first time which commenced ON or AFTER 1st August 2022, the maximum registration period for each taught programme will be determined by its length:

- Up to one year programme – three years maximum.
- Programme longer than one year – three additional years to normal duration.

For students registering on a programme for the first time on or after 1st August 2022 any period of suspension **continues to count** towards the maximum registration period.

In exceptional circumstances, the Director of Student and Academic Services may agree limited extensions to a student's maximum registration period.

8. BORDERLINE CRITERIA

For **ALL** students the following academic regulation applies

ACADEMIC REGULATION D25(i) An Examining Board may award one classification higher than that which is determined by the calculation where a student's overall mark is less than or equal to 0.5% below the next higher classification.

For students who started their programmes prior to **1st August 2022** (outcomes generated by the old classification algorithm) the following criteria **ALSO** applies

If student's overall mark is greater than 0.5% and less than or equal to 1% below the next classification, they may be awarded one classification higher than that determined by the normal method of calculation but only if 50% or more of the credits at the highest level required by the programme have marks in the higher banding.

- 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.

- 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.
- It is expected that all students who meet the criteria will have their classification/differential raised up without question.

9. MASTERS DIFFERENTIAL AWARDS

For students who started their masters' programmes on or after 1st August 2024, the following regulations apply.

ACADEMIC REGULATION D22(iii) A merit will be awarded where a weighted average of at least 60% has been achieved across all modules at level 7.

ACADEMIC REGULATION D22(iv) A distinction will be awarded where a weighted average of at least 70% has been achieved across all modules at level 7.

For students who started their masters' programmes prior to **1st August 2024** the following criteria applies instead.

- 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.
- 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.
- 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 Examining Board can consider an uplift provided the student meets the required criteria.

10. AEGROTAT AND POSTHUMOUS AWARDS

Occasionally an Examining 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.

ACADEMIC REGULATION C4 - Aegrotat awards

In exceptional cases, a student may be considered for an aegrotat award where their personal circumstances mean that they will not be able to complete the required assessments. (ii) Aegrotat awards can be considered where evidence from previously assessed work confirms that they would have achieved the necessary standard for that award. 9 (iii) An aegrotat award is not classified. (iv) The University will consult with a student (or nominee) before an aegrotat award is recommended. (v) Academic Board will be advised of any aegrotat awards.

ACADEMIC REGULATION C5 - Posthumous Awards

- (i) The University may grant a posthumous award to a registered student who has died.
- (ii) Where a student has completed all the assessments, they will be awarded a degree at the applicable classification or equivalent. The student will otherwise be awarded an aegrotat degree.
- (iii) The University will liaise with the next of kin about the posthumous award, including arrangements for graduation.
- (iv) Academic Board will be advised of any posthumous awards.

11. ACCREDITED PRIOR LEARNING/ 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 AL/ALE regulations have been adhered to.

ACADEMIC REGULATION B4(iv)

AL and/or AEL requests may be considered on the following basis:

- No more than two-thirds of the credit requirements of a University award can be applied for through AL/AEL, unless the credit has been achieved at UWE Bristol and the student is proceeding to a higher-level award.
- Credit cannot be counted towards more than one award, if they are re-using the credit and marks (see B4v)
- Where a student has previously accepted an award, they may re-use a maximum of 20% of the credit achieved to contribute to the same level of qualification.
- Only credit will be transferred. Marks will not be transferred unless they have been awarded by the University.
- As part or all the training requirement for candidates studying towards MPhil, PhD, and DPhil awards.
- Up to two-thirds of the training requirements for candidates studying towards a Professional Doctorate unless the previous credit has been obtained under the Regulations.

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)

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.

12. SUB-COMMITTEES

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 with terms of reference limited to the review in question. The rationale for any changes to board decisions must be clearly stated for any subcommittee.

[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 in advance . 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 consent from the chief external examiner is required for any changes to the original award granted.

13. EXAMINING BOARD REPORTS AND CODES

Award Board Report		Faculty:	HEALTH AND LIFE SCIENCES	
Meeting Date : 15 February 2008		School:	LIFE SCIENCES	
Meeting (Jurisdiction Name) : B90032:B90032:B90032/1		Board (Jurisdiction Name) :	B90032:B90032	
Award Board Meeting:		S-FEB08-MSC ENV HEALTH		
Primary Award:		MSC/PGDIP ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH		

Student Name	Number	Reg Status	REG	Total credits gained	120
Primary Target Details:	Secondary Type	Award Level	Outcome Type	Award Code	Certificate Title
	MDEG	MSC	B90032	ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH	Overall Mark 39.3
Secondary Award Eligibility:	INTERIM	PDP	PGD	B90032PGD	ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
					52.5
Level 3	USSJFE-10-3 FOOD&H INV	USSJFH-10-3 PBLnPHA	USSJFK-10-3 PBLnPHB		
Agg	64	57	47		
Credits	10	10	10		
Level M	UBCLH3-10-M	USSJB4-10-M PUBLIC HS	USSJB5-10-M HOUSING RE	USSJB8-10-M (EC) FOOD MS	USSJBF-10-M EH LAW&COM
COMP A					
COMP B					
Agg	50(66)*	52	52	50(53)*	50
Credits	10	10	10	10	10
Level M	USSJCA-60-M Project	USSJCB-10-M (EC) RiskManEHZ			
COMP A					
COMP B					
Agg	20(ECA)	50(63)*			
Credits	1RALL	10			

Level 3	Level M	Level M
Ave mark (Level 3)		
55.7%		
Total Level 3 Credits:		
30		
Ave mark (Level M)		
39.3%		
Total Level M Credits:		
90		

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.

