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GLOSSARY

Course of study
A specified set of modules/subjects leading to an award.

Tutor reassessment
Opportunity offered to a candidate who, having failed to achieve a mark of 40% in any assessment other than formal examination, may elect on a single occasion for each element of such assessment, to rework and resubmit the piece of assessment in-year. The maximum mark available for an in-year resubmission is the standard pass mark for that piece of assessment.

Pass (module)
Recorded when a student achieves the minimum pass mark for a module.

Deferred (module)
Recorded when either:
  a student has failed to achieve a pass mark in a module and has submitted recognised extenuating circumstances

or

  a student has achieved a pass mark in a module and has submitted recognised extenuating circumstances against a mark of 0NS for an element of assessment as defined in the module specification document

Deferral allows a student to repeat the affected element(s) of assessment for the maximum mark available (if taking the assessment for the first time, the mark awarded for the piece of assessment and the module will be the mark achieved; if taking the assessment or the module for a second time, the mark awarded for the piece of assessment will be the mark achieved and the maximum mark awarded for the module will be the standard module pass mark).

Condonement
Recorded when a student has failed to achieve a pass mark in an eligible module but satisfies the identified criteria. The mark achieved is recorded but the credit for the module is granted without the student having to make good the failed elements of assessment for that module.

Referred
Recorded at the point of first consideration by a CAB when a student has achieved an overall mark within the specified referral range for a module which is not eligible for condonement. Referral allows a student to repeat the failed elements of assessment with the overall module mark being capped at the standard pass mark.

Fail (module): Undergraduate
Recorded when a student has achieved a mark of 39% or below for a module at the point of second consideration by the Assessment Board.

Fail (module): Postgraduate
Recorded when a student has achieved a mark below the specified referral range for a module at the point of first consideration by the Assessment Board or a mark below the specified pass mark at the point of second consideration by the Assessment Board.
Pend
Recorded for a module where information is outstanding.

May progress
Recorded when a student has met the minimum criteria for progression between stages.

May not progress (decision postponed)
Recorded when a student profile is incomplete because decisions on modules are awaited pending the outcome of referral or deferral opportunities being retrieved in the subsequent academic session

May not progress (repeat year)
Recorded when a student has not met the minimum criteria for progression but has achieved the minimum criteria to remain a current student but is repeating modules in the subsequent academic session

Decision postponed
Recorded when a student's profile is incomplete because decisions on modules are awaited pending the outcome of referrals or deferrals.

Fail (course)
Recorded when a student is not able to progress having exhausted his/her rights of re-assessment or module substitution or when a student does not satisfy the minimum criteria to be eligible to continue on his/her course.

Accumulated failure
A module which has been taken and failed on two occasions is deemed to be an accumulated failure. Students who accrue a total of 60 credits of accumulated failure at undergraduate level or 30 credits of accumulated failure at postgraduate level lose their right to count their existing credits towards any award on which they are currently registered.

A student who fails a core module on two occasions may be barred from progressing irrespective of the number of accumulated failed credits.

A student who has failed to again any academic credit in two consecutive sessions will have their registration terminated.

Trailing module
A module being taken by a student which he/she failed in a previous session.

Initial re-assessment
Having taken and failed a module, a student may take the module for a second time – this is classed as an initial re-assessment.

Substitute module
A module chosen by a student to replace an optional module which he/she has failed at the first attempt. The mark awarded for a substitute module is the mark achieved. The module which is not retrieved is deemed to be an accumulated failure.

Stage of Assessment
120 credits which would normally be deemed to constitute one year of full-time undergraduate study as defined in the Programme Specification Document (excluding any trailed modules) or 180 credits which would normally be deemed to constitute one year of full-time postgraduate study.

**End assessment**
Used when referring collectively to the submission of a thesis and any accompanying documentation and/or material and, where relevant, the oral examination, for the award of a postgraduate research degree.

**Terminology for credit levels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Huddersfield</th>
<th>FHEQ Level</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D (postgraduate)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Doctoral level [eg PhD/Professional Doctorate]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (postgraduate)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Master’s level [eg MA/MSc/Integrated Master’s degrees]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H (undergraduate)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Honours level [eg BA (Hons)/BSc (Hons)/LLB (Hons)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S (undergraduate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervised Work Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (undergraduate)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Intermediate level [eg DipHE/FD/HND]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (undergraduate)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Foundation level [eg CertHE/HNC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (undergraduate)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pre-foundation level [eg IFY/Science Foundation Year]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION F - THE ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS ON COURSES OF STUDY

F.1; General principles

F1.1; Course outcomes

The purpose of assessment is to enable students to demonstrate that they have addressed the learning outcomes of the course of study and achieved the standard required for the award they seek. All courses of study are subject to regulations which relate the assessment requirements of the course to its learning outcomes, and it is within these assessment regulations that examiners make their judgements on student performance.

F1.2; Grading scales

The following module grading scales and award classification bands shall apply in connection with the grading of modules and the determination of award classifications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate modules</th>
<th>Postgraduate modules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honours awards</td>
<td>Non-Honours awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer</td>
<td>0-39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Module Grading Bands**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>70% +</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>60-69%</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>50-59%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>40-49%</th>
<th>R/F*</th>
<th>0-39%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>70% +</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>70% +</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>70% +</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>70% +</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>70% +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>50-59%</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>50-59%</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>50-59%</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>50-59%</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>50-59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>40-49%</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>40-49%</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>40-49%</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>40-49%</td>
<td>R***</td>
<td>35-49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/F*</td>
<td>0-39%</td>
<td>R/F*</td>
<td>0-39%</td>
<td>R/F**</td>
<td>30-39%</td>
<td>F***</td>
<td>0-49%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F**</td>
<td>0-39%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Award Classification Bands**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>69.5%</th>
<th>2:1</th>
<th>59.5%</th>
<th>2:2</th>
<th>49.5%</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>40%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>Distinction</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>Distinction</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>Distinction</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>Distinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>Merit</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>Merit</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>Merit</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Initial CAB consideration allows referral between 0% and 39%
CAB consideration following referral will conclude fail between 0 and 39%

** Initial CAB consideration allows referral between 30% and 39%
CAB consideration following referral will conclude fail between 0 and 39%

*** Initial CAB consideration allows referral between 35% and 49%
CAB consideration following referral will conclude fail between 0 and 49%

**F1.3; Confirmation of standard**

Assessment must reflect the achievement of the individual student in addressing course learning outcomes, and at the same time relate that achievement to a consistent national standard of awards. It must therefore be carried out by competent and impartial examiners, and by methods which enable them to assess students fairly. In order to achieve this end, External Examiners must be associated with all assessments which may count towards an award; their particular role is to ensure that the standard of awards is maintained.

**F1.4; Examiners’ judgement**

Assessment is a matter of judgement, not simply of computation. Marks, grades and percentages are not absolute values but symbols used by examiners to communicate their judgement of different aspects of a student’s work, in order to provide information on which the final decision on a student’s fulfilment of course learning outcomes may be based. It is particularly important for students to understand the nature of examiners’ discretion and judgement when details of individual marks are available to them.

Within the constraints imposed by the requirements of **F1** and subject to guidance issued by the Senate, examiners have discretion in reaching decisions on the awards to be recommended for individual candidates. They are responsible for interpreting the assessment regulations for the course if any difficulties arise, and their academic judgements cannot, in themselves, be questioned or overturned.

