17B ASSESSMENT AND PROGRESSION REGULATIONS (DEGREE PROGRAMMES)

Boards of examiners

Introduction

17b.1 The university operates a two-tier system for boards of examiners: Tier 1 for module outcomes and discussion of programme delivery and Tier 2 for programme outcomes in terms of awards and progression. Collectively these boards will consider every module and programme of study approved through the university's approval processes.

17b.2 QS programmes, which have a separate system of progression boards, are not subject to these regulations.

17b.3 The purpose of these boards is:

- to consider module performance and issues arising from the learning, teaching and assessment approaches adopted by the modules
- to review students' overall performance on their programme of study
- to make recommendations on awards to Academic Council, and
- actively to facilitate reflection, review and dialogue within the module and programme teams and between these teams and external examiners, in order to encourage quality enhancement at each level.

Subject Groups and Boards of Examiners

17b.4 All modules will be allocated to a subject group (SG) as determined by the Faculties. Faculties will ensure that the workload for each subject group is appropriate. A cognate subject group may contain one or more subject groups, according to the range of academic disciplines, programmes and number of modules it encompasses and a cognate subject group may include modules from more than one Faculty. Each cognate subject group will convene Tier 1 Board of Examiners for the modules and programmes for which it is primarily responsible three times a year: at the end of each semester (in January/February and May/June) and to consider the results of reassessments taken over the summer (August/September).

Membership of Tier 1 Boards

17b.5 Membership of a Tier 1 Board of Examiners, based around the cognate subject groups noted above shall include:

- the dean of the relevant faculty or nominee (who will normally chair the board – but note that a member of staff may not serve as the chair of a Tier 1 Board of Examiners when it is considering a module in whose assessment he or she has been involved)
- the associate dean for the cognate subject group
- the programme leaders and depute programme leaders for the programmes lying primarily within the cognate subject group
- all module leaders for modules to be considered by the board
- Tier 1 External Examiner(s) with responsibility for modules and programmes primarily within the cognate subject group.

In attendance:

- clerk to the Tier 1 Board of Examiners.

Others with a right to attend as observers:
- the chair of Academic Council or nominee
- the chair of Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee or nominee.

The following may be in attendance:
- an appropriate administrator from an academic partner or executive office
- other academic staff who are part of the module team for a module or modules to be considered by the board. Such staff will have the right to speak to the meeting when modules in which they have been involved are being considered.

17b.6 All those attending a Tier 1 Board of Examiners shall make a declaration of interest if they have any involvement with the matters to be considered beyond that stipulated by their official role.

17b.7 The Faculty Board is responsible for approving membership of Tier 1 Boards of Examiners annually, and for approving any subsequent changes.

Responsibilities of the Tier 1 Board of Examiners

17b.8 The Tier 1 Board of Examiners is responsible for:
a. satisfying itself that all results presented are correct
b. agreeing the result for each student on each module being considered
c. where necessary, deciding on the type of reassessment to be taken
d. approving when reassessments shall take place
e. if necessary, scaling the results in any component of assessment of a module (i.e. moving the marks for every student in the module up or down by an agreed percentage, while retaining the relative placing of each student's mark
f. reviewing module results by mode of study and by Home Academic Partner, to address any variation which may be attributable to these factors
g. taking account of any recommendations of the mitigating circumstances panel
h. submitting verified and confirmed results for modules together with recommendations for pass or fail to Tier 2 Boards of Examiners
i. in addition, the Tier 1 Board of Examiners will, at the end of the meeting, invite external examiners to provide comment on any issues relating to the delivery, resourcing or design of programmes. These comments should be recorded and where appropriate conveyed in writing to the Tier 2 Board of Examiners (see below).

17b.9 The Tier 1 Board of Examiners does not consider the overall performance of individual students.

Information flow

17b.10 The timely flow of accurate information between the various bodies in the board of examiners system is vital:
- it is the responsibility of each module leader to ensure that the provisional results for each module are entered into SITS in time to allow the preparation of module result sheets
- the relevant clerk to the board will provide relevant completed module result sheets to each meeting of the Tier 1 Board of Examiners
- it is the responsibility of the chair of the Tier 1 Board of Examiners, working with the

clerk to the board, to ensure that the agreed module results are entered into SITS timeously following each meeting of the board of examiners.

17b.11 Module results should be entered into SITS as whole numbers, i.e. rounded down to the nearest whole number where the assessment result is less than XX.5 and rounded up where the assessment result is XX.5 or greater.

Tier 2 Boards of Examiners

17b.12 Tier 2 Boards of Examiners shall be convened at least twice in each academic session: normally this will be in May / June and in August / September. For programmes which do not follow the usual semester pattern, the Faculty Board will agree an appropriate calendar of meetings.

17b.13 A Tier 2 Board of Examiners will be responsible for one or more programmes. The Faculty Board, following liaison with the responsible academic partners for the programmes in its area, will be responsible for approving a list of Tier 2 Boards of Examiners annually.

Membership of Tier 2 Boards of Examiners

17b.14 Membership of Tier 2 Boards of Examiners shall include:

- the Dean of Faculty or nominee (who will normally chair the board – but note that a member of staff may not serve as the chair of a Tier 2 Board of Examiners when it is considering a programme in whose assessment he or she has been involved)
- the relevant associate dean or nominees
- the relevant programme leader(s) and depute programme leader(s)
- a senior representative of the responsible academic partner(s) for the programme(s) concerned
- Tier 2 External Examiner(s) appointed for each cognate subject group

In attendance:

- clerk to the Tier 2 Board of Examiners

Others with a right to attend as observers:

- the chair of Academic Council or nominee
- the chair of Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee or nominee

The following may be in attendance:

- an appropriate administrator from an academic partner or executive office
- module leaders for modules which contribute to the programme(s) concerned.

17b.15 All those attending a Tier 2 Board of Examiners shall make a declaration of interest if they have any involvement with the matters to be considered beyond that stipulated by their official role.

