

The London Interdisciplinary School

Examination Regulations and Procedures

(A) Examination and Assessment Regulations

Introduction

There are three types of examination and assessment at the School:

- Diagnostic examinations and assessments, which provide indicators of learners' aptitude and readiness for a programme or module, and identify possible learning problems;
- Formative examinations and assessment, which provide learners with feedback on their performance and give guidance on how it can be improved, without counting toward the overall result on a module or programme;
- Summative examinations and assessments, which provide a measure of a learner's achievement in relation to the learning outcomes of a programme, and count towards the overall result in a module and programme.

These Examination Regulations relate to summative examinations and assessments only. Consistent implementation of these regulations is crucial in safeguarding academic standards and ensuring fairness to students.

Principles

The School's assessment and examinations must be conducted by impartial internal and external examiners, who are competent to make judgments about the performance of individual students both in relation to the assessment criteria and learning outcomes and to students on other comparable programmes.

There must be full confidence in the security and validity of the School's assessment and examination processes. This means that arrangements to ensure the integrity and objectivity of the School's assessment and examinations must be made clear.

External Examiners must be involved in any School assessment or examination that contributes to an award, or where it is required for progression from one level to the next in a programme. External Examiners ensure impartiality, moderation and externality in the assessment process, to ensure that student work is assessed fairly and the academic standard of the School's awards are upheld.

Students will receive clear information on the assessment requirements for their programme of study, including the type, weighting, and timings of these assessments. This information will be included in the Student Handbook and will be circulated to students at the beginning of each academic year.

A Board of Examiners will determine awards to be recommended for individual candidates; their academic judgments cannot be questioned or overturned, although

appeals may be raised on the grounds of procedural irregularities or Extraordinary Mitigating Circumstance, as per the School's Academic Appeals Procedure.

Students will be given constructive and timely feedback on their performance to promote learning and assist development; they will also be encouraged to reflect on their own performance. Feedback will be based on clear assessment criteria and will clarify to the student how the mark was derived and the extent to which learning outcomes have been met.

Where a student is unable to be assessed by the methods specified by the programme, the School will try to accommodate that student by making special arrangements for examination or assessment. Any arrangements will be determined by the Extraordinary Reasonable Adjustments for Examinations and Assessments Procedure.

The School will put in place transparent and fair mechanisms for internal marking and internal moderation of marks. Following internal moderation, all assessment that contributes to an award must be moderated by External Examiners, and advice provided to internal examiners as appropriate.

Definitions

Credit: awards are conferred on the basis of qualification level and volume of credits achieved. Credits are a measure of notional learning time, which is 1,200 hours at undergraduate qualification level. Credit is assigned as follows:

- It is allocated to a learning activity on the basis of stated learning outcomes.
- Credit may only be assigned after a student has demonstrated through assessment that they have achieved the learning outcomes.
- The number of credit points assigned is independent of the standard of student achievement, which will be reflected in the grade and classification of the award.

The assessment for a module may comprise one or more than one assessment instruments (e.g., an unseen examination, and/or a piece of coursework).

Assessment Element: an assessment instrument the result of which is aggregated with the result(s) of other assessment instruments to give the final module result. The student is deemed to have passed the overall module if the overall mark is a pass, irrespective of whether or not an individual assessment element has been failed.

Assessment Component: an assessment element that as well as being aggregated with other assessment elements must be passed in its own right.

Level and Credit Requirements

The School's Bachelor's degree will comprise 360 credits in three years of 120 credits each. Year 1 will comprise modules at level 4 and above; Year 2 at level 5 and above; Year 3 at level 6.

Students shall be awarded a Bachelor's Degree with Honours where they exit from the degree programme having:

- Completed 360 credits, with 120 at level 6, 120 at level 5, and 120 at level 4;
- Obtained a mark of at least 40% (the pass mark) in each assessment component of each module.

Students shall be awarded an exit award of an Ordinary Bachelor's Degree where they exit from the degree programme having:

- Completed 300 credits, with 60 at level 6, 120 at level 5 and 120 at level 4;
- Obtained a market of at least 40% (the pass mark) in each assessment, to including all assessment components of modules amounting to at least 300 credits.

Where a student leaves the School with an exit award they may reapply at a later date to upgrade to a higher award on the same programme, provided it is still offered by the School.

Classification

The calculation of the overall percentage mark for an undergraduate degree is conducted as follows:

- The first year of the degree programme must be passed, but does not count towards the weighting of the final classification;
- The overall percentage mark for the programme will be calculated according to the credit weightings of each module undertaken in Years 2 and 3. Modules in Year 2 are weighted at 40% of the overall degree; modules at Year 3 are weighted at 60%.

For Years 2 and 3, each module mark shall contribute to the overall mark for the award, according to the credit value of the module divided by the total credit value of the award. Each assessment component mark contributing towards the overall mark for the module shall be calculated according to the weighting prescribed for the individual assessment component. The aggregated, weighted percentage mark is the average mark the candidate obtains across all the programme modules (with each module weighted in proportion to its credit).

The final grade for an individual assessment will be determined after completion of the quality assurance process (moderation) as set out in the Moderation Policy below.

Students who are awarded an honours degree will be awarded the highest classification for which they are eligible. Ordinary degrees will not be classified, but the student's aggregated final mark will be indicated.

A student will be eligible for a *first class* honours degree (i.e., Excellent Pass) where they obtain:

- An overall aggregate mark of at least 70% *or* an overall aggregate mark of 68% *and*
- A mark of at least 70% in modules worth at least half the credits undertaken in Year 3.

A student will be eligible for a *second class upper division* honours degree (i.e., Very Good Pass) where they obtain:

- An overall aggregate mark of at least 60% *or* an overall aggregate mark of 68% *and*
- A mark of at least 60% in modules worth at least half the credits undertaken in Year 3.