**F1.5; Moderation and Marking**

The University believes that second or blind double marking is an example of best practice, but recognises that, for practical reasons, the single marking or the team marking of a piece of assessment will be the norm for the majority of scripts unless there are reasonable grounds, in the opinion of the course leader, for either second or blind double marking to take place.

In cases where a module of 40 credits or more is assessed by a single piece of assessment, unless the process has involved a model of collaborative marking, it is considered good practice to apply either second or blind double marking.

Moderation as outlined below should take place such that the assessment processes for the work of a minimum of 15% of the student cohort or 10 students (whichever is the greater but normally not more than 30 students) normally covering high, medium, low attainment and failed assessments should be made available to the External Examiner. It is expected that where multiple markers have been used across a cohort of submissions that the sample size normally includes assessments moderated by all markers who contributed.

A pro-forma for this moderation should be used and kept as evidence for the process having been undertaken.
F1.5.1; Moderation

For each delivery of a module, the module leader is required to ensure that it can be demonstrated that the assessment for that cohort has been subject to the appropriate moderation. This must include evidence that those responsible for moderation have confirmed their satisfaction with the standards and processes applied to the assessment of that delivery.

It is an activity which allows an academic not involved in the initial assessment to confirm that:

a) the marking has been undertaken appropriately against the assessment criteria
b) the marking was fair, valid and reliable
c) appropriate feedback has been provided
d) standards have been consistently and appropriately applied for the level of study being assessed.

It is not a further mark of the piece of work in question.

Disagreements with the standard applied are referred back to the initial marker for review. If the matter cannot be reconciled between the two, a separate sample is identified for moderation by a third member of academic staff.

F1.5.2; Single marking

Single Marking is an activity where a piece of assessment is marked in its entirety for the whole cohort by a single member of academic staff.

Work which has been single marked will still be subject to the moderation process.

F1.5.3; Team Marking

Team Marking is an activity where a piece of assessment is marked by a team of markers amongst whom responsibility for the marking of the assessment has been distributed. Team marking may refer to distribution by groupings of students (so that a member of academic staff marks the entire assessment for an identified subgroup of students) or by elements of the assessment (for example tutor A marks all of question 1 for all students while Tutor B marks all of question 2 for all students) – or a combination of the two.

Work which has been team marked will still be subject to the moderation process which should ensure that marked work from all markers is included in the sample to be moderated.

F1.5.4; Blind Double Marking

Blind Double Marking is an activity where two markers mark independently with no knowledge of the other’s marks or comments. Discrepancies in the mark allocated are reconciled between the two markers after the initial marking is complete.

Work which has been double marked will still be subject to the moderation process.
F1.5.5; Second Marking

Second Marking is an activity where the second marker marks the work in full with sight of the first marker’s marks/comments. Discrepancies in the mark allocated are reconciled between the two markers after the initial marking is complete.

Work which has been second marked will still be subject to the moderation process.

F1.5.6; Collaborative Marking

Collaborative Marking is an activity where an initial unconfirmed mark for a piece of assessment is reached through discussion between two or more markers.

Work which has been collaboratively marked will still be subject to the moderation process.

F1.5.7; Sight by an external examiner

A sampling of the assessment process of 15% or 10 students (whichever is the greater but normally not more than 30 students) normally covering high, medium and low attainment and failed assessments should be made available to the External Examiner. It is expected that where multiple markers have been used across a cohort of submissions that the sample size normally includes assessments moderated by all markers who contributed. A pro-forma for this moderation should be used and kept as evidence for the process having been undertaken. This applies irrespective of whether second or double marking has taken place.

For each delivery of a module at post-Foundation level, the module leader is required to ensure that it can be demonstrated that the assessment process for that cohort has been subject to appropriate scrutiny by an External Examiner. The purpose of engagement with the External Examiner is to allow him/her appropriate opportunity to confirm satisfaction with the standards and processes applied to the overall assessment of that delivery - the External Examiner has no responsibility to reach or review decisions on individual pieces of work.

Work presented for sight by the EE must have been part of the internal moderation sample. The role of the EE is not to mark or adjudicate on individual pieces of assessment; it is to confirm independently that processes have been followed with consistent application of standards that are typical of the sector as a whole.

F1.6; Information for students

The University will ensure that the assessment requirements for courses of study are made known to students. The assessment scheme of an individual course of study is subject to both institution-wide regulations and regulations specific to that course, and students will be made aware of the detailed requirements of both sets of regulations.

The University will make available to students information about the grounds on which they may request that Assessment Boards be asked to review their decisions and about the arrangements for dealing with any such requests.
F1.7; Responsibilities of students

It is the responsibility of students to attend examinations and submit work for assessment by the agreed submission date and to provide the examiners in advance of their meeting with any relevant information on personal circumstances which may have affected performance and which they wish the examiners to take into account. By attending the examination, a student is confirming that he or she is fit to undertake that examination.

If a student fails to attend examinations or submit work for assessment without good cause, the examiners have authority to deem the student to have failed the assessments concerned. The submission of work is receipted. In cases of dispute over submission, claims by students to have submitted work will only be considered in cases where the student provides a copy of the receipt to demonstrate submission.

Assessed work which is submitted late but within five working days of the agreed submission date will be accepted and the maximum mark available for that piece of assessment will be the standard pass mark for that piece of assessment. This facility does not apply to the submission of assessed work relating to Tutor Reassessment, referral or deferral requirements but does apply to previously agreed extended or renegotiated deadlines.

If a student fails, without good cause, to provide the examiners in advance of their meeting with information about any personal circumstances that may have affected performance in assessments, the Senate or other body authorised by it to consider appeals against an examiner's decision has authority to reject the appeal on those grounds.

If a student is found to have cheated or acted in a way which may have resulted in an unfair advantage, the Academic Integrity Officer, Deputy Academic Integrity Officer and the Academic Integrity Committee have authority to deem the student to have failed part or all of the assessments and the authority to determine whether or not the student shall be permitted to be reassessed.

F1.8; Extenuating Circumstances

Where a student has failed to secure a pass mark for the module(s) concerned, remedial action is to permit another attempt at the assessment(s) for which an EC claim has been approved. The results of this reassessment will be considered at the next scheduled Course Assessment Board.

Where the student has secured a pass in the module(s) concerned but has not submitted work for one or more element(s) of assessment (as defined in the module specification) for which an EC claim has been approved, remedial action for this/these element(s) of assessment is to permit another attempt at the assessment(s) concerned. The results of this reassessment will be considered at the next scheduled Course Assessment Board. No further discretion will be applied against this/these element(s) of assessment.

Where the student has secured a pass in the module(s) concerned and has submitted work for one or more element(s) of assessment (as defined in the module specification) for which an EC claim has been approved, remedial action for this/these element(s) of assessment will be for the Course Assessment Board to take the approved EC claim into account when deciding a candidate's classification in accordance with University
Submission against an element of assessment includes either partial or full submission. No further attempts at this/these element(s) of assessment will be granted.

If a student suffers from a short-term illness or experiences serious personal difficulties which warrant a request for an extension of course work submission dates, he or she must submit a written request for such an extension as soon as possible and no later than two working days after the agreed submission date (other than in exceptional circumstances agreed by the Course Assessment Board). Extensions cannot be applied to deadlines set for Tutor Reassessment or work that has been formally referred or deferred by an Assessment Board.

Students who wish to claim that either

a) failure to attend an examination, or
b) failure to submit work by the agreed submission or extension date, or

was due to illness or other extenuating circumstances must make such a claim in writing within five working days of the submission or examination date. The written claim must be submitted to the School Office of the School responsible for the course.