17b.16 The Faculty Board is responsible for approving membership of Tier 2 Boards of Examiners annually, and for approving any subsequent changes.

Responsibilities of Tier 2 Boards of Examiners

17b.17 The Tier 2 Board of Examiners is responsible for:

a. considering the profile of each student studying on the programme(s) for which it is

responsible, taking account of the confirmed results and recommendations made by the Tier 1 Boards of Examiners

b. taking account of any recommendations of the mitigating circumstances panel(s) for the programme(s)
c. considering whether poor performance in a module can be condoned in accordance with the regulations
d. confirming for students with poor performance in a module or modules where condonement is not possible the reassessment that must be taken
e. deciding if a student will progress to the next stage of study, continue at the same stage of study, or leave the programme with or without a relevant award
f. deciding on the award and any classification as appropriate
g. reviewing programme results by mode of study and by Home Academic Partner, to address any variation which may be attributable to these factors
h. considering any issues relating to the delivery, resourcing or design of programmes reported from Tier 1 Boards of Examiners.

Condonement

17b.18 Tier 2 Boards of Examiners may exercise their discretion in condoning a fail in any module at SCQF Levels 7-11. In doing so they should be closely guided by the Dean of Faculty, associate dean and programme leader for the relevant award. Where condonement is being recommended for a module lying outwith the scope of the Tier 2 Board of Examiners and its related cognate subject groups this should be communicated to the chair of the relevant Tier 2 Board of Examiners.

17b.19 In considering whether to allow a condoned fail, the board will take account of the student's overall performance profile across the programme of study.

17b.20 Where a fail in a module is condoned, the student will not be allowed to take the reassessment for that module, as specified by the Tier 1 Board of Examiners, with the aim of improving the mark in his or her record.

17b.21 Where a condoned fail is agreed, the student's original mark for the module will stand in the record but be annotated to note that the fail mark has been condoned. The original mark, annotated to show that the failure was condoned, will appear on the student's transcript.

17b.22 The student will be given the appropriate credit for the module in which failure has been condoned.

17b.23 Tier 2 Boards of Examiners have the power to condone failure by a student in a maximum of two modules in any academic year.

Information flow

17b.24 The relevant clerk to the board of examiners will provide programme result sheets to each meeting of the Tier 2 Board of Examiners.

17b.25 It is the responsibility of the chair of the Tier 2 Board of Examiners, working with the clerk to the board, to ensure that confirmed results for each student are entered into SITS timeously following each meeting of the board, and to provide recommendations of

awards to Academic Council.

17b.26 Module results should be entered in SITS as whole numbers, i.e. rounded down to the nearest whole number where the assessment result is less than XX.5 and rounded up where the assessment result is XX.5 or greater.

Recording and reporting the outcomes from boards of examiners

17b.27 Each cognate subject group will retain a full set of minutes and papers for each Tier 1 Board of Examiners. Each faculty will retain a full set of minutes and papers for each Tier 2 Board of Examiners. The minutes, signed by the chairs, will be held in a paper minute book and electronically. The clerk to the board will be responsible for creating and maintaining these records. The minutes of boards will include information on non-standard decisions made about individual students, for example, the consideration of mitigating circumstances. The reports of Tier 2 Boards of Examiners will be made available to the relevant Tier 1 External Examiners, and they will be invited to comment on the approved outcomes in their annual reports.

Quorum and chair's action

17b.28 The quorum for boards of examiners will be one third of the approved membership including the chair and at least one external examiner.

17b.29 Where chair's action on behalf of a board of examiners involves a change in a module or award decision, and is anything other than a correction to an error in processing decisions, it should be confirmed in liaison with an appropriate external examiner. All instances of chair's action must be reported to the next meeting of the board of examiners.

17b.30 Decisions on changes affecting progression or reassessment decisions are normally taken by the chair. In special cases it may be necessary to convene an exceptional meeting of the relevant board of examiners comprising members as appropriate. The remit and membership of such a board will be agreed, in advance, by the Faculty Board and the meeting will be minuted.

Management of assessment

17b.31 All teaching staff must comply with the Assessment Feedback and Feedforward Policy, the Assessment retention policy, and use the undergraduate assessment coversheet. Assessments may only be submitted through UHI technologies approved for assessment submission. The recommended technology is the virtual learning environment (VLE). For GDPR and records management reasons externally hosted technologies that have not been approved may not be used. Email may not be used for submitting assessments or for sharing personal data such as assessment feedback and marks.

17b.32 Students shall be given, at the beginning of their programme, a programme handbook that will include a section on the most up-to-date regulations pertaining to that programme. Students should be given detailed information in their handbook on how to submit electronically and, if required, in hard copy.

17b.33 Students shall be given, at the beginning of each level of the programme, details of the

dates for assessment of that level and the requirements to progress or achieve an award. Students must attempt all components of assessment; non-submission of any component of assessment will result in a fail mark for the overall module.

17b.34 Programme leaders shall endeavour to ensure that the assessment schedule facing students is sequenced in such a way that it is evenly distributed and avoids a bunching of assessment submission dates. However, it is recognised that this can become difficult to achieve in an increasingly modularised system but that programme leaders will liaise with module leaders to minimise the difficulties that students might otherwise face.

17b.35 Students are responsible for checking their module marks online using their student record, and for ensuring that they are aware of reassessment arrangements where necessary.

17b.36 Students shall be informed of their progress throughout the programme and have the opportunity of regular contact with their personal academic tutor (PAT). Students' work will be marked and feedback given with an appropriate timescale (normally not more than 15 working days from the submission date). Where this is not deemed to be possible, students should be informed of when the work will be returned.

17b.37 Students who fail a programme or any of the programme modules shall be given the opportunity to be advised of the reasons underlying the failure(s) and what they have to do to redeem the position. At the module level, this will come from the member of staff who is delivering the module and at the programme level from the student's PAT and / or programme leader.

Anonymous and second marking

17b.38 University policy normally requires, wherever achievable, that anonymous marking exists in respect of all written course work and examination scripts but not for other forms of assessment.