A student will be eligible for a *second class lower division* honours degree (i.e., Good Pass) where they obtain:

- An overall aggregate mark of at least 50% *or* an overall aggregate mark of 48% *and*
- A mark of at least 50% in modules worth at least half the credits undertaken in Year 3.

A student will be eligible for a *third class* honours degree (i.e., Pass), where they obtain:

- An overall aggregate mark of at least 40%.

A student will be deemed to have failed where their overall aggregate mark is less than 40%.

Where the result of the overall assessment calculation creates a mark of 0.5% or greater, this will be rounded up to the next full percentage point (e.g., 69.5% is rounded up to 70%, 59.5% is rounded up to 60%, etc.). Where the calculation creates a mark below 0.5%, this will be rounded down to the next full percentage point (e.g., 69.4% is rounded down to 69%, 59.4% is rounded down to 59%, etc.). For the purposes of rounding up or down, only the first decimal place is used.

Performance in work for which an award of credit for prior learning has been made is not taken into account in the calculation of the final award, in line with the School's Recognition of Prior Learning Policy.

Submission of Assessed Work

Where coursework is submitted after the closing deadline and there is no accepted Extraordinary Mitigating Circumstances, it will be penalised in line with the following tariff:

- *Submission within 6 working days*: a 10% reduction deducted from the overall marked score for each working day late, down to the 40% pass mark;

- *Submission that is late by 7 or more working days:* submission refused, mark of zero.

Provision for *Viva Voce* Examination

Exceptionally, *viva voce* examinations may be required by a Board of Examiners (with the approval of External Examiners):

- To confirm the progression/result status of a student;
- To determine the result status of unusual or borderline cases;
- When there is conflicting evidence from the various assessment components;
- As an alternative or additional assessment in cases where poor performance in assessment is the result of Extraordinary Mitigating Circumstances as verified through the Extraordinary Mitigating Circumstances procedure.

Reassessment of Failed Assessment(s)

A student who fails one or more assessment component(s) will only be reassessed in the failed assessment component(s).

A student who fails an element of an assessment but passes the module overall shall not be required to be reassessed in that element.

A student who fails an element of an assessment and fails the module overall will be reassessed in all elements of the assessment.

Where a student fails a component of a module, or an entire module, the following applies:

- **Resit**—a second attempt of an assessment component within a module, following failure at the first attempt;
- **Compensation**—the award of credit by the Board of Examiners for a failed module on account of good performance in other modules at the same credit level where the learning outcomes have been met;
- **Retake**—a second attempt of all assessment components within a module following failure at the first or resit attempt. Retake of the failed component may require the student to participate in classes to prepare them for the second attempt. This will be confirmed at the Board of examiners

Resit provision is subject to all of the following conditions:

- A student may resit the failed assessment components of a module only once. Where there are Extraordinary Mitigating Circumstances, the Board of Examiners has discretion to decide whether a further assessment opportunity shall be permitted, unless explicitly prohibited in the rules for the programme, as approved in the validation process and programme specification.
- A student who does not complete the resit by the date specified shall not progress on the programme, except in cases where the procedure for allowing Extraordinary Mitigating Circumstances has been followed.

- Resits may only take place after the meeting of the Board of Examiners or following agreement by the Chair and the External Examiner of the Board.
- A student who successfully completes any required resits within a module shall be awarded the credit for the module and the result for the individual assessment component shall be capped at the pass mark (40%).
- A student shall not be permitted to be assessed by resit in any module that has received a pass mark, or in a component that has received a mark of 40% of above.
- The resit will normally be carried out by the same combination of written examination, coursework, etc. as in the first attempt.

The School may apply fees for resits as it sees fit, and will publish these fees by October 1st each year.

Progression

The paths through which students are required to progress through the programme in order to obtain an award, and the elements identified as compulsory or optional, are set out in the programme specification and approved in the School's programme validation process.

A student may be permitted to progress from term to term carrying a failure in up to 30 credits, but must attempt to retrieve that failure at the next available assessment sitting.

Compensation for Marginal Failure

Compensation will be applied at stage level and agreed during an examination board when the following conditions are met:

- No more than 20 credits can be compensated in any one stage of the programme;
- The Examination Board must assure itself that learning outcomes of the qualification level have been satisfied, as set out in the programme specification;
- A minimum mark of no more than 5 percentage points below the module pass mark has been achieved in the module to be compensated;
- Taking the module mark to be compensated into account, an aggregate mark of 40% has been achieved for the qualification level of the programme;
- No compensation shall be permitted for any core project/dissertation, as defined in the programme specification.

A student who receives a compensated pass in a module shall be awarded the credit for the module. The original component mark(s) (i.e., below the passmark) shall be

retained in the record of marks and used in the calculation of the aggregate mark for the stage or qualification.

Options for the Retake of Study

If, having exhausted all permitted compensation, resit and retake opportunities, a student is still unable to pass, the Board of Examiners may, at its discretion, permit one of the following repeat options: partial retake as a fully registered student; partial retake for assessment only; full retake.

Partial retake as a fully registered student

- The student is not permitted to progress to the next stage of the programme, but must retake the failed modules and/or components in full during the following academic year.
- The student has full access to all facilities and support for the modules and/or components being retaken.
- The marks that can be achieved for the modules and/or components being retaken will be capped (uncapped if Extraordinary Mitigating Circumstances have been approved) at the module and/or component pass marks.
- The student retains the marks for the modules and/or components already passed.
- No further resit opportunities are permitted.

Partial retake for assessment only

- As above (“partial retake as a fully registered student”), except that access to facilities and support will be limited to certain learning resources for the module(s) and/or component(s) being retaken. Participation will only be allowed for relevant revision sessions and assessments.