The claims that are submitted will first be considered by the Extenuating Circumstances Panel. That panel will consider the claims and submit its decisions to the Course Assessment Board.

F2; REGULATIONS GOVERNING ASSESSMENT IN THE CREDIT ACCUMULATION AND TRANSFER SCHEME (CATS)

F2.1; The award of credit

Candidates are awarded credit at an appropriate Course Assessment Board for each module that they pass, including a condoned pass. Where a student is an associate student and is not linked to a named course, Schools must make arrangements to assign responsibility for the award of credit to such students to an appropriate Course Assessment Board.

Candidates are not normally permitted to retake a module or component of assessment which they have passed with a view to obtaining a higher mark.

F2.2; Graded and non-graded modules

Each module must have the status either of being graded or of being non-graded.

All Honours level modules contributing to a classified award must be graded. A maximum of 40 Intermediate level credits may be ungraded. An exception to this rule will be permitted in the case of existing ungraded placement Intermediate level modules.

Candidates who obtain the minimum pass mark or more on a graded module will be deemed to have passed that module, unless additional criteria have been explicitly approved as part of the validated module specification. Candidates studying health or social work related modules with a professional practice component, and for which
Professional and Statutory Bodies have set a requirement that these be passed the following rule will apply:

a) Where the theory and practice components reach the minimum pass mark or above and the practice element has been passed, the credit will be awarded with the appropriate full mark and grade;

b) Where the theory component reaches the minimum pass mark or above and the practice component has been referred the credit will not be awarded until the practice component has been passed and the full theory mark and grade will be awarded.

c) Where the theory component is referred and the practice component has been passed the credit will not be awarded until the theory component has been passed, and the mark and grade will be capped at 40% the minimum pass mark.

d) Where either the practice and/or theory component is failed after referral the standard University regulations for retaking modules will apply or the mark and grade will be capped at the minimum pass mark.

F2.3 Tutor re-assessment, Condonement, Referral, and Failure

The decision as to whether the result should be declared as deferred, referred, condoned or failed lies with the Course Assessment Board. These decisions apply to graded and ungraded modules. The nature of the assessment to retrieve a referred or deferred module is at the discretion of the Assessment Board and may reflect whether or not the student submitted the original attempt. The maximum mark available for a graded module following referral is the minimum pass mark.

Subject to the provisions of F1.7, if a student fails to attend an examination or to submit assessed work by the agreed submission date (after allowing for any extension that might have been granted) the Course Assessment Board will record a mark of zero, leading to failure in that examination or assessed work, unless it is satisfied that there are good grounds for treating the student differently.

In calculating the mark for a module following a referral or deferral, the higher of the marks achieved for each element of assessment will be the mark used in the calculation of the overall mark.

Assessments other than formal examinations and end assessments as identified in the Assessment and Feedback Strategy should be marked and made available for return to candidates within three term-time weeks of the submission date – in cases of extensions or renegotiated deadlines, the return date should be within three term-time weeks of the revised submission date.

Other than in the case of a Tutor Re-assessment, deferred or referred work can only be considered after the initial result has been formally published as a deferral or referral by a Course Assessment Board. Assessment of deferred or referred modules must be completed by a standard time as specified in the University’s assessment timetable published by the Head of Registry. Where a candidate is deferred or referred in a pre-requisite module the work should normally be assessed before the candidate starts the post-requisite module. Where a piece of work submitted for Tutor Re-assessment attains
a mark less than the minimum pass mark and the candidate’s overall mark for the module is less than the minimum pass mark, the Course Assessment Board will follow the regulations set out in F2.3.

F2.3.1; Tutor Reassessment

Tutor Re-assessment is where a candidate is given the opportunity to resubmit once a piece of work and for it to be re-marked prior to the meeting of the Course Assessment Board at which the module is to be considered. In calculating the mark for a module following a Tutor Re-assessment, the higher of the marks achieved for the assessment will be the mark used in the calculation of the overall module mark. Tutor Reassessment is not available for formal examinations but may be available for in-class tests.

A Tutor Re-assessment may only be applied when:

a) A candidate achieves a mark within the specified referral range in an assessment which is conducted under coursework protocols;

b) It is possible for the candidate to complete the work and for it to be marked and moderated before the Assessment Board meets.

A Tutor Re-assessment will not normally be offered to a candidate who fails to submit a piece of work for the original assessment.

The maximum mark for a successful Tutor Re-assessment will be the minimum pass mark. An EC claim cannot be submitted for an assessment that has been offered as a Tutor Reassessment.

F2.3.2; Condonement of a module

Condonement is not permitted on ungraded modules or pre-foundation modules or awards.

In all cases where a module has been condoned, the credit for the module will be awarded, and the actual mark achieved will be recorded.

Where a module has been condoned, the module will be accepted as a prerequisite for subsequent relevant modules.

Candidates on undergraduate awards who at any point in their studies fail to achieve a pass in a single 20 credit module or a single 30 credit module or in two 10 credit modules but who have passed all other modules in that level of award (i.e. Foundation, Intermediate or Honours level) will be awarded a condoned pass in the module(s) in question provided that:

a) the mark achieved in the module(s) in question is in the range of 30% to 39%

b) the module has not been identified as compulsory for that course

c) the candidate has achieved the learning outcomes, educational aims and all other modules of the level as a whole

d) the student would otherwise have been referred, remained referred (through deferral) or failed the module in question
e) the overall average achieved by the candidate for all modules at that level exceeds 40%

f) the module is not currently subject to a proven allegation that the student has failed to abide by the academic integrity regulations

g) the total condoned credits for the candidate do not exceed 60 credits across a 360 credit honours award (pro rata for awards of fewer credits)

Candidates on postgraduate awards who at any point in their studies fail to achieve a pass in a single module, which does not exceed 30-credits or two 15-credit modules, but who have passed all other modules will be awarded a condoned pass in the module/s in question provided that:

a) the overall mark achieved in the module(s) in question is in the range of 45% to 49%
b) the module has not been identified as compulsory for that course
c) the candidate has achieved the learning outcomes and educational aims
d) the student would otherwise have been referred, remained referred (through deferral) or failed the module in question
e) the overall average achieved by the candidate for all modules at that level exceeds 50%
f) the module is not currently subject to a proven allegation that the student has failed to abide by the academic integrity regulations

h) the module does not form part of a ‘top-up’ stage

j) the module does not incorporate the major project or dissertation

k) there are not any professional body requirements preventing condonement

l) the module does not incorporate the major project or dissertation

Condoned modules should not be used as APL.

**Note**: Core modules are modules available for condonement. Compulsory modules cannot be condoned.

**F2.3.3; Referral in a module**

Candidates who achieve an overall mark within the specified referral range in a graded module or who fail to secure a pass in an ungraded module will normally be referred by the Course Assessment Board in the first instance, unless the module has satisfied the condonement criteria in section **F2.3.2**. The maximum mark available for a graded module following referral will be the minimum pass mark.