17b.39 The university requires a significant sample of all assessed work to be second-marked. Unless the regulations of a validating body determine otherwise, a significant sample of all assessed work, including examination scripts, course work, projects etc, will be subject to second-marking by a second internal marker. For clarification, a script includes all of a student's answers. The role of the second-marker is to assure and confirm the appropriateness of standards, i.e. the second-marker may receive annotated scripts from the first marker.

17b.40 The sample of assessed work should include a minimum of 10% or six scripts, whichever is the greater, of the total. This sample should be taken from across the module teaching team. This must include a sample of work considered by the first marker to be failed, mid-range for each grade and worthy of distinction for each individual assessment. Where a module is delivered in more than one academic partner by different staff, then second-marking should take place across the partners and markers concerned.

17b.41 All dissertations contributing towards honours classification should be blind double-marked, i.e. the second-marker receives no grade information from the first, nor are they required to provide detailed feedback to the student.

17b.42 Where discrepancies on individual scripts or assignments arise between the first and second internal markers and cannot be resolved through dialogue, the module leader should seek to involve a third internal marker to achieve an internally agreed mark.

17b.43 All provision validated for the first time and all provision which has changed level is subject to more extensive sampling for second-marking during the first year of operation. This sample will include a minimum of 25% or 12 scripts, whichever is the greater, of the total scripts submitted. This sample should be taken from across the module teaching team. This must include a sample of work considered by the first marker to be failed, mid-range for each grade and worthy of distinction for each individual assessment. Where a module is delivered in more than one academic partner by different staff, then second-marking should take place across the partners and markers concerned. Thereafter the sample outlined in 17b.40 is allowable.

17b.44 When a marker is new to a programme or scheme and therefore marking for that programme/scheme for the first time the sampling of marked work detailed in 17b.43 should be applied.

Students with disability

17b.45 Under current equalities legislation, the university has an anticipatory duty to make 'reasonable adjustments' to ensure that disabled students are not substantially disadvantaged relative to non-disabled peers.

17b.46 Students who disclose additional needs will be invited to have an assessment of their needs with student support services at their HAP. This assessment will allow a Personal Learning Support Plan (PLSP) to be set up, if appropriate, which details the adjustments, including those relating to academic assessment, that have been approved in light of a student's specific needs.

17b.47 An approved adjustment that entails a variation from the standard academic regulations, or those specific to a module or programme, is acceptable as long as:

- the adjustment is necessary to enable the student to demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes and
- the adjustment has been approved following a contextualised assessment of need by authorised staff in HAP student support services, and is/will be documented in the student's agreed PLSP. The anticipatory nature of the reasonable adjustments duty requires these to be identified and implemented prior to a PLSP being constructed, where appropriate.

17b.48 Non-standard adjustments (including those relating to academic assessment) are similarly permissible on an individual (exceptional) basis with approval from the student's Programme Leader, so long as the needs assessor has an assurance in advance from the Programme Leader and relevant others that the arrangement is viable and compliant in terms of academic standards, professional body requirements, and learning outcomes.

17b.49 Assessments should be marked in accordance with normal marking criteria, notwithstanding any adjustments in place as part of a PLSP and / or needs assessment

report.

17b.50 Students, by reason of disability proven by acceptable evidence, may be assessed by methods other than those approved for the programme. Where formal diagnostic evidence is unavailable, pending or yet to be obtained, the student's needs assessor (HAP student services):

- should, wherever possible, obtain third party confirmation (e.g. from the student's GP or other relevant professional) that the student is diagnosed or is awaiting or pursuing diagnosis
- may seek evidence of need from teaching staff and/or the student's PAT
- may still determine the need for reasonable adjustments based on their professional judgement of the (likely) impact of the student's needs on their learning
- must recognise that in extremis (especially in relation to mental health) a student's actions and behaviours can be taken as evidence.

17b.51 The needs assessor's professional judgement will be shaped by their knowledge and awareness of the student's needs at the time and other forms of evidence and considerations relevant to the needs assessment process.

17b.52 Alternative assessment methods shall be contracted between the programme leader, HAP student services and the student and be reported to the board of examiners. Additional requests to be assessed by methods other than those approved for the programme, if not already documented in the student's agreed PLSP, should normally be made by the student to the Programme Leader at least six weeks prior to the date of the submission of an assessment or the sitting of an examination. Reasonable requests and adjustments should be supported wherever possible.

Postgraduate research students

17b.53 Postgraduate research (PGR) assessment and examination processes are different from assessments at undergraduate and taught postgraduate level. For PGR students, reasonable adjustments are permissible so long as the student's needs assessor (HAP student services) adopts the same contextualised approach to needs assessment and thus:

- pays due regard to the formal assessment and examination points within the research degrees journey
- seeks advice from the student's Director of Studies and secures assurances from them as appropriate, to ensure viability and compliance with academic standards and learning outcomes. The Director of Studies is equivalent to the student's PAT or Programme Leader in this context
- advises the UHI Graduate School when adjustments are being considered or have been recommended, so that approval can be sought from the Research Degrees Committee as required. This is particularly important when adjustments relate to the final oral examination/viva.

Marking of assessed work or examination carried out under special arrangements

17b.54 Adjustments may be made to assessments, or the mode of delivery of assessments, to enable students with disabilities to demonstrate their achievement of the academic standards. Adjustments should be made during the assessment rather than during the marking. Where assessment or examination has been undertaken under special

arrangements, examiners should mark the work without regard to the fact that special arrangements were made for the assessment. Any necessary consideration of the candidate's circumstances will be undertaken by the board of examiners as appropriate.

Dyslexia Sticker Scheme

17b.55 The university operates a dyslexia sticker scheme to ensure that the work of diagnosed students is assessed in a way which neither penalises nor compensates for dyslexic attributes.

17b.56 A concise version of the marking guidelines is available from the website (www.uhi.ac.uk/dyslexia) along with the full guidance document, explaining how work should be assessed.