Full retake

- This is only permitted where the student has Extraordinary Mitigating Circumstances.
- The student does not progress to the next stage of the programme, but instead repeats all of the modules in the current stage during the following academic year.
- The student has full access to all facilities and support.
- The marks that can be achieved are not capped, and the student is normally entitled to the resit opportunities available. However, a student is not able to carry forward any credit from previous attempts at the stage.

Where compensation, resit and retake opportunities have been exhausted, a Board of Examiners may recommend a student for an exit award as described in these Regulations.

With the approval of the Board of Examiners, students may be eligible to progress to a higher stage of a programme without having completed the requisite 20 points of the lower stage. They may exceptionally be allowed to do so if any of the following conditions are met:

- A minimum of 80 credit points at the lower level have been successfully completed including passes in all designated core modules;
- All requirements for academic prerequisites for the higher-level modules are met;
- The Examination Board has approved progression following a successful application for Extraordinary Mitigating Circumstances, and results are still pending in the student's profile.

Posthumous awards

Posthumous awards are admitted for the School's programmes. The classification for such awards is based on past performance and aligned to the closest exit award (which may include a classification).

Anonymity

Wherever possible, student work submitted for assessment will be anonymised for the purpose of marking and identified by candidate number only. Anonymisation may not be possible in some forms of assessment (e.g., a presentation).

Word limit

Where a word limit has been specified for a written assessment (e.g., coursework), words in excess of this will not be marked.

Confidentiality

A student's assessment results shall be confidential unless the student grants permission to release the results to a third party.

(B) Extraordinary Deferral of Examination and Assessment Procedure

If a student fails to submit work for an assessment component by the deadline or to attend an examination without good cause, they shall be deemed to have failed the assessment component or examination and will be assigned no marks for it.

The School has an inclusive approach to examination and assessment. To this end, the School will ensure that examinations and assessments can be sat at multiple, spaced sittings, to limit the need for deferrals. All students will be allowed to draw on 100% extra time during the examination. In the case of coursework, the submission deadlines will be set within a range of weeks to allow for later submissions, again to limit the need for deferrals. Students will be advised to attend the earliest examination sittings and to submit coursework at the beginning of the submission period, in order to allow contingency for unforeseen circumstances arising (e.g., illness) that would mean that their sitting or submission would be delayed. It is the responsibility of students to manage their examination sittings and assessment submissions so that they allow for contingency for being ill or having other good cause for missing an examination sitting or being delayed in submitting coursework. Students will not be penalised for sitting in later examination sittings, drawing on extra examination time, or submitting work at the end of the submission window.

Where a student has an enduring condition (such as learning difficulties or disabilities), the student is responsible for disclosing this to their personal tutor or the Student Experience Department with one calendar month's notice if they wish reasonable adjustments to be made to accommodate them in sitting an examination or submitting an assessment. Where a student fails to do so, they will not be permitted to apply for an Extraordinary Deferral on the grounds of reasonable adjustments for their condition.

Where Extraordinary Mitigating Circumstances impair a student's ability to prepare for or sit/submit an examination/assessment even in spite of the multiple sittings arranged or the extended deadline for coursework, the student may apply to the Learning Director, or their nominee, for an Extraordinary Deferral. An Extraordinary Deferral is a request for an additional examination sitting to be set, or for an extension to the submission deadline period. This application for deferral must be made in writing (email or letter) by 12pm on the working day before the last sitting of the examination or final deadline for the submission, and must provide objective and authoritative evidence (e.g., a medical note) of the mitigating circumstances justifying a deferral. The standard of evidence will need to be high to justify a deferral given the School's arrangements to accommodate the need for unexpected late submission and late sittings.

Where an Extraordinary Deferral application has been made, it will be at the discretion of the Learning Director to grant or deny the request based on the evidence submitted and given the flexible arrangements for examination and submission that have already been made. In exercising his/her discretion, the Learning Director must be satisfied that:

- The illness or other good cause would have a significant adverse impact on the student's performance in the examination or would prevent the student from sitting the examination or submitting the assessment; *and*
- The illness or other good cause would have precluded the student from attending any of the scheduled examination sittings, or from submitting their work at an earlier point in the submission window; *and*
- The student did not have an earlier opportunity to notify the Learning Director so that any reasonable adjustments could be accommodated to mitigate for their condition.

Where the Learning Director or their nominee is satisfied that these conditions have been met, the student will be withdrawn from the examination or assessment and arrangements will be made for deferral. The Learning Director will process any deferral applications by 6pm on the day before the assessment or submission deadline. Where a student has not received confirmation of Extraordinary Deferral by this time, they should assume that their request has not been granted, and should therefore expect to sit the examination or submit their assessment.

The Learning Director will make a record of any Extraordinary Deferrals granted and submit them to the Assessment Department.

(C) Extraordinary Mitigating Circumstances and Concessions

Mitigating circumstances are defined as unforeseeable and unavoidable circumstances that may have a detrimental effect on academic performance.

A *concession* is the acceptance on the part of the authorised body (in this case the Academic Appeals Board) that mitigating circumstances, supported by objective and authoritative evidence, have affected a student's summative assessment and therefore their assessment attempt should be voided, with the student having a right to take the examination or assessment as though for the first time.

Students who do not consider themselves fit to sit an examination or believe that an assessment would be impaired because of unforeseen and unavoidable circumstances outside their control are referred to the Extraordinary Deferral of Examination and Assessment Procedure above. Students must be aware that to qualify for an Extraordinary Deferral they must be able to demonstrate that the mitigating circumstance meant that they would not have been able to sit the examination in any of the examination sittings or submit their assessment at any time during the submission window.