Page 3 of 5

Date/Time of Printing : 06/05/2008 11:18:19

MODULE OUTCOMES

1RALL	Referred in one or more assessment tasks on a first sit of a module.
1F, 2F	Failed module on a first/second attempt, student is already eligible for further attempt.
2F+	Failed module on the second attempt and has used up an exceptional retake awarded by an Examining Board. Student is already eligible for a further attempt.

LEGACY MODULE OUTCOMES (for modules still under 22/23 regulations)

1RA, 2RA	Referred in component A on a first sit of a first/second attempt of module.
1RB, 2RB	Referred in component B on a first sit of a first/second attempt of module.
1RALL/2RALL	Referred in all components on a first sit of a first/second attempt of module.

PERSONAL CIRCUMSTANCES CODES	
UZSNMQ-30-2 (EC)	Previous personal circumstances exist for this module which have already been considered by an Examining Board meeting i.e. their effect may have a bearing on the board's 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	
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 Examining 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 Examining Board.

EXAMINING 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	Examining Board Decision on professional practice module, first sit, first attempt.
1_2 ABDEC 2	Examining Board Decision on professional practice module, second sit, first attempt.
2_1_ABDEC 3	Examining Board Decision on professional practice module, first sit, second attempt.
2_2_ABDEC 4	Examining Board Decision on professional practice module, second sit, second attempt.

OTHER CODES	
30 (C)	Previously compensated (or condoned if prior to 22/23) 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
U2	Upper Second
L2	Lower Second
3	Third
MP	Masters Pass
MM	Masters Merit
MD	Masters Distinction

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 because of personal circumstances
140(NA)	Standard credit attempted but not achieved (failed or referred)
20(NC)	Non-counting credit

FAILED AWARDS – ADMINISTRATIVE GUIDANCE

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

1. Failed Award no resits available

If a Failed Award decision is reached by an Examining 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

If a Failed Award decision is reached by an Examining 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 Examining 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' 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 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 the whole registration.

The resit opportunities will be presented as contributing to the existing 'failed award' but will be shown on the pre-Examining 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
Secondary Award Eligibility:	INTERIM	DEGHONS	BSC	H200	CIVIL ENGINEERING	0
		CERT	CERTHE	H20013CHE	CIVIL ENGINEERING	57

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

If a Failed Target decision is reached by an Examining 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

If 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.

WITHDRAWING STUDENTS WHO HAVE NOT ENGAGED

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 regulation B2(iv)).

The process considers undergraduate students only.

A student is flagged for withdrawal by the University once the following monitoring processes and checks had 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.

Student Support Advisers create a list of those students who have been through the MyEngagement escalation process and have not responded to attempts to make contact and re-engage with studies. As part of the escalation checking process, the Student Advice Team share the lists of students being “escalated” with faculties to flag the students who have reached the withdrawal stage.

1. A check is made of any structural circumstances which may impact on a cohort’s record on MyEngagement for example: nursing students on placement, students on the Team Entrepreneurship programme.
2. The list is passed to the Student and Programme Support Team (SAT) to check whether there has been any engagement with assessments. Where SAT do not have marks yet, they should note this against the student on the spreadsheet.
3. If there has been no engagement with assessments, SAT withdraw students, using the **withdrawal code 20** – “Non-engagement with studies and failure to respond to associated communications”, and the **secondary withdrawal code of 2001** “Non-engagement with studies and failure to respond to associated communications” and send withdrawal communications. The withdrawal date will align with the fee liability deadlines as set out in section 3 ‘Criteria for withdrawal’. Fees to be cancelled using ‘withdrawal’ as the reason and re-invoiced to 77771.
4. SAT will take the list of students who have been withdrawn to the Examining Board for noting.
5. The withdrawal cannot be overturned by the Examining Board.

APPENDIX 1 - FIELD BOARDS

The following information applies where two-tier examining boards are in operation.

1. 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 and Programme Support 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.

2. 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.

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

- Where there are comments from the Module Leader.
- On request from the College Dean of Learning & Teaching or their representative.
- 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 had an exceptional removal of a mark application accepted will have had their mark/s removed for the individual elements affected by their personal circumstances. The mark/s will have been replaced by a non-submission 'NS.'

3. ADVERSE GROUP CIRCUMSTANCES – MARK MODERATION

Module Leaders may propose that the marks for a cohort or sub 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 act 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.

4. 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 decide an appropriate penalty.

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.

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' signify different things and recording something as a non-submission 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 may prompt a review of the rationale for this.