Feedback

17b.57 All course work assessments should provide students with guidance on the criteria that will be applied when they are marked. Students should be provided with written feedback, not normally later than 15 working days from the submission date, on their assessments that relate to the marking criteria, normally using a feedback proforma (see Section 17b.36 above).

Components of assessment

17b.58 All assessed work will normally be marked according to the following performance criteria and conventions:

Description	Mark	Grade
Excellent	70+	A
Above average	60-69	B
Average	50-59	C
Satisfactory (pass)	40-49	D
Unsatisfactory	0-39	F

Table 1: UG performance criteria and conventions

17b.59 In determining the mark / grade to be awarded, written criteria should exist for each module.

General assessment provisions

17b.60 These provisions apply to assessment in undergraduate programmes at Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF) Levels 7-10.

Language used for examinations and assessments

17b.61 The language to be used in examinations and assessments will normally be that of the language of instruction.

Use of language or technical dictionaries by students in examinations

17b.62 In general, students may not normally use a dictionary in examinations unless the

directions on the examination paper explicitly state otherwise. However, certain categories of student may apply for permission to use a dictionary:

- students whose first language is not English, at SCQF Levels 7 and 8 only
- exchange or incoming study abroad students whose first language is not English, at any SCQF level.

17b.63 NB Separate arrangements may pertain for modules and programmes where Gaelic is the medium of teaching and assessment.

17b.64 The relevant programme leader is authorised to grant permission for use of a dictionary, by providing a signed letter to the student confirming student details and stating the ISBN number or the specific details of the approved dictionary(ies). This letter must be presented at all examinations to certify that they may use a dictionary.

17b.65 Where such permission is granted, students using a dictionary will be given ten minutes extra for each hour of the examination, e.g. 30 minutes extra for a three-hour examination. The use of electronic dictionaries is not allowed.

17b.66 Students who are eligible to use a dictionary under this regulation, will be expected to provide their own dictionary for each of their examinations. The dictionary must be clean from written notes or materials. Students should arrive 30 minutes prior to the start of their examination so that the letter and dictionary can be checked by the invigilator. In the examination room, students should place their dictionary on the desks in front of them for checking by an invigilator at any time.

17b.67 Any student found using a dictionary without a letter of permission, or using a dictionary with written notes or materials, will have the dictionary confiscated for the duration of the examination period and may be reported for suspected cheating. If such a dictionary is confiscated, the university will be under no obligation to issue the candidate with a replacement dictionary for the remainder of the examination or any other examination.

17b.68 Under no circumstances are translators allowed, either for assessments, or during an examination.

17b.69 Students with disabilities or other identified support needs, on an individual basis, be granted special provision as provided for in these regulations and in existing university policy (e.g. Learner Support policy).

Student withdrawal from a programme

17b.70 Students who fail to give formal notice in writing by 31 March of their intention to withdraw from the programme and who fail to complete assessments will normally be deemed to have failed the programme.

Mitigating circumstances

17b.71 If, by reason of absence, failure to submit work or poor performance, students fail programme modules and it is established, to the satisfaction of the board of examiners, that this was due to proven illness or other circumstances found valid on production of evidence, the board shall use its discretion to ensure that the students are not disadvantaged (nor advantaged) as a result. Further guidance on dealing with mitigating

circumstances can be found in an appendix of these regulations.

17b.72 In exercising its discretion, the board of examiners may decide to allow students to be assessed as for the first time and to vary the form of assessment to be used.

17b.73 Where a student has submitted work, either on time or late, the preparation of and / or submission of which has been affected by mitigating circumstances, a claim should be submitted by the student setting out these circumstances. The internal examiner should mark the work without regard to these circumstances and the student informed that these will be made known to the board of examiners.

17b.74 Where a student feels that their performance was adversely affected by illness or other factors which they were unable or, with valid reason, unwilling to divulge, prior to the meeting of the board of examiners the appeals procedure may be followed (see Section 18).

Late submission of assessments

17b.75 Students who do not submit assessments by the prescribed date will be penalised by a deduction of a percentage of the mark achieved as below.

17b.76 Penalties for late submission apply equally to full-time and part-time students. 'Days' refers to actual days, not working days.

17b.77 Cases of persistent late submission shall be brought to the attention of the board of examiners, which shall exercise its discretion to determine the student's final results.

Timescale	Penalty (%age)
Up to 1 day late [ie up to 24hours after the submission time/date, if a time was specified, or by 23.59hours on the day following the submission date if no time was specified.]	5% of final mark will be deducted e.g. 65 – 3 = **62**
2-5 days late	10% of final mark will be deducted e.g. 65 – 6.5 = **58.5** (**59** rounded)
6-10 days late	20% of final mark will be deducted e.g. 65 - 13 = **52**
More than 10 days late	Work will not be accepted and will be marked as **0**

Table 2: Late submission of assessment and the penalty to be applied

Word counts

17b.78 Assessments will normally have a word count set at the point of approval, with regard to the level of the module and its overall assessment load, and in line with the indicative guidance below. Programme teams are required to provide a rationale if they seek to vary significantly from the indicative guidance.

17b.79 Indicative word counts for total summative assessment load for a 20-credit point module are as follows:

SCQF Level	Word Count
SCQF Level 7	2500 to 3000 words
SCQF Level 8	3000 to 3500 words
SCQF Level 9	3500 to 4000 words
SCQF Level 10	4000 to 4500 words
SCQF Level 11	4500 to 5000 words

Table 3: Indicative word counts by SCQF level

17b.80 Word counts will normally include all text in the main body of the assignment, including headings, footnotes, tables, citations, quotes, lists. However, titles, table of contents, bibliographies, lists of references, appendices, indices will not normally be included in the word count.

17b.81 These word counts are intended to be a proxy guide to workload. Where summative assessment tasks include artefacts, pictorial, mathematical or other non-verbal output, programme teams will have to make judgements about how such output is to be mapped onto the word limits above. Similarly, where a module has a written examination as part or all of its assessment, this will need to be mapped onto the word count guidance. For example, a three-hour examination might be suitable if it was the sole form of summative assessment in a 20-credit point module; or a Level 7 module with two pieces of summative assessment might use a 1000-word assignment plus a one-hour examination. For work-based learning programmes, word count equivalency should accommodate the time and engagement required for work-based learning activities.