Where a student has already sat an examination or submitted an assessment and believes that their performance has been adversely affected by unforeseen circumstances outside their control that they were unable to anticipate by noon on the working day before the final examination window or assessment deadline, they may submit an appeal via the Academic Appeals Procedure, on the grounds of Extraordinary Mitigating Circumstances. For the appeal to be valid, the student must demonstrate that they have made reasonable contingency efforts to protect against last-minute emergency given the multiple examination sittings and the extended coursework submission deadline.

The appeal must be lodged by the student with the Head of Quality in writing (either by letter or by email) within 15 working days of the publication of results or date of the written confirmation of the decision of the Board of Examiners, and preferably as soon as possible after the examination has been sat or the assessment has been submitted. In this letter or email, the student must set out the basis for the appeal and enclose any relevant evidence. An appeal lodged after 15 working days will only be considered where the applicant is able to prove to the satisfaction of the Head of Quality that they were mentally or physically incapable of lodging an appeal within the prescribed time limit. Late appeals must be accompanied by authoritative and objective evidence (e.g., a medical note) which confirms that the student was incapable of submitting an appeal within the prescribed time limit. The Head of Quality may, at her/his complete discretion, extend the period within which an appeal may be lodged.

Students who experience any unforeseen or unavoidable incidents during an examination must notify the invigilator before leaving the venue; the invigilator will

then log the incident in their report. Students will be required to seek medical attention on the day of examination if they feel their performance was adversely affected by illness.

Students may not make an appeal on the grounds of Extraordinary Mitigating Circumstances as a result of technical or other problems (such as computer failure) unless the problem was with a LIS machine or an external server.

Upon receipt of recommendations from the Academic Appeals Board, the Board of Examiners will decide whether to:

- Provide a student with the opportunity to take the affected assessment(s) as if for the first time, allowing them to be given the full marks achieved for the examination or assessment, rather than imposing a cap;
- Waive late submission penalties;
- Determine that there is sufficient evidence of the achievement of the intended learning outcomes from other pieces of assessment in the module(s) for an overall mark to be derived;
- Note the accepted Extraordinary Mitigating Circumstances for the module(s) and recommend that it is taken into account at the point of award and classification.

The Board of Examiners, depending on the circumstances, may exercise discretion in deciding on the particular form any reassessment should take. Options are a *viva voce* examination, additional assessment tasks designed to show whether the student has satisfied the programme learning outcomes, review of previous work, or normal assessment at the next available opportunity. The student will not be put in a position of unfair advantage or disadvantage: the aim will be to enable the student to be assessed on equal terms with their cohort.

The Extraordinary Mitigating Circumstances provision is intended to cover circumstances which are essentially transient, and do not prevent the student from continuing the work of the programme. If the student is affected by serious ongoing circumstances, the student will be referred to the Student Experience Department and advised on how to proceed. In line with the School's Enrolment and Registration Policy, a student may, with the written consent of the Learning Director, decide to suspend registration from their programme if they have a long-term difficulty that affects their studies. Such suspensions may be for a minimum of one month and a maximum of 12 months.

Aegrotat

An Aegrotat award may be recommended, where it is available, when the Board of Examiners 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 programme regulations, but is satisfied that but for illness, or other valid cause, the student would have reached the standard required. Aegrotat awards are limited to students who are permanently unable to continue their studies and are

registered for the final module that would complete a qualification, and have been assessed on at least part of the module. The Board of Examiners must be satisfied that the student's prior performance shows beyond reasonable doubt that they would have passed but for the illness, or other circumstances.

Before a recommendation of an Aegrotat is submitted, the student must have signified willingness to accept the award and understand that this implies waiving the right to be reassessed.

(D) Marking and Moderation Policy

Introduction

The School is committed to ensuring validity, accuracy and consistency in its marking process. This policy sets out how summative assessed work for the School's programme is marked and moderated. It enables staff involved in marking and moderating summative assessments completed by students to be "guided by clear processes which address the degree-awarding body's requirements. In particular arrangements for, and the degree-awarding body's definition of, first and second marking are clearly set out and applied, and include guidance on how agreement will be reached on the final marks to be awarded" in accordance with Chapter B6 of the QAA Quality Code.

Scope

This policy applies to all summative assessments, on all modules of the School's programmes. It does not cover the design of assessments, marking schemes or rubrics, or the scrutiny process before the release of assessments. Nor does it cover formative marking. It relates solely to the marking process which continues up and until external moderation is completed.

Definitions

Assessment: A single assessment or element of an assessment.

Script: The answer booklet(s) or oral performance from a single student.

Mechanical Assessment: An assessment that is marked by reference to a clear marking scheme that affords the marker no discretion beyond deciding if the point should be awarded or not.

Discretionary/Skills Assessment: An assessment where the marker must decide how many marks to award based on criterion. Essays, reports, papers, oral and written skills assessments would fall into this category.

Assessment Leader: The member of faculty with overall academic responsibility for a particular assessment.

Marker: A member of faculty who gives an assessment a numerical mark.

Moderator: A member of faculty who decides if a marker has marked one or more assessments correctly.

Moderation: A moderator looks at a batch of scripts from a single marker and determines whether they have been marked properly in accordance with the mark scheme.

Top Mark Script: A script that gains a mark in the highest mark band for the particular assessment.

Fail Mark Script: A script that gains a mark that is a fail but within 15 marks of a pass for a Skills/Discretionary Assessment and 5 marks for a Mechanical Assessment.

Middle Mark Script: A script that is a pass and does not fall into the top mark script definition.

Training

It is the Learning Director's responsibility to ensure that markers are competent both in their subject area and in marking assessments. This may require training, which could take the form of:

- New Marker Training;
- Refresher Training for experienced markers;
- Calibration Events, where new and experienced markers ensure that they are properly calibrated within a programme and with regard to academic levels when marking assessments that require judgment against a mark scheme or criteria.