**F2.3.4; Approved referral**

Subject to the provisions of **F2.3**, candidates on a postgraduate module who achieve an overall mark below the specified referral range will normally be failed by the Course Assessment Board. In the light of a candidate’s good overall performance, a Course Assessment Board may require that a candidate who has achieved a mark below the specified referral range in the first instance should be referred provided that:

a) the module in question has not been identified as ‘not open for Approved Referral’
b) the module in question carries a value of 30 credits or below
c) the profile of Approved Referral for an individual student does not exceed a total of 30 credits across the 180 of a full MA/MSc (pro rata for PGDip or PGCert or other), or
30 credits across the 120 M level credits within the M level stage of an integrated masters award

d) the student’s profile to date does not include a breach of the academic integrity regulations at master’s level

e) all other modules taken to date on the course have been passed at a minimum of the specified pass mark plus 10%

This should be recorded as an Approved Referral. The nature of the re-assessment is at the discretion of the Course Assessment Board. The maximum mark available for the module following approved referral is the minimum pass mark.

**F2.3.5; Failure in a module**

Subject to the provisions of F1.7, candidates who fail to achieve the specified pass mark in a graded module or who fail to secure a pass in an ungraded module will normally be failed by the Course Assessment Board in the second instance, unless the module has satisfied the condonement criteria in section F2.3.2. The maximum mark available for a graded module taken for the second time is the minimum pass mark.

**F2.4; Nature of reassessment following an initial failure in a module**

Subject to the provisions of F2.3.3, where a candidate fails an undergraduate module, the nature of the assessment to retrieve a failed module is normally the re-submission in the subsequent academic session of the component(s) of assessment in which the candidate has failed to secure a pass. The maximum mark available for a graded module taken for the second time is the minimum pass mark.

Subject to the provisions of F2.2, where a candidate fails a postgraduate module the candidate will have to undertake a new and different full set of assessment activities, normally when the module is next offered in a subsequent academic session. The maximum mark available for a graded module taken for the second time is the minimum pass mark.

Exceptionally and for postgraduate dissertation or postgraduate project modules only, an Assessment Board may require a candidate who has failed a dissertation or project module to rework the original assessment rather than undertake a new and different assessment. The maximum mark available for a module taken for a second time is the minimum pass mark.

**F2.5; Progression**

**F2.5.1; Full-time undergraduate awards**

At all times, progression shall be subject to the provision that it is still possible for the candidate to complete the course within the maximum specified period.

Candidates at the point of initial consideration by the Assessment Board shall have the right to be referred in any module where credit has not been awarded.

Candidates at the point of initial consideration by the Assessment Board who have been awarded a total of 120 credits for the current stage of assessment may progress.
Progression decisions for all other candidates at the point of initial consideration by the Assessment Board will be deferred pending the outcome of referral assessments.

Candidates at the point of second consideration or subsequent by the Assessment Board who have been awarded a total of 120 credits for the current stage of assessment may progress.

Candidates at the point of second consideration or subsequent by the Assessment Board who have been awarded a minimum total of 90 credits for the current stage of assessment may progress with any failed modules to be retrieved in the subsequent session.

Candidates at the point of second or subsequent consideration by the Assessment Board who have been awarded a total of 80 credits for the current stage of assessment may progress with a failed module to be retrieved in the subsequent session provided that the failed 40 credits is a single module in which the candidate has achieved a minimum overall mark of 30%.

Candidates at the point of second or subsequent consideration by the Assessment Board who have been awarded a total of 80 credits for the current stage of assessment may progress with incomplete modules to be retrieved in the subsequent session provided that the profile of incomplete modules includes a decision of deferral (from either the first or second instance of consideration by the Assessment Board).

Candidates at the point of second or subsequent consideration by the Assessment Board who have been awarded at least 50 credits for the current stage of assessment but who do not fall into one of the categories outlined in the three points above may not progress but will be permitted to return in the subsequent session to retrieve failed modules.

Candidates at the point of second consideration or subsequent by the Assessment Board who have been awarded 40 or fewer credits for the current stage of assessment shall be deemed to have failed the course and lose any opportunity for further reassessment.

F2.5.2; Part-time undergraduate

Candidates shall be subject to the same progression principles outlined above, taking account of the maximum number of credits permitted for registration by a part-time candidate.

F2.5.3; All awards

Subject to relevant progression regulations, candidates at whatever point in their course of study shall have the right, following a first failure, to repeat and be reassessed once only (including, where appropriate, Tutor Reassessment and referral) in the failed module, provided that it is still possible to complete the course within the maximum specified period.

Candidates may, following a first failure in an optional module (and in accordance with the appropriate course regulations), choose to substitute a different optional module in preference to exercising their entitlement to reassessment. For the purpose of these regulations, such modules will be termed substituted modules. Candidates who elect to
study substituted modules will not be capped at the minimum pass mark upon successful completion of the substituted module but will, in so doing, sacrifice their entitlement to a second attempt in their failed module(s).

Timing of initial reassessments of failed modules
A second attempt at a failed module will normally take place in the subsequent session or in the case of postgraduate awards, when the module is next offered.

Subject to the provisions of F2.2, in graded modules, the grade awarded for the module on reassessment should be no higher than the minimum pass mark regardless of the actual grade achieved. The candidate’s transcript will record the grade awarded on the second attempt of the module.

Failure to achieve an award
a) Candidates who, after exercising their entitlement to a second attempt at a failed module, fail to achieve a pass in undergraduate modules totalling 60 credit points at any level or combination of levels, shall normally lose their right to count their existing credits towards any award on which they are enrolled and for which they have not yet become eligible.

b) Candidates who, after exercising their entitlement to a second attempt at a failed module, fail to achieve a pass in modules totalling 30 credit points at postgraduate level, shall normally lose their right to count their existing credits towards any award on which they are enrolled and for which they have not yet become eligible.

c) A candidate’s registration for an award of the University will be terminated if two academic years (including standard resit periods) elapse without the award of credit. The Assessment Board will confer any interim award to which the student is entitled.

F2.6; Subsequent reassessment of modules following a second failure in a module

Exceptionally and with the approval of the relevant Course Assessment Board, a candidate may be permitted, following failure in a second attempt at a failed module, to undertake a third attempt at the module in question. This does not apply to modules on some professional courses.

Where a candidate has failed a second attempt at a core or compulsory module, the relevant Course Assessment Board may refuse an application for a third attempt even though the candidate has not yet reached the limits of failure laid down in F2.5.3.

F2.7; Changed modules

F2.7.1; Undergraduate awards
Module assessment requirements may change from year to year. An undergraduate candidate who is undertaking a module for a second time should normally expect to be assessed using the same evidence and criteria which were current at the point of assessment on the first attempt. In cases where it is not practicable for candidates to be reassessed using the same assessment requirements as at the first attempt, the
appropriate assessment board may, at its discretion, make such special arrangement as it deems appropriate.

**F2.7.2; Postgraduate awards**

A candidate who is undertaking a module for a second time may not demand reassessment using evidence and criteria which are no longer current in the module. The appropriate assessment board may, at its discretion, make such special arrangement as it deems appropriate in cases where it is not practicable for candidates to be reassessed using the same assessment requirements as at the first attempt.

**F2.8; Registration for modules**

Full-time undergraduate students will normally register for tuition in no more than 120 credit points each year. Full-time postgraduate students will normally register for tuition in no more than 180 credits.

Full-time students shall be progressed from one stage to the next provided 90 credit points have been recorded in the earlier stage.

In exceptional circumstances, at the discretion of the Course Assessment Board, a student may be registered for tuition in 160 credit points.

Part-time undergraduate students will normally register for tuition in no more than 80 credit points per academic session except at the explicit and recorded discretion of the Course Assessment Board. Part-time postgraduate students will normally register for tuition in no more than 90 credit points per academic session.

The responsibility for ensuring that module choices have been made and correctly recorded rests with the student.