17b.82 Work which significantly exceeds the set word (or other equivalent such as time) count (i.e. by 10% or more) will normally be penalised by a deduction of a percentage of the mark achieved as follows (unless specified otherwise in the assessment brief):

Exceeding word/time (or other equivalent) count	Deduction (%age)
Exceeded by 11-20%	5% of final mark will be deducted e.g. 65 – 3 = **62**
Exceeded by 21-30%	10% of final mark will be deducted e.g. 65 – 6.5 = **58.5** (**59** rounded)
Exceeded by 31-40%	20% of final mark will be deducted e.g. 65 - 13 = **52**
Exceeded by 41-50%	30% of final mark will be deducted e.g. 65 – 19.5 = **45.5** (**46** rounded)
Exceeded by 51% or more	50% of final mark will be deducted e.g. 65 – 32.5 = **32.5** (**33** rounded)

Table 4: Exceeding the word count and penalties

17b.83 There is not normally a penalty for submitting work significantly under the word count; work will be assessed as normal against the marking criteria and learning outcomes.

Professional Standards and Fitness to Practise

17b.84
a. students on courses accredited by Professional, Statutory, and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs) are also subject to the PSRB's professional standards, which may include a Fitness to Practise Policy
b. serious professional misconduct constitutes grounds for referral to a Fitness to Practise Committee, which may lead to student dismissal from the programme if the student is deemed unfit to continue professional training
c. any breach of the Student Code of Conduct or relevant professional standards may be reported directly to the PSRB and/or trigger a Fitness to Practise procedure.

Academic misconduct

17b.85 Cases of suspected cheating or plagiarism shall be investigated according to the procedure as set out in Section 19.

Viva voce assessment

17b.86 The viva voce form of assessment may be used as an alternative or additional means of assessment in exceptional circumstances. It will be used only to raise or confirm, and not to lower, a student's marks.

Student academic appeals

17b.87 Appeals against the decisions of boards of examiners shall be subject to the university regulations as set out in the assessment appeals procedure in Section 18.

Electronic submission of assessments

17b.88 Where students are permitted or required to submit assessments electronically, they must use their university student account to do so.

Semester assessment

17b.89 Assessments of modules delivered in each semester shall be marked and internally moderated and students may be informed of the internally moderated marks. The final marks will be confirmed at the board of examiners which will involve external examiners.

Module assessment

17b.90 The minimum overall pass mark on each module is 40% (weighted average). Students must attempt all components of summative assessment; non-submission of any component of assessment will result in a fail mark for the module overall. In order to avoid over-assessment, module leaders are encouraged to limit the total number of components of assessment to a normal maximum of three (e.g. one exam and two pieces of coursework).

17b.91 A module may additionally, subject to approval, have one or more components of assessment which require a minimum mark of 30% in order to achieve a pass. This should always be on the basis that the assessment is linked to a specific learning outcome of the module and satisfactory acquisition of an essential skill or competency. Module leaders may also wish to consider mechanisms for marking such exercises as a straightforward pass or fail judgement with no formal grade carrying forward to the final module mark. Where any such minimum threshold requirement is made, students must be notified in the module descriptor and all related materials.

17b.92 Where a student is required to resit a particular assessment, it is recommended that this should normally take the form of a new piece of work, rather than resubmission of the original piece of work with revisions.

Module reassessment

17b.93 Where a student does not pass a module at the first attempt, they are entitled to one reassessment opportunity. This will normally take place within the same academic session. The maximum module mark that can be obtained at reassessment shall be 40%.

17b.94 The board of examiners will determine the nature, conditions and timing of the required reassessments. Normally, where a module is assessed by more than one component of assessment then any component(s) that have been passed will not require to be attempted again, and the original mark will stand. Boards of examiners shall not withhold permission for students to be reassessed for a module(s) without good cause.

17b.95 If a student fails to pass a module at SCQF Level 7-9 at the reassessment, the board of examiners may permit the student to repeat the module, as if studying it for the first time, for a second and final time.

17b.96 If a student fails to pass a module at SCQF Level 10 at the reassessment, the board of examiners may permit the student to repeat the module, for a second and final time, and the maximum module mark that can be obtained at the repeat shall be 40%.

17b.97 Students failing to achieve the minimum requirements for passing in any optional module at SCQF Level 10 may be permitted by the board of examiners to take an alternative optional module, subject to approval. In reaching a decision, the board will have regard for the availability of an appropriate module, and for the overall standard and integrity of the final award. The maximum module mark that can be obtained under these circumstances will be 40%. Students may normally only take one such alternative optional module.

Study abroad

17b.98 Students may seek to undertake a period of study abroad through an approved inter-institutional agreement supporting student mobility, and gain academic credit counting towards their award.

17b.99 Study abroad periods, and the student's proposed study at the host institution, must be approved by the Dean of Faculty (or nominee) prior to departure, and demonstrate sufficient equivalence with regard to credit volume and level and subject.

17b.100 Study abroad periods will only be approved where there is an existing inter-institutional exchange or study abroad agreement between the university and the host institution.

17b.101 Students will remain registered with the university during the study abroad period and are entitled to appropriate access to student support and academic advising.

Grading of credit

17b.102 Academic credit gained through a study abroad period will be ungraded, i.e. recorded as Pass / Fail, except where programme-specific exceptions have been approved relating to specific inter-institutional agreement(s).

17b.103 Academic credit gained through a study abroad period will not be included in degree classification calculations for Honours degrees, nor for the award of distinction for other awards (other than where programme-specific exceptions have been approved).

Limitations on volume of credit and timing

17b.104 Academic credit gained through a study abroad period may not contribute to SCQF Level 7.