Marking and Moderation Process

There are five stages in the marking and moderation process for summative assessments at the School:

1. Standardisation;
2. Marking;
3. Moderation;
4. Assessment Leader sign-off;
5. External Examiner.

Stage 1: Standardisation

The standardisation process precedes full marking of scripts, and ensures that markers are confident that they are marking consistently in accordance with the mark scheme.

The Assessment Leader and markers are all expected to take part in this process by marking the standardisation scripts and then meeting (either in person, or online, or by conference call) to discuss the marks awarded, their approach to the mark scheme,

and, where permitted, to make changes to the scheme to ensure it reflects the appropriate academic standards.

Assessment Leaders must choose one of the following methods of determining how many scripts are standardised:

- i) At least one common script standardised by all markers; or
- ii) At least three scripts standardised by all markers where the Assessment Leader has determined that one is a top mark script, one is a middle mark script, and one is fail mark script.

Markers must adhere to the agreed mark scheme. If after the standardisation meeting, markers encounter unusual answers not discussed during the standardisation meeting or included in the mark scheme, they are required to refer these to the Module Leader or their nominee.

Stage 2: Marking

The marker(s) mark the scripts allocated to them. Each script is marked once by a single marker.

Stage 3: Moderation

Moderation is where a moderator examines a batch of scripts from a single marker. One moderator can moderate all markers (where there is more than one) or there can be multiple moderators.

Pass/Fail Assessments

Where an assessment is pass/fail with no passing gradations, for each marker the Assessment Leader must create a moderation bundle consisting of:

	Skills/Discretionary	Mechanical
Fail Mark Scripts	All scripts that are 15 marks or fewer from the pass mark.	All scripts that are 5 marks or fewer from the pass mark.
Middle and Top Mark Scripts	10% of the scripts across both categories, rounded up to the nearest whole number.	5% of the scripts across both categories, rounded up to the nearest whole number.

All Other Assessments

For each marker, the Assessment Leader must create a moderating bundle consisting of:

	Skills/Discretionary	Mechanical
Fail Mark Scripts	All scripts that are 15 marks or fewer from the pass mark.	All scripts that are 5 marks or fewer from the pass mark.
Middle Mark Scripts	2 scripts that are a bare pass, plus 2 other scripts.	

Top Mark Scripts	The lowest scoring top mark script plus the highest scoring top mark script.
-------------------------	--

The moderator's role is to determine the following question: *Has the marker correctly applied the mark scheme and/or marking criteria to the scripts in the moderation bundle?*

If the answer is *yes*, the first marker's marks for all scripts (i.e., not just those included in the bundle) are approved, and considered to be the final mark awarded to the candidate.

If the answer is *no*, the moderator must decide between the following two choices:

1. If the moderator takes the view that there is an identifiable issue with the marker's marking (e.g., the treatment of a particular question), then the moderator must reject the sample and return it to the first marker, and ask them to remark all scripts (i.e., not just those included in the bundle) on this point, or, where multiple points are identified, on each point identified.
2. If the moderator takes the view that there is no identifiable issue, and therefore the marking is inconsistently below standard, they must reject the bundle and all scripts marked by the initial marker will be marked by a new first marker. Where this happens, the new marker will be subject to the moderation process.

The moderator will record their view on the sample(s) they receive in writing.

At any point in the moderation process, a moderator is entitled to ask to see other scripts from the same marker in order to determine whether the marker has correctly applied the mark scheme/criteria.

Stage 4: Assessment Leader Sign-Off

Where a moderator has determined that the marker has correctly applied the mark scheme/criteria to the script in the moderation bundle, the Assessment Leader can sign off the marks awarded by that marker.

Where a moderator has determined that the marker has not correctly applied the mark scheme/criteria to the scripts in the moderation bundle, the Assessment Leader must be satisfied that the remedial work required to all of the marker's scripts has been completed to satisfaction, at which point s/he can sign off the marks awarded by that marker.

Stage 5: External Examiner

The External Examiner must be sent the following:

- a) A schedule of final marks for all scripts;
- b) A sample size and range of scripts as follows:

No. of Students	Minimum No. of Assessments	Maximum No. of Assessments
Fewer than 10	All	-
11-100	10	20
101-399	10%	50

The composition of a sample must include:

- i) All fails within 10% of the pass borderline; and
- ii) An appropriate sample of assessments which fall within 2% below and 1% above the grade classification boundary; and
- iii) A sample of assessments throughout the top classification.

The External Examiner shall have the right to increase the size and composition of the sample as they see fit.

The rationale for the sample size and range required is to ensure that the External Examiner has sufficient evidence on which to come to a judgment on the School's classification standards. This approach offers assurances as to the integrity of the External Examiner procedure and gives confidence in the accuracy of awards.

The External Examiner will be invited to confirm that, on the basis of the sample they have marked, the marking standards are reasonable.

Where an External Examiner has marked a whole cohort or whole grade cohort for an assessment, such as all fails, the External Examiner may recommend that an individual student's mark be amended. In such cases the rationale for the change should be agreed by the internal marker(s). Where a whole cohort or a whole cohort grade for an assessment has been sampled, the marks of individual students may not be amended. To do so may lead to unfairness to other students whose work was not part of the sample.

Where an External Examiner finds repeated instances of cases where they disagree with the mark awarded they may either recommend that a recalling of the marks be applied to the whole cohort, or recommend that the whole cohort be remarked.

Records and Auditing

The Assessment Leader is responsible for ensuring that:

- Scripts have been properly annotated to indicate that they have been marked; and,
- Scripts have been properly annotated to indicate that they have been moderated, if appropriate; and,
- Scripts have the final mark awarded clearly and unambiguously stated on the face of them; and,
- Moderation written findings are retained; and,
- Mark schedules are accurate.