The Head of Registry will publish an annual timetable by which continuing and new students must record their modules for the academic session.

Students do not have the right to change their module choices. Exceptionally, a student may be allowed to change up to the end of the third week of the academic session. However, to make such exceptional module changes, the student will need to obtain the express permission of the course leader and to complete all the necessary paperwork. Students must note that any agreed change(s) can only be accommodated within the timetable slot(s) as originally allocated.

A student is entitled to be assessed only in those modules on which he or she is formally enrolled. If a student changes modules without seeking approval and/or without changing registration, any work in connection with such module(s) will not be formally assessed.

If a student fails to confirm his or her recorded module choices, he or she will only be assessed in those modules which have been registered.

If a student enrolls for a module which is subsequently not taken, the Course Assessment Board will record a fail in that module.
F2.9; Registration for awards

Any specific credit accumulated by a candidate shall normally be deemed to be general credit if the candidate has not converted that specific credit into an award of the University within a period of six years following the award of the specific credit.

F2.10; The classification of Bachelor’s degrees awarded with honours

In a course leading to the award of a Bachelor’s degree with honours, classification will be based on a weighted numerical average of marks awarded in graded I and H level credits undertaken in a student’s course of study, with the best marks totalling 100 credits at each level being included in the calculation. Subject to the provisions of F2.4, candidates must have achieved a pass mark in all modules. For candidates returning to complete an honours degree having previously accepted an interim award, classification will include those intermediate and honours level modules which formed part of the interim award.

In calculating the weighted numerical average for the Bachelor’s degree with honours, the calculation shall be conducted on a pro rata basis with H level credits counting to the calculation carrying a weighting of two and graded I level credits counting to the calculation carrying a weighting of one (subject to the provisions of F2.2).

The Integrated Master’s Degree comprises a first and second cycle award. In calculating the numerical average for the classified first cycle award of Bachelor’s degree with honours, all H level credits counting to the calculation will carry a weighting of two and all graded I level credits counting to the calculation will carry a weighting of one (subject to the provisions of F2.2). Confirmation of the first cycle award is recorded by the Course Assessment Board on the completion of H level modules but its conferment is deferred until the conclusion of the student’s registration for the course or the conferment of the second cycle award.

In the case of a designated sandwich course, weighted marks attached to S level credits may also play a part in determining the classification of a degree with honours. Such S level credits will be weighted at one.

In a course leading to the award of a Bachelor’s degree with honours where the student has received accreditation for prior learning, the classification will be based on a numerical average of marks awarded in up to 100 graded I and 100 H level credits undertaken in the student’s course of study as a registered student of the University. Subject to the provisions of F2.4, candidates must have achieved a pass mark in all modules.

F2.11; The classification of foundation degrees

In a course leading to the award of foundation degree, classification will be based on a numerical average of the overall marks awarded at intermediate level, with the best marks totalling 100 credits at intermediate level being included in the calculation. Subject to the provisions of F2.4, candidates must have achieved a pass mark in all modules.

F2.12; The classification of non-honours qualifications

In a course leading to an award other than an honours qualification or a foundation degree, classification will be based on a numerical average of the overall marks awarded.
When calculating the classification average for merit or distinction for an interim award, the average to be used must be drawn from the marks achieved for the required modules at the level of study of the award.

**F2.13; The classification discretion band**

Course Assessment Boards must be guided by the relevant classification bands in assigning classifications. Within a 0.5% discretion band below a higher classification banding and subject to the published criteria, a Course Assessment Board may exercise academic judgement (including that relating to poor performance due to recognised extenuating circumstances) in determining classifications, and may also take account of a profile of the marks that have contributed to the overall numerical average. In cases where a student profile includes a module with an unretrieved approved extenuating circumstance, a 1.5% discretion band will apply provided that at least one other criterion is satisfied.

**F2.14; Failure to meet the requirements for an Integrated Master’s Degree**

Where a candidate fails to meet the requirements for an Integrated Master’s Degree, the candidate will be considered for the award of a bachelor’s degree with honours. This award will be subject to the provisions of F2.10 and will exclude marks awarded in modules taken in the final year of the Integrated Master’s Degree course.
SECTION G; EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES AND COURSE ASSESSMENT BOARDS

G1; EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES

An Extenuating Circumstances (EC) Panel is responsible to the UTLC for overseeing all matters relating to the approval of EC claims and onward reporting to the relevant Assessment Board. Authority to make decisions on EC claims in accordance with processes and criteria prescribed and monitored by the EC Panel is delegated to Registry. The EC Panel’s specific responsibilities are:

a) To establish and oversee procedures for the submission and receipt of EC claims by students in accordance with the University’s regulations.
b) To develop and ensure the dissemination of a strategy for ensuring that staff and students are aware of their rights and responsibilities in relation to processes for the submission of EC claims.
c) To oversee procedures for the consideration and conclusion regarding the acceptability of submitted EC claims in accordance with the University regulations.
d) To oversee the establishment of criteria regarding the required supporting evidence*.
e) To monitor recommendations to the CAB regarding appropriate submission dates which may be in excess of the standard resit period in cases where the grounds presented for the EC claim are ongoing.
f) To oversee processes for keeping full and accurate records of the decisions taken in respect of EC claims.
g) To ensure the maintenance of the confidentiality of all submitted claims and evidence.
h) To ensure effective and timely notification to the student and, where relevant, the Assessment Board of the outcome of the consideration of an EC claim.

* On very rare occasions and in exceptional circumstances only (such as situations involving extreme abuse or severe domestic violence) independent documentary evidence may not be available, although the normal expectation would be for a medical or counselling note to be forthcoming. In such cases, direct communication between the chair of the EC Panel (or nominee) and the student concerned may result in a written statement to the EC Panel by the chair (or nominee) confirming the existence of confidential circumstances that justify the approval of an EC claim.

G1.1; Valid reasons for poor performance

If it is established to the satisfaction of an assessment board that a student’s performance has been adversely affected by authenticated extenuating circumstances, the Board shall act under the below (subject to the provisions of F1.8).

A student in this situation has the right to be reassessed as if for the first time in any or all of the elements of assessment, as specified by the Assessment Board. If an assessment was itself a second attempt the student shall be permitted to resit as if for the second time.

Where a Course Assessment Board is satisfied that there is sufficient evidence of the student’s achievement, or this evidence is subsequently obtained, the student may be recommended for the award for which he or she is a candidate, with or without honours,
classification or Distinction as appropriate. In order to reach a decision a Board may assess the candidate by whatever means it considers appropriate.

An Aegrotat award may be recommended, where it is available, when the Course Assessment Board does not have enough evidence of the student’s performance to recommend the award for which the student was a candidate or a lower award specified in the course regulations, but is satisfied that but for illness or other valid cause the student would have reached the standard required.

Before an award resulting from a recommendation under the above is conferred, the student must have signified that he or she is willing to accept the award and understands that this implies waiving the right to be reassessed.

**G2; COURSE ASSESSMENT BOARDS**

The Course Assessment Board will not change moderated marks brought before it but is responsible for:

a) reaching decisions about the performance of candidates (passed, referred, deferred, condoned or failed) in modules based on the moderated marks brought forward to the Board;

b) confirming moderated marks;

c) making decisions (where appropriate) on extenuating circumstances relating to student performance both in particular modules and across an entire course;

d) (where appropriate) exercising quality control within modules and across courses to review the comparability and fairness of marks;

e) making decisions about student progression between stages;

f) deciding on classifications and making recommendations for the conferment of awards;

g) exercising various discretionary powers.