17b.105 Academic credit gained through a study abroad period may not contribute to the final level of study of the undergraduate award for which the student is registered (except where programme-specific exceptions have been approved relating to specific inter-institutional agreement(s)). Thus, for students registered on an Honours degree or integrated Masters degree, credit may only be counted towards SCQF Level 8 or 9. For students registered on an ordinary degree, credit may only be counted towards SCQF Level 8.

17b.106 The total amount of credit gained through a recognised study abroad programme may not exceed 120 SCQF credit points towards an undergraduate award.

17b.107 For students registered on a Masters degree, credit may only be counted towards SCQF Level 11, and may not exceed 60 SCQF credit points of the 'taught' component of the award. Credit may not be counted towards intermediate awards of PGCert or PGDip.

Provisions for the progression of students

17b.108 These provisions apply to all full-time, sandwich and part-time programmes where the progression of students from one level to another is under consideration. References are made throughout the remainder of this section to the levels associated with the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF).

17b.109 For continuing students there is an expectation that outstanding debt should be cleared before commencing a further year of study (for full-time and structured part-time students semester to semester progression within academic year should not be subject to such constraint). See admissions and enrolment (16.55-16.58).

Progression from SCQF Level 7 to SCQF Level 8

17b.110 The requirement for progression from SCQF Level 7 to SCQF Level 8 is normally:

- a minimum of 40% in each of six modules or their equivalent (equating to 120 SCQF points of which a minimum of 100 must be at SCQF Level 7 or higher).

17b.111 Students failing to achieve the normal requirements for progression from Level 7 to Level 8 may nonetheless be permitted to progress, at the discretion of the board of examiners, while carrying forward up to 40 SCQF points. The board will take into account the extent and nature of the modules outstanding and decide, on all of the evidence available, whether the student has a reasonable chance of redeeming their position if progression

is permitted. In reaching its decision, the board will consider whether:

a. any outstanding modules are designated core
b. any outstanding modules are designated prerequisites to core modules in the next level
c. there are any PSRB accreditation requirements or programme-specific regulations regarding progression.

17b.112 Students failing to achieve the minimum requirements for passing in any optional module may be permitted by the board of examiners to take an alternative optional module as for the first time. In reaching a decision, the board will have regard for the overall objectives of the level. Students may normally only take one such alternative optional module in each level.

17b.113 In-programme assessments contributing to an award, or to progression, that are internally marked as fails, these will normally be resubmitted by a date fixed by the board of examiners. However, where prior agreement has been sought from the external examiners, a date prior to the meeting of the board of examiners can be fixed for the work to be resubmitted. The maximum mark that the student will be able to achieve for the module in question in such circumstances will be 40%.

Progression from SCQF Level 8 to SCQF Level 9

17b.114 The requirement for progression from SCQF Level 8 to SCQF Level 9 is normally:

- a minimum of 40% in each of an additional six modules or their equivalent (equating to 240 SCQF points of which a minimum of 100 must be at SCQF Level 8 or higher).

17b.115 Students failing to achieve the normal requirements for progression from Level 8 to Level 9 may nonetheless be permitted to progress, at the discretion of the board of examiners, while carrying forward up to 40 SCQF points. The board will take into account the extent and nature of the modules outstanding and decide, on all of the evidence available, whether the student has a reasonable chance of redeeming their position if progression is permitted. In reaching its decision, the board will consider whether:

a. any outstanding modules are designated core
b. any outstanding modules are designated prerequisites to core modules in the next level
c. there are any PSRB accreditation requirements or programme-specific regulations regarding progression.

17b.116 Students failing to achieve the minimum requirements for passing in any optional module may be permitted by the board of examiners to take an alternative optional module as for the first time. In reaching a decision, the board will have regard for the overall objectives of the level. Students may normally only take one such alternative optional module in each level.

17b.117 In-programme assessments contributing to an award, or to progression, that are internally marked as fails, these will normally be resubmitted by a date fixed by the board of examiners. However, where prior agreement has been sought from the external examiners, a date prior to the meeting of the board of examiners can be fixed for the work to be resubmitted. The maximum mark that the student will be able to achieve for the module in question in such circumstances will be 40%.

Progression from SCQF Level 9 to SCQF Level 10 (Honours)

17b.118 The requirement for progression from SCQF Level 9 to SCQF Level 10 is normally:

- a minimum of 40% in each of an additional six modules or their equivalent (equating to 360 SCQF points of which a minimum of 100 must be at SCQF Level 9 or higher).

17b.119 Students failing to achieve the normal requirements for progression from Level 9 to Level 10 may nonetheless be permitted to progress, at the discretion of the board of examiners, while carrying forward up to 40 SCQF points. The board will take into account the extent and nature of the modules outstanding and decide, on all of the evidence available, whether the student has a reasonable chance of redeeming their position if progression is permitted. In reaching its decision, the board will consider whether:

a. any outstanding modules are designated core
b. any outstanding modules are designated prerequisites to core modules in the next level
c. there are any PSRB accreditation requirements or programme-specific regulations regarding progression.

17b.120 Students failing to achieve the minimum requirements for passing in any optional module may be permitted by the board of examiners to take an alternative optional module as for the first time. In reaching a decision, the board will have regard for the overall objectives of the level. Students may normally only take one such alternative optional module in each level.

17b.121 In-programme assessments contributing to an award, or to progression, that are internally marked as fails, these will normally be resubmitted by a date fixed by the board of examiners. However, where prior agreement has been sought from the external examiners, a date prior to the meeting of the board of examiners can be fixed for the work to be resubmitted. The maximum mark that the student will be able to achieve for the module in question in such circumstances will be 40%.

Provisions for the conferment of final awards

17b.122 These provisions apply when students are being considered for the final award for which they have registered. In addition, Certificate or Diploma of Higher Education may be recommended by way of an exit award, even where these awards are not formally approved as part of the programme.

17b.123 Average (mean) mark will be calculated as a whole number, i.e. rounded down to the nearest whole number where the average mark is less than XX.5 and rounded up where the average mark is XX.5 or greater.