(E) Regulations for the Preparation and Administration of Examinations and Assessments

Scope

An *examination* is, for the purposes of these rules, defined as a summative assessment of any duration that is subject to continuous invigilation.

These rules are directed to the Board of Examiners, the Assessment Department, and any other members of staff involved in the preparation and administration of examinations.

Formative assessments which are intended to provide the student with the opportunity of experiencing an examination should adopt the relevant parts of these examinations (such as invigilation) as closely as possible.

Provision of Information for Candidates

The examination timetable and location of examinations for each year of the programme will be published to candidates on the student website prior to the first term in the academic year, and in the programme handbook.

The details of each examination will be published on the student Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) two weeks in advance of the first examination sitting. The information published will include rules for candidates, and any materials permitted. The Head of Assessment or nominee will ensure the timely provision of information about examinations to candidates on the VLE.

Preparation of Examination Papers

The *module leader* is responsible for the preparation of the draft question paper and marking scheme.

The *Learning Director* is responsible for ensuring that an appropriate vetting process is undertaken of the question paper and marking scheme.

The *External Examiner* will be invited to review and endorse the examination paper.

Where relevant, the secrecy of the contents of the examination paper must be preserved at all stages of its development until provided to candidates in the examination. Those involved in the development, approval and handling of examination papers must have a professional duty of confidentiality.

All question papers will state in the opening rubric what examination aids the student may bring into the examination.

The *Head of Quality* or their nominee is responsible for ensuring arrangements are in place for the proper conduct of each examination, including the delivery and receipt of examination papers and scripts.

Examination Room

The location, equipment and furniture of the examination room will be determined by the Head of Quality or their nominee in consultation with the module lead. A clock, visible to all candidates, will be on the wall.

Scripts

The Learning Director will be responsible for having in place procedures for the marking of examination scripts. The Head of Quality or their nominee will arrange for the retention and storage of marked scripts of summative assessments for not less than one year after candidates have completed their approved programme

(F) Rules for Candidate Conduct

On entering the examination room, candidates must deposit all bags and unauthorised sources of information in a place designated by the invigilator. Candidates may not bring additional materials to their desks in the examination room unless expressly permitted.

Where calculators are permitted, they must be cordless, non-programmable, non-networked, silent and without case or cover.

Candidates must switch off their mobile phones and smart watches and leave them in their bags in the place designated by the invigilator.

Candidates must display their School identity card in a prominent position on their desk.

Candidates must behave in an orderly manner in the examination room, taking care not to disturb others. A candidate creating significant disruption may be removed by the chief invigilator and excluded from the examination. In this case the chief invigilator will notify the Chief Executive or their nominee of the incident, who will determine whether to initiate disciplinary procedures against the candidate.

Candidates must not communicate with any other candidate in the examination room, by any means.

Candidates may bring a water bottle (with the label removed) into the examination room, but no other drinks and no food.

Any candidate who wishes to attract the invigilator's attention must raise their hand.

Where a candidate wishes to temporarily leave the examination room for a bathroom break, they must seek permission from an invigilator, and must be accompanied by an invigilator.

Candidates must not remove any question papers, answer scripts, other paper used or unused or any aids provided by the School from the examination room.

A candidate whose script is deemed illegible by the module leader concerned, in consultation with the Head of Quality or nominee, may be required to contribute to the costs of having the script professional transcribed.

A candidate suspected of academic malpractice in an examination will be reported and dealt with under the Academic Malpractice Procedure.

(G) Extraordinary Reasonable Adjustments

Principles

As part of its commitment to Equality, Diversity and Inclusion as set out in its Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Policy, the School will make reasonable adjustments to ensure that students with a learning difficulty and/or disability have equal and fair opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge, understanding and ability in assessments.

As such, and in line with the School's inclusive approach, all examination schedules are flexible, with multiple, spaced, sitting dates, and with 100% additional time allowed in all examinations and assessments for all students, to accommodate extra time needs required given a student learning difficulties or disabilities. This inclusive approach will also support the accommodation of students who are pregnant, committed to religious observance, or who have caring responsibilities.

Students who will require additional equipment or assistance should notify the Head of Student Experience at least one calendar month before the examination sittings begin.

Adjustments that the Head of Student Experience may agree on include:

- A separate room;
- A scribe;
- A reader;
- A BSL interpreter;
- Assessment materials in a different format (e.g., coloured/enlarged paper, braille, transcripts)
- Coloured overlays;
- A computer;
- Assistive technology;
- Alternative assessment forms which meet the required programme objectives and learning outcomes.

An adjustment may be granted for the duration of the student's programme where the disability, learning difficult or medical condition and their impact upon assessments are unlikely to change.

In some instances alternative forms of assessment may be required to accommodate a student. For the purpose of this Policy, these are called Extraordinary Reasonable Adjustments.

Extraordinary Reasonable Adjustments Procedure

A student must apply to the Head of Student Experience for Extraordinary Reasonable Adjustments at least one calendar month before the examination sittings begin.

Where the student's needs cannot be reasonably and appropriately met by the School's inclusive assessment approach or by the reasonable adjustments listed above, the Head of Student will forward the case to the Extraordinary Reasonable Adjustments Panel.

The Panel will be chaired by the Chief Executive or nominee and will include three of the following members: the Learning Director, senior academic faculty, Head of Student Experience, the Head of Quality or nominee.

At the Panel hearing, the student must provide evidence as to why they are unable to sit their examination under the normal School conditions with the range of reasonable adjustments already available to them. The Panel will then determine whether the student may undertake an alternative assessment, or whether they must undertake the standard assessment with the reasonable adjustments already available to them.