No other body has authority to recommend conferment of an award, nor to amend the decision of an approved and properly constituted Course Assessment Board acting within its terms of reference and in accordance with the regulations for the courses of study. A Course Assessment Board may, however, be required to review a decision or may have that decision annulled under the terms of **G2.6**.

The Chair has the authority to act on behalf of the Assessment Board except in the cases of the conferment of an award. The action must be recorded and reported to the next meeting of the Assessment Board.

Queries from students relating to unconfirmed marks should be addressed in accordance with the regulations pertaining to a student’s request for a re-mark situated in the Students’ Handbook of Regulations.

Course Assessment Boards may be responsible for either a single course or for two or more closely related courses which have a similar structure and a high proportion of common modules.
The membership of each Course Assessment Board will normally comprise the Chair nominated by the Dean of School and who will be independent of the course being considered, the course leader(s), module leader(s) as necessary and the Course External Examiner(s). Any members who have a private relationship with any candidate to be considered must declare their interest at the start of the Assessment Board and may be required to leave the Board at the point of consideration of that candidate or that candidate’s cohort.

The Chair, course leader and External Examiner should be in attendance for the Course Assessment Board to be quorate. If the External Examiner cannot attend a module leader should attend in place of the External Examiner. Where a University award is to be conferred an External Examiner must be in attendance. Where for very good reason this is not possible the External Examiner must confirm any awards to be made in writing. The Board may not proceed in cases where it is not quorate.

Course Assessment Boards may exercise their right to take remedial action if the Extenuating Circumstances Panel is satisfied that a student’s absence from an examination, or failure to submit work for assessment by the agreed submission date, or failure to pass one or more elements of the course work assessment can be attributed either to illness or to other circumstances of a personal nature. By attending an examination it will be assumed that the student has declared that he or she is fit to sit that examination and a claim for extenuating circumstances will not normally be accepted.

When considering an approved claim for extenuating circumstances, the Course Assessment Board will not attempt to judge how a student might have performed in different circumstances with a view to awarding extra marks.

**G2.1; Appointment of Course Assessment Boards**

For every course of studies approved as leading to an award there must be an Assessment Board whose constitution and terms of reference accord with the approved regulations for the course and which includes the External Examiner(s) approved by the Senate. The constitution of the Board may include provision for the appointment of subsidiary examination committees and the same Board may be responsible for more than one course of study.

The assessment boards are appointed in accordance with procedures determined by the Senate and are accountable to that body for the fulfilment of their terms of reference.

**G2.2; Secretary of assessment boards**

The Senate shall ensure that arrangements are made to appoint a secretary to each assessment board and shall require the secretary to maintain detailed and accurate records of the board’s proceedings.

**G2.3 Student membership of Course Assessment Boards**

No student may be a member of an Assessment Board or attend an examiners’ meeting other than as a candidate for assessment.
G2.4; Module Leaders responsibilities for Course Assessment Boards

The responsibility for managing the assessment of modules which are completed shall lie with the designated Module Leader.

The Module Leader will be responsible for:

a) the collation of marks,
b) oversight of all second marking and other moderation procedures required to ensure the full and proper assessment of student performance,
c) authorisation and arrangements for Tutor Reassessments in appropriate units of reassessment;
d) ensuring that the External Examiner has access to all necessary information and scripts to enable him or her to carry out full and proper moderation of students’ work on the module,
e) ensuring that the External Examiner has detailed knowledge of the moderation processes undertaken by the module teaching team,
f) confirming a final and complete set of marks with the agreement of the External Examiner.

Each School shall be responsible for ensuring that mechanisms are in place for ensuring that Module Leaders perform the tasks laid out above in G2.4.

G2.5 External Examiners responsibilities for Course Assessment Boards

External Examiners will be appointed in the first instance to modules on the basis of the relevance of their academic expertise. External Examiners will also be assigned to one or more Course Assessment Boards. As members of Course Assessment Boards, External Examiners will exercise both an oversight of students' overall performance and carry out a responsibility for monitoring the comparability and fairness of the assessment processes for all the modules which comprise the Course.

The External Examiner will not comment on the marks awarded to individual students when seen as part of a sample selection but will:

a) undertake moderation of student performance within modules,
b) assure and comment on the comparability of marks between the modules ascribed to him or her,
c) monitor the effectiveness of the processes used to moderate scripts, and, where necessary, make recommendations to improve or develop these processes.

External Examiners need not be associated with the assessment of performance at foundation level or pre-foundation level with the following exceptions:

a) where foundation level or pre-foundation level modules lead to a University award – an External Examiner must be appointed to the course
b) in the case of foundation level modules, when examining modules on foundation degrees.

External Examiners must attend the Course Assessment Boards ascribed as their responsibility at which awards are due to be conferred.
No recommendation for the conferment of an award may be made without the written consent of the approved External Examiner(s).

On any matter which the External Examiner(s) have declared a matter of principle, the decision of those examiner(s) shall either be accepted as final by the Course Assessment Board or shall be referred to the Chair of University Teaching and Learning Committee. Any unresolved disagreement between External Examiners shall be referred to the Senate.

G2.6; Appeal against a decision of a Course Assessment Board

The Senate, or a body authorised by it to act as an Appeals Committee, may in the following circumstances require an assessment board to reconsider its decision:

a) if a candidate requests such a reconsideration and establishes to the satisfaction of the Senate or Appeals Committee that his or her performance in the assessment was adversely affected by illness or other factors which he or she was unable, or for valid reasons unwilling, to divulge before the assessment board reached its decision. The candidate’s request must be supported by medical certificates or other documentary evidence acceptable to the Senate or Appeals Committee;

b) if the Senate or Appeals Committee is satisfied on evidence produced by a candidate or any other person that there has been a material administrative error, or that the assessments were not conducted in accordance with the current regulations for the course, or that some other material irregularity relevant to the assessments has occurred.

Disagreement with the academic judgement of an assessment board in assessing the merits of an individual piece of work or in reaching any assessment decision based on the marks, grades and other information relating to a candidate’s performance cannot in itself constitute grounds for a request for reconsideration by a candidate.

If after reconsideration, in the circumstances detailed in G2.6, the assessment board does not modify its decision, the Senate may annul that decision if in its opinion due and proper account has not been taken of those circumstances.

In cases of procedural or other irregularity, or where it is not possible to reconvene an assessment board, the Senate shall have power to annul a decision of the assessment board without making a prior request for reconsideration. If an error or irregularity is found to have affected more than one candidate, the Senate may annul the whole assessment or any part of it.

When a decision has been annulled it is the responsibility of the Senate to take action, including if necessary the appointment of new External Examiners, to ensure that recommendations are made to it in respect of the candidate(s) concerned by an approved assessment board.

The Senate shall ensure that adequate permanent arrangements are established for dealing with any requests by candidates or with other evidence which may lead to the reconsideration or annulment of a decision.
G2.8; Students identified as having a disability

If a student is unable, through disability, to be assessed by the normal methods, examiners may vary the methods as appropriate, bearing in mind the learning outcomes of the course and the need to assess the student on equal terms with other students.

G2.9 Regulations relating to a breach of Academic Integrity

The Senate will establish procedures under which allegations that students have committed an offence relating to academic integrity will be investigated fairly and impartially with a view to establishing the facts.

Where a case of a breach of the University’s academic integrity regulations is suspected the assessment board will not reach a decision on the student’s performance until the facts have been established.