17b.124 Certificates and Diplomas of Higher Education will not be named (e.g. Cert HE in Mathematics) unless such a named award has been formally approved as part of the programme. This applies to final awards, and to both Aegrotat and posthumous degrees.

17b.125 The university reserves the right to withhold confirmation of a university award, including the release of transcripts, award certificates and any related documentation, until any

outstanding debt has been cleared, or the sum at issue has been consigned pending agreement, arbitration, or judicial hearing. See admissions and enrolment 16.58-16.61.

Certificate of Higher Education (CertHE)

17b.126 The minimum requirements for the award of a Certificate of Higher Education are normally:

a. a minimum of 40% in each of six modules or their equivalent at Level 7 (equating to 120 SCQF points at SCQF Level 7 or higher), and
b. satisfactory completion of any designated core modules.

Diploma of Higher Education (DipHE)

17b.127 The minimum requirements for the award of a Diploma of Higher Education are normally:

a. satisfactory completion of Level 7 of the programme, or its equivalent, and
b. satisfactory completion of any designated core modules, and
c. a minimum of 40% in each of six modules or their equivalent at Level 8, and
d. 240 SCQF points at SCQF Level 7 or higher, of which a minimum of 100 must be at SCQF Level 8 or higher.

Ordinary Degree

17b.128 The minimum requirements for the award of an Ordinary Degree are normally:

a. satisfactory completion of Levels 7 and 8 of the programme, or their equivalent
b. satisfactory completion of any designated core modules, and
c. a minimum of 40% in each of six modules or their equivalent at Level 9, and
d. 360 SCQF points at SCQF Level 7 or higher, of which a minimum of 100 must be at SCQF Level 9 or higher.

Distinction

17b.129 Students may be recommended for the award of Certificate of Higher Education, Diploma of Higher Education or degree with distinction if they attain an average mark of 70% on the relevant level of programme. [NB double modules are counted as two instances of the same mark.]

Honours degree

17b.130 The minimum requirements for the award of a degree with honours are normally:

a. satisfactory completion of Levels 7, 8 and 9 of the programme, or their equivalent
b. satisfactory completion of any designated core modules, and
c. a minimum of 40% in each of six modules or their equivalent studied during Level 10, and
d. 480 SCQF points at SCQF Level 7 or higher, of which a minimum of 200 must be at SCQF Levels 9 and 10, including at least 100 at Level 10
e. for Joint Honours, there should normally be equal balance in credits between two subjects.
f. if switching from Joint Honours to Single Honours, there should normally be an appropriate level of module credit in the subject chosen, meeting the requirements of the programme descriptor for that subject (or equivalent), which may require taking additional modules whereby standard module fees will apply.
g. if switching from Single Honours to Joint Honours, there should normally be equal balance in module credit between two subjects (or equivalent) to achieve the award,

which may require taking additional modules whereby standard module fees will apply.

17b.131 For all of the above awards, where credit has been achieved through prior completion for HN awards and recognised through RPL, QS units at SCQF Level 6 that formally constitute part of a named award completed by the student may contribute to the SCQF Level 7 credit requirements. No other credit below SCQF Level 7 should be counted towards a university award (see section 16.19-16.21).

Honours classification

17b.132 These regulations set out the minimum requirements normally expected of a student in each classification category. A board of examiners may exercise its discretion in making a classification decision where there are exceptional circumstances which may have affected a student's performance, and which have not already been taken into account while marking their assessed work. Such discretion may only be applied to raise a student's classification, not to lower it.

17b.133 Students will be awarded a first class honours degree if they achieve an average (mean) mark of 70% or more across all SCQF Level 10 credits.

17b.134 Students will be awarded an upper second class honours degree if they achieve an average (mean) mark between 60-69% across all SCQF Level 10 credits.

17b.135 Students will be awarded a lower second class honours degree if they achieve an average (mean) mark between 50-59% across all SCQF Level 10 credits.

17b.136 Students will be awarded a third class honours degree if they achieve an average (mean) mark between 40-49% across all SCQF Level 10 credits.

17b.137 Modules will be weighted according to their credit value, e.g. 40-credit modules will be counted as two instances of the same mark. If the student has completed more than 120 credits at Level 10, all module marks will be included in the mean mark calculation. If a student has completed only 100 credits at Level 10, the mean mark of **all** Level 9 modules will be calculated and included as the sixth mark. Any failed modules will be excluded from the mean mark calculation.

Double counting of credit

17b.138 Simultaneous double counting of credit for the same module towards degree awards is not permitted. Therefore, once credit has been counted towards one degree award, it cannot be used towards another degree award. In circumstances where exemptions cannot be granted, alternative modules should be selected on advice from the programme team. See Admissions regulations.

Conferment of intermediate awards

17b.139 These provisions apply when students are progressing from one level to the next and inter alia qualify for an intermediate award.

17b.140 Intermediate awards shall not normally be conferred on students proceeding to some

higher award.

17b.141 Students who fail to achieve the minimum requirements for an award shall be recommended for a lower award for which they have qualified.

Aegrotat awards

17b.142 When a board of examiners does not have enough evidence of a student's performance to be able to recommend the award for which the student was registered, or a lower award specified in the programme regulations, but is satisfied that, but for illness or other valid cause, the student would have reached the standard required, an Aegrotat award may be recommended.

17b.143 Aegrotat awards are not intended to be posthumous, and the student must have signified in writing that they are willing to accept the award and understands that this implies waiving the right to be reassessed. Where a student has died prior to completing an award, the regulations for posthumous awards should be followed.

17b.144 Aegrotat awards are, therefore, exit awards by definition and students must be clearly advised that temporary withdrawal from their studies may be a better option in some circumstances. Aegrotat awards should only be applied in cases where it is not anticipated that the student will be able to re-engage with study in a reasonable timeframe.

17b.145 In recommending an Aegrotat award, the board of examiners must assure themselves that, but for illness or other serious circumstances, the student would have completed the award. Students being recommended for an Aegrotat award must, therefore, have commenced study at the level at which the award will be made, and some assessed work must be available for review. Normally, it would be expected that the student would have completed at least a full semester's study at their level.