An alternative form of assessment must assess the same intended learning outcomes as the standard examination, must be conducted under conditions that are as far as possible equivalent to those of standard assessments, and must be conducted in the same time windows as the standard assessments. In most cases, the format of the alternative assessment will be an assessment paper similar in style to coursework, to be completed over a specified period of time. Each piece of assessment will be followed by a short 15-minute question and answer session, to verify that the assessment piece is the student's own work. The outcome of the assessment will be communicated to the student in the normal way and the student will have the same entitlement to feedback.

Students may appeal decisions of the Extraordinary Reasonable Adjustments Panel under the Academic Appeals Procedure.

(H) Staff training in assessment approaches

The Head of Assessment will provide support, training and development to the members of academic staff involved in the assessment of students. In line with the UK Quality Code (Chapter B6), this training and support will be designed and delivered to ensure that the relevant staff members:

- Understand the theory and practice of assessment and its implementation, including the different purposes of formative and summative assessment;
- Are able to effectively evaluate the extent to which learning outcomes have been achieved;
- Understand effective ways to feedback to students and encourage students to reflect on their own performance;
- Are made aware of the importance of designing assessments that minimise opportunities for plagiarism and other forms of unacceptable academic best practice;
- Have opportunities to learn about assessment best practices and new approaches to assessment;
- Are made aware of assessment implications for a diverse body of students, with reference to cultural diversity, differences in learning methods, and the need for inclusivity.

The relevant administrative staff will receive training on the academic regulations so that they may manage the administrative aspects of assessment and examination properly and efficiently.

(I) Review of Examination and Assessment Regulations

These assessment and examination regulations will be reviewed annually during the programme evaluation process, and through engagement with External Examiners. Any changes to these regulations require sign off by the Board.

(J) Academic Malpractice Policy

Introduction

This Policy sets out the School's principles, policies and procedures relating to student Academic Malpractice in assessments.

Principles

The School is committed to fair examination and assessment practices; safeguarding the integrity of these is essential if the School is to discharge its responsibilities to our students and uphold its own reputation.

Definitions

Poor academic practice is an inept or inadvertent breach of the conventions or regulations of academic practice, committed through a defensible ignorance of those conventions or regulations, where no distinguishable advantage may be or has been gained by the student, and where there is no discernible intention to deceive.

Academic malpractice is any act, or attempted act leading to circumstances whereby a student might gain an unpermitted or unfair advantage in an assessment or in the determination of results, whether by advantaging themselves or by advantaging or disadvantaging another or others, or which might otherwise undermine the integrity or reputation of the School's awards or its examination and assessment processes.

Policies

Poor academic practice

Defensible ignorance may be assumed in the early stages of a student's career.

Poor academic practice will be addressed by the Learning Director or their nominee as a matter of academic development. A student may receive a formal caution for poor academic practice. Any potential advantage gained by the student should be removed, either by voiding the assessment attempt or through the marking and moderation process.

Academic malpractice

Examples of academic malpractice are:

- *Plagiarism*—presenting the work of another as one's own;
- *Collusion*—aiding, or being aided by, one or more others in the preparation of an assessment for submission where the assessment brief or invigilation instructions do not expressly permit collaboration (note that input from tutors or approved readers or scribes is not considered to be collusion);
- *Fabrication*—presenting data or results that have been deliberately invented or falsified;
- *Impersonation*—the act of one person assuming the identity of another, with the intent to gain an unfair advantage for the person being impersonated;

- *Contract cheating*—engaging a third party such as “essay mill” sharing websites, or a third party individual, to contribute to the student’s assignments, research or examinations;
- *Misrepresentation*—presenting a claim for mitigating circumstances or supporting evidence which is misleading, untrue or unfair;
- *Unauthorised possession or reference*—being in possession of any prohibited or unauthorised material or item within the examination room, consulting books or notes whilst temporarily outside the examination room, or gaining access to a copy of the assessment paper in advance of its authorised release;
- *Bribery/intimidation*—attempting to influence, by bribery or intimidation or other unfair means an official of the School, with the aim of affecting the student’s results;
- *Breach of the rubrics of assessment*—disobeying beginning and end times of an examination or improperly annotating open book material.

It should be noted that where a student has an acknowledged learning disability, a proof-reader may be used to ensure that the student’s meaning is not misunderstood as a result of the quality and standard of writing. Where permitted, a proof-reader may identify spelling and basic grammatical errors. Inaccuracies in academic content should not be corrected nor should the structure of the piece of work be changed.

Academic Malpractice Procedure

It shall be for the School to bring an allegation of academic misconduct and to prove the allegation on the balance of probabilities.

All School staff have a professional obligation to protect the integrity of the School and its examination and assessment processes. Where a staff member suspects academic malpractice, they must notify the Chief Executive or nominee, and the module and programme leaders. It is the Chief Executive’s responsibility, or their nominee’s, to ensure that all members of the School are aware of their obligations under this policy.

Suspected academic malpractice must be reported to the Head of Quality in writing as quickly as possible. The Head of Quality or their nominee will evaluate the case presented, and may investigate by meeting or corresponding with the student(s) and staff member(s) involved. Where a student is invited to meet with the Head of Quality or their nominee on the issue of suspected academic malpractice, other staff members may be present as appropriate, and the student may be accompanied by a member of the Student Experience Department. The Head of Quality or their nominee will make a decision on the accusation of academic malpractice within 10 working days of the referral being made, and may:

- Dismiss the allegation and inform the student that no further action shall be taken; *or*
- Determine that the incident was poor academic practice rather than academic malpractice, and issue a formal caution that will be placed on the student’s record. The School may reduce the mark awarded to the student to mitigate any advantage from the poor academic practice; *or*

- Determine that the incident was academic malpractice and refer the case to the Academic Malpractice Panel.