Where it is established that a student has committed an offence relating to a breach of the University’s academic integrity regulations or otherwise sought to gain an unfair advantage the Academic Integrity Officer or Academic Integrity Committee shall assign the appropriate penalty in accordance with the University of Huddersfield Penalties Tariff in the Students’ Handbook of Regulations.
SECTION H; REGULATIONS ON EXTERNAL EXAMINERS

External Examiners are appointed to ensure that all students are treated fairly and equitably, that appropriate standards of assessment are maintained, and that assessments are conducted in accordance with approved regulations.

H1; The rights and responsibilities of External Examiners in relation to modules

The role of the External Examiner(s) is to advise the subject group with regard to standards and fairness of assessment and, when appropriate, to consider the results of individual students in the context of the University’s current regulations.

In order to carry out these responsibilities, the External Examiner(s) will:

a) attend the University External Examiner’s Induction briefing prior to or following appointment. Where this is not possible, a signed acknowledgement for receipt of the induction pack must be supplied;
b) offer advice impartially without being influenced by previous association with the staff or any of the students;
c) compare and comment on the standard of assessments with that of similar modules in higher education elsewhere;
d) comment on the set of assessment activities for any particular module, in the light of the need to ensure that all students are assessed fairly in relation to the module specifications;
e) have the right to inspect all forms of assessed work in line with paragraph C8;
f) see the work of all students proposed for failure, and samples of the work of students proposed to each other grade, in order to ensure that each student is placed fairly in relation to the rest of the cohort. In cases where 5 or fewer students are proposed for the highest grade, the work for all of the students in that grade must be included in the sample sent;
g) have the right to make recommendations with regard to the moderation of marks/grades awarded by internal examiners;
h) comment on the way assessments are conducted, and share in developmental discussions with module teams where appropriate;
i) complete the external examiner’s template report in full, following the course assessment board or more frequently if appropriate, which reflects upon their duties;
j) maintain confidentiality of all course materials and student results;
k) report to the Chair of the University Teaching and Learning Committee on any matters of serious concern arising from the assessments, which put at risk academic standards.

To carry out these responsibilities the External Examiner(s) will be:

a) expert in the field of study concerned;
b) competent in assessing students’ knowledge and skills at higher education level;
c) impartial in judgement;
d) fully briefed on their role, in line with the University’s procedures having attended the University’s External Examiner Induction Programme.


H2; THE RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF EXTERNAL EXAMINERS IN RELATION TO COURSES

The role of the External Examiner(s) is to advise the Course Assessment Board with regard to standards and fairness of assessment and, when appropriate, to consider the results of individual students in the context of the University’s current regulations.

In order to carry out these responsibilities, the External Examiner(s) will:

a) attend the University External Examiner’s Induction briefing prior to or following appointment;
b) offer advice impartially without being influenced by previous association with the course, the staff, or any of the students;
c) compare in overall terms the performance of students with that of their peers on similar courses of higher education elsewhere;
d) be consulted and will respond about any proposed changes to the approved Course assessment regulations which will directly affect students currently on the Course(s);
e) offer advice on progression and awards based on the agreed module grades and in the light of discussion at the Course Assessment Board;
f) attend the meetings of the Course Assessment Board at which decisions on recommendations for award are made and ensure that those recommendations have been reached in line with the University’s regulations and normal practice in higher education;
g) participate as required in any reviews of decisions about individual students’ results during the examiner’s period of office;
h) complete the external examiner’s template report in full, following the course assessment board or more frequently if appropriate, which reflects upon their duties;
i) maintain confidentiality of all course materials and student results;
j) report to the chair of the University Teaching and Learning Committee on any matters of serious concern arising from the assessments, which put at risk the standard of the award.
k) make reference to benchmark standards (subject benchmark statements or professional benchmark statements) in their evaluation of student work.

To carry out these responsibilities the External Examiner(s) will be:

a) expert in one of the fields of study associated with the course;
b) competent in assessing students’ knowledge and skills at higher education level;
c) impartial in judgement;
d) briefed on their role, in line with the University’s procedures; having attended the University’s External Examiner Induction Programme.
e) an External Examiner for a group of modules involved in the Course.

All recommendations for the conferment of awards must be signed by the Chair of the Course Assessment Board and all External Examiner(s) present at the meeting.

H2.1 Courses which lie outside the CATS framework

The Senate may exceptionally give approval for the design of courses of study leading to awards of the University which lie outside the CATS framework. In such cases an External
Examiner(s) will be appointed and the functions of the Course Assessment Board will be discharged by a Board of Examiners for the course.

H3; THE APPOINTMENT OF EXTERNAL EXAMINERS

All External Examiner appointments must be approved by the Teaching and Learning Committee acting on behalf of the Senate. An assessment board which does not include approved External Examiners is not authorised, subject to G2.4 and G2.5, to assess students for an award or to recommend the conferment of an award upon a student.

The School Board must normally submit External Examiner nominations for approval by the Teaching and Learning Committee at least six months before the date of the first assessments with which the proposed appointee is to be associated.

New External Examiners should take up their appointments on or before the retirement of their predecessors. They should remain available after the last assessments with which they are to be associated in order to deal with any subsequent reviews of decisions.

Normally, appointments will run from the September before the first assessments to the September after the last assessments. The usual term of office will be one which allows the External Examiner to assess four successive cohorts of students; this will normally mean four calendar years but may be longer where, for example, in the case of a new course, the first output will not occur in the first year of appointment.

External Examiners should not normally hold more than the equivalent of two substantial undergraduate appointments at the same time.

In approving the appointment of External Examiners the Senate will be seeking to ensure that they will be competent and impartial.

New External Examiners must be briefed on their task as soon as possible after appointment and must attend the University’s External Examiner Induction Programme. The briefing will cover as appropriate: the dates of meetings, their role in relation to the examining team as a whole, the learning outcomes of the course, the module specifications including the methods of assessment and marking scheme, the regulations for the course, and the University’s assessment regulations and requirements and conditions of award as set out in this handbook.

Any decision to request termination of an appointment prematurely must be referred by the Dean of the School to the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) in writing giving reasons for the request. The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) will advise the School and Registry of his/her decision. Registry will inform the External Examiner.

H3.1; Criteria for appointment of External Examiners

The following criteria and notes for guidance, reflecting the QAA’s UK National Criteria for appointment of External Examiners, were approved by the University Teaching and Learning Committee on 3 July 2012.
a) An External Examiner’s academic/professional qualifications should, in level and subject, be appropriate to the module/course to be examined.

b) External examiners should be fluent in English.

c) An External Examiner should, where appropriate, be able and willing to receive samples of work electronically rather than as paper-based material.

d) An External Examiner should have appropriate and current standing, expertise and experience to maintain comparability of standards across the Higher Education sector. Standing, expertise and breadth of experience may be indicated by:

i) the present post and place of work;

ii) exceptionally, an External Examiner may have retired from full or part-time employment, but must demonstrate continuing relevant involvement in Higher Education or the professions;

iii) the range and scope of experience across Higher Education/the professions;

iv) current recent active involvement in research/scholarly/professional activities in the field of study concerned;

v) awareness of current developments in the design and delivery of relevant curricula;

vi) competence and experience relating to designing and operating a variety of assessment tasks appropriate to the subject and operating assessment procedures;

vii) competence and experience relating to the enhancement of the student learning experience;

viii) knowledge and understanding of the UK sector agreed reference points for the maintenance of academic standards and the assurance and enhancement of quality.