17b.146 Where an Aegrotat award is not supported by the board of examiners, the student should be recommended for an exit award at a lower level based on credit gained from studies undertaken at the university. This may be a recommendation for the awarding of a Certificate or Diploma of Higher Education, even where such awards are not formally a validated part of the programme of study.

17b.147 Aegrotat Ordinary degrees will not be recommended with merit or distinction.

17b.148 Aegrotat Honours degrees will be unclassified in all cases.

17b.149 Any recommendations for Aegrotat awards should be forwarded to the Deputy Principal immediately following the relevant board of examiners with a note of support from the relevant external examiners(s).

Posthumous awards

17b.150 These regulations apply in circumstances in which a posthumous award is to be made. The making of a posthumous award should not be confused with the making of an award

posthumously, ie to a candidate who has died after qualifying for, but before admission to, the award. In the latter case, the award will not be distinguished in any way from those given to other graduates.

17b.151 Posthumous awards will include the words 'has been admitted to the posthumous degree / award of…'. No distinguishing wording is included on certificates issued to graduands who, having completed the usual requirements and having qualified for the award, die before admission to their award.

Overview

17b.152 A board of examiners should consider the specific regulations below for the award in question before recommending the award of a posthumous degree, diploma or certificate, and should take into consideration any other evidence to support a posthumous award, including the possible impact of mitigating circumstances, the candidate's level of commitment and participation, and the quality of work submitted by the candidate prior to death.

17b.153 Where it is not possible to award a posthumous degree, diploma or certificate for which the candidate was enrolled because there is insufficient evidence to support doing so, an alternative lower level award should be considered as described in the paragraphs below, irrespective of whether that lower level award had been approved at validation for the programme in question.

17b.154 Where a student was registered for an QS award, or in any other case where it is not permitted by an external validating or professional body to award posthumously the qualification, or one of its exit awards, for which the candidate was enrolled, a board of examiners may consider an alternative award at an equivalent level of achievement.

17b.155 A written proposal for any posthumous award should be directed to the Deputy Principal immediately following the relevant board of examiners with a note of support from the relevant external examiners(s).

Undergraduate awards

17b.156 A board of examiners may recommend that a posthumous degree, diploma or certificate be awarded, provided that the candidate has (i) progressed into, or been admitted directly to, the relevant year of study for that award and (ii) has completed at least 60 credits at the relevant SCQF Level, i.e.:

- 60 credits or more at SCQF Level 7 or above must have been completed for recommendation of a posthumous Certificate of Higher Education
- 180 credits or more at SCQF Level 7 and above, including not fewer than 60 credits at SCQF Level 8, must have been completed for recommendation of a posthumous Diploma of Higher Education
- 300 credits or more at SCQF Level 7 and above, including at least 100 credits at SCQF Level 8 and at least 60 credits at SCQF Level 9, must have been completed for recommendation of an Ordinary degree
- 420 credits or more at SCQF Level 7 and above, including at least 100 credits at SCQF Level 8, at least 60 credits at SCQF Level 9 and at least 60 credits at SCQF Level 10, must have been completed for recommendation of an Honours degree.

17b.157 A board of examiners may use discretion in whether to recommend an Ordinary degree with distinction. There should be a clear indication in the student's completed module results that such a recommendation is appropriate. Where a board of examiners wishes to request an award with distinction, they should forward a detailed request to the Deputy Principal outlining the basis for the request.

17b.158 Posthumous Honours degree will normally be recorded as unclassified unless there is clear evidence to allow confident assessment of the likely degree class had the student completed the programme. Where a board of examiners wishes to request such classification, they should forward a detailed request to the Deputy Principal outlining the basis for the request.

17b.159 A board of examiners may consider recommending the award of a Certificate or Diploma of Higher Education, even if this award has not been approved at validation for the programme in question, and providing that this lower level award is based on credit gained from studies undertaken at the university.

17b.160 Certificates and diplomas may also be recommended in the case of students who had been studying on QS programmes, including HNC, HND or PDA awards. In these cases, the principles of credit accumulation outlined above should be applied to credit from any QS units completed.

Taught Masters programmes - postgraduate certificate and diplomas

17b.161 A board of examiners may recommend that a posthumous postgraduate certificate or diploma be awarded, provided that the candidate has achieved no fewer than two-thirds of the credits required.

17b.162 A board of examiners may consider recommending the award of a postgraduate certificate, even if this award has not been approved at validation for the programme in question, where it is not possible to award the postgraduate diploma.

17b.163 A board of examiners may use discretion in deciding whether to recommend the award of a postgraduate diploma with either merit or distinction.

Taught Masters programmes - modular Masters degrees by examination and dissertation

17b.164 A Board of Examiners may recommend the award of a posthumous postgraduate diploma to a candidate registered on a full taught Masters programme who has died:

(i) before successful completion of the taught element (typically represented by the postgraduate diploma exit point), but after having achieved no fewer than two-thirds of the credits require to complete successfully the taught element

(ii) before commencing the dissertation phase of the award, but after successful completed of the taught element.

17b.165 A board of examiners may recommend that a posthumous Masters degree be awarded to a candidate on the dissertation phase of a Masters programme, who has died prior to the submission of a dissertation, provided that the following criteria are satisfied:

(i) enough of the research project must have been completed to allow a proper assessment to be made of the scope of the dissertation

(ii) the standard of research work completed must be of that standard normally required for the award of a Masters degree in question, and must demonstrate the candidate's grasp of the subject
(iii) any written work available (e.g. draft chapters, work published or prepared for publication, presentations, progress reports) must demonstrate the candidate's ability to write a dissertation of the required standard.

17b.166 The board of examiners must be provided by the candidate's supervisor, with evidence of the research work completed, draft chapters etc. The supervisor shall also submit a report for consideration by the examiners.

17b.167 A board of examiners may use discretion in deciding the grade for the dissertation and whether to award the Masters degree overall with Distinction.