In circumstances where a proposed external examiner is drawn from outside of an Higher Education environment (e.g. from business, industry, the professions), and does not possess formal qualifications and/or experience of assessment or quality assurance practices, the University Teaching and Learning Committee may consider these proposals as exceptions to the criteria.

An External Examiner should have enough recent external examining or comparable related experience, at an appropriate level, to indicate competence in assessing students in the Subject Area.

If the proposed External Examiner has no previous external examining experience at the appropriate level, the application should be supported by either:

a) other external examining experience;

b) extensive internal examining experience;

c) other relevant and recent (i.e. normally within the previous three years) experience likely to support the external examiner role.

Proposed External Examiners without experience as Externals must join an experienced team of External Examiners, and must not be the sole External Examiner.

External Examiners should not be over-extended by their external examining duties. The External Examiner should normally hold no more than two External Examiner appointments for taught courses/modules at any point in time.
There should be an appropriate balance and expertise in the team of External Examiners and the proposed External Examiner should complement the external examining team in terms of expertise and examining experience.

The range of academic perspectives necessary to the course should be represented in the external examining team.

If the course is associated with or may lead to a professional award, at least one practitioner with appropriate experience should be in the team (where a PSRB has express requirements in relation to the appointment of external examiners, the course team must ensure that these are met).

The external examining experience in the team as a whole must be sufficient and wide-ranging.

**H3.2; Conflicts of Interest**

External Examiners should be drawn from a wide variety of institutional/professional contexts and traditions in order that the module/course benefits from wide-ranging external scrutiny. The following arrangements are not permissible:

- a) more than one External Examiner from the same institution in the team of External Examiners;
- b) reciprocal external examining of modules/courses between the University of Huddersfield and any external institution;
- c) replacement of an External Examiner by an individual from the same institution;
- d) an External Examiner from an institution which has been the source of examiners for similar subject areas in the preceding five years;
- e) where there is a single External Examiner for a course, that Examiner must be from an academic, rather than practice-based context;
- f) no School should, at any given time, have more than six External Examiners employed by the same Institution.

External Examiners must be impartial in judgement and must not have previous close involvement with the institution which might compromise objectivity. Over the previous five years, the proposed External Examiner should not have been:

- a) a member of staff, governor or student of the University of Huddersfield or one of its collaborative partners, or be a near relative of a member of staff of the University in relation to the course;
- b) an examiner in a cognate course in the institution;
- c) involved as an External Examiner for the course when it was approved by another validating body.

The following are recognised conflicts of interest which will normally disqualify an External Examiner as the proposed External Examiner should not be:

- a) personally associated with the sponsorship of students;
- b) required to assess colleagues who are recruited as students to the course;
c) in a position, or knows they will be in a position, to influence significantly the future employment of students on the course;
d) significantly involved in recent or current substantive collaborative research activities with a member of staff closely involved in the delivery, management or assessment of the of the course(s) or modules in question;
e) anyone with a close professional, contractual or personal relationship with a member of staff or student involved with the course;
f) likely to be involved with student placements or training in the examiner’s organisation.

H3.3; External Examiner Terms of Office

External Examiners will be appointed for an initial term of office of up to four years. Under certain exceptional circumstances, the University Teaching and Learning Committee may sanction a once-only extension of an External Examiner’s term of office by one year, up to a maximum term of office of five years. Multiple extensions of an External Examiner’s term of office are not permissible.

The exceptional circumstances in which the University Teaching and Learning Committee may sanction a once-only extension of an External Examiner’s term of office by one year will include the following:

a) in the event of an unplanned vacancy arising from the loss of an External Examiner who had not reached the end of his or her term of office;
b) if the subject is highly specialised, with a known shortage of expertise;
c) if there is a specific and pressing operational or academic need. This circumstance should be described in detail on the application form;
d) if the course had only run sporadically during the retiring External Examiner’s term of office.

H4; TERMINATION OF AN EXTERNAL EXAMINER’S CONTRACT

An External Examiner’s contract may only be terminated prematurely in exceptional circumstances, through the following procedure:

Any decision to terminate an appointment prematurely must be referred by the Dean of School to the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) in writing giving reasons for the request.

The grounds for premature termination will be limited to the following areas:

a) failure to submit an annual report;
b) failure to participate in Course Assessment Boards;
c) serious transgression of the University’s regulations and policies;
d) if a conflict of interest arises which cannot be satisfactorily resolved.

H5; REPORTS OF EXTERNAL EXAMINERS

External Examiners are required to report promptly to the Senate at the end of each academic year on the conduct of the assessments and on issues related to assessment, including:
a) the overall performance of the students in relation to their peers on similar courses/modules;
b) the quality of knowledge and skills (both general and subject specific) demonstrated by the students;
c) the overall standard of assessments;
d) the overall approach to teaching, learning and assessment as indicated by student performance;
e) any other recommendations arising from the assessment.

Reports will be made in accordance with a standard proforma which is available from the External Examiner section of Registry’s website. They should be returned to Registry, preferably in electronic format, within four weeks of the main Course Assessment Board. Registry will forward copies of the report to the Dean and appropriate Administrative Assistant for transmission onwards to other relevant staff.

The purpose of the report is to enable the Senate to judge whether the course is meeting its stated learning outcomes and to make any necessary improvements, whether immediately or at the next review as appropriate.

External Examiners have authority to report direct to the chair of the Senate if they are concerned about standards of assessment and performance, particularly where they consider that assessments are being conducted in a way that jeopardises either the fair treatment of students or the standard of awards.

H5.1; Feedback and Response to External Examiner Reports

Prompt feedback must be given to External Examiners about action proposed and taken in response to their reports, in accordance with the process described below. Form EE3 (Action Plan) is attached to these guidelines.

The External Examiner’s report must be considered so that an initial response can be given, within one month of receipt of the Examiner’s report. The issues raised by the External Examiner must be identified and an action plan proposed to deal with them. It is acknowledged that, in view of the requirement to complete this element of the form within one month of receipt of the External Examiner’s report and of the normal timings of the submission of those reports and of Course Committee meetings, it may be completed by the Course Leader and subsequently reported to the Course Committee.

Examples of good practice identified by the External Examiner should be recorded on the form, with specific proposals for their dissemination within the University.

The completed form should be sent to the External Examiner for comment and approval and should then be attached to the External Examiner’s report, which itself must be attached to the relevant annual evaluation report. The annual evaluation report should refer to the issues and actions identified in the form.

The External Examiner’s report and the partly completed Form EE3 (Action Plan) should be considered at the first available Course Committee meeting subsequent to receipt of the External Examiner’s report.
Form EE3 (Action Plan) should be completed in full and approved by the Course Committee within six months of receipt of the External Examiner’s report or following consideration at annual evaluation, and sent for comment and approval by the External Examiner. The statement of action outcomes should inform the completion of the subsequent year’s annual evaluation report.

When completed and fully signed off, Form EE3 (Action Plan) should be retained by the Course Leader so that the contents may be included in the following year’s annual evaluation report. There is no requirement to send copies of the forms to Registry.

Subject Reviews will pay particular attention to the outcome of these processes in making judgements about the manner in which the Subject Area is monitoring academic standards.

Annual evaluation reports will make reference to standards of students’ work and will determine whether sufficient attention has been paid to benchmark standards. Subject reviews will examine External Examiners’ reports and minutes of Course Assessment Boards to form judgements about standards being achieved in the Subject Area in question, including particular areas of strength and weakness.