Academic Malpractice Panel

Where the Head of Quality or their nominee determines to refer the case to the Academic Malpractice Panel, they will notify the student of this within 10 working days of receiving the allegation, specifying the nature of the allegation and any evidence.

The student will be given 10 working days' notification of the date of the Panel, and must submit any written representation or evidence in response to the allegation within the five working days after this notification. The student will have two working days before the hearing in which to consult the evidence gathered by the Panel.

The Academic Malpractice Panel is responsible for:

- Establishing whether the alleged violation is proven;
- Determining what, if any, mitigating circumstances apply; and
- Determining any penalty.

The Hearing

The student has the right to be accompanied by an observer, who may be an LIS Student's Union officer, a fellow student, or an aid who assists the student in any special needs. Legal representation would not normally be permitted, except in exceptional circumstances and if permitted by the Chair. The observer may not address the panel or question witnesses during the hearing.

Where the student fails to attend the hearing or has waived the right to attend the hearing, the hearing will go ahead as planned without them.

The Panel will determine:

- That no malpractice has occurred, and recommend that the case be dismissed and the student's results be processed as normal; *or*
- No malpractice has been committed, but there has been poor academic practice, in which case the nature of the poor practice will be explained to the student, a note will be made on their student record, and the mark awarded to them may be reduced to mitigate any unfair advantage; *or*
- Malpractice has been committed, in which case any mitigating circumstances will be considered and the penalty determined.

Penalties

In the case of academic malpractice, the primary aim of any penalty will be to protect the integrity of the School's reputation, assessment processes and awards. The penalty will be determined taking into account:

- The degree of intention (i.e., premeditation, intention, recklessness, or negligence);
- The circumstances in which the malpractice took place and the scale of impact on the School's reputation;

- Any mitigating factors (e.g., admitting the offense at the earliest opportunity, which would normally reduce the severity of the penalty, or cooperation with the School's investigation);
- Any aggravating factors, that may cause the action to be considered more serious (e.g., pattern of malpractice, committing the act for financial gain, an attempt to conceal or dispose of evidence, intimidation, committing the act while under the influence of alcohol or drugs).

Penalties for academic malpractice may include all or any of the following:

- Training to address the form of malpractice;
- Where assessment advantage has been gained, a proportionate penalty must be identified to negate the advantage, for example:
 - Deduction of marks;
 - Written warning on the student's record;
 - Voiding the attempt for the examination or the entire related module, with the right to take the examination or assessments as though for the first time;
 - Assigning no marks to the assessment item or to the entire related module, with the right to retake the assessment item but where the mark of the resit will be capped at the pass mark;
 - Where the module is non-core, assign no marks to the relevant module as a whole, without the right to retake the module, but with the right to take an alternative elective module for a capped mark;
 - Termination of the student's registration, with readmission to the School at the discretion of the Chief Executive based on consideration of the student's case for readmission. This penalty is reserved for cases of multiple misconduct in one examination, a serious second offence, or extremely serious and aggravated cases.

Where a case of academic malpractice gives rise to concern about the integrity of the assessment of a student's previous module(s), the module(s) may be reviewed to ascertain if malpractice was conducted before.

Appeal

A student may appeal against the decision of the Academic Malpractice Panel to the Academic Appeals Board, via the Academic Appeals Procedure.

Conferment

A student may not graduate until the investigation into any alleged academic malpractice on their part has been completed.

Monitoring, evaluation and review

The Academic Council will review all cases and resulting action relating to Academic Malpractice annually, and determine any changes to either assessment processes, or the Academic Malpractice Policy and Procedure.

(K) External Examining

Introduction

External examining helps the School ensure that:

- The academic standards of its awards and their component parts are set and maintained at the appropriate level;
- The standards of student performance are properly judged against this level;
- Its assessment process measures student achievement appropriately against the programme's learning outcomes, and is rigorously and fairly operated in line with the School's policies, procedures and regulations;
- Its awards are comparable with the standards of equivalent awards in other UK higher education institutions.

Roles and responsibilities

Learning Director

The Learning Director will recommend nominees for External Examiners, agree the nomination with the nominee, and submit the nomination to the Head of Quality for submission to the Academic Council, which will approve or deny the appointment.

Head of Quality

The Head of Quality will present nominees for consideration by the Academic Council. S/he will maintain a register of appointment External Examiners. They will issue an External Examiner Handbook to appointed External Examiners, and arrange an Induction session, the details for which are set out in the School's Guidelines for the Briefing and Induction of External Examiners.

Academic Council

The Academic Council will consider each nomination on its individual merit and in the context of the register of appointments, and will either approve or deny the appointment.

External Examiners

External Examiners are asked by the School to report on:

- Whether the standards set are appropriate for the School's awards or components of awards;
- The standards of student performance in the programme or module(s) they have been appointed to examine;
- The extent to which the School's assessment processes are rigorous, ensure the fair and equal treatment of students, and have been conducted in line with the School's relevant policies, procedures and regulations;
- Whether the assessment instruments enable students to demonstrate the achievement of the intended learning outcomes for the module and programme;

- The comparability of standards and student achievements with those at other UK higher education institutions.

Specifically, the duties of the External Examiners are to:

- Scrutinise and approve all summative assessment instruments including coursework and examination papers;
- Evaluate students with a module result in the fail-grade band and review the results of students in the highest grade band, either individually or using sampling; and review results from each grade boundary;
- Report to the Chair of the Board of Examiners any candidate that they suspect may have been engaged in academic malpractice;
- Be a full member of the relevant Board of Examiners and participate in the Board's business, where that includes deciding on module results or stages in programmes;
- Participate as required in the review of decisions about individual student awards;
- Submit an annual report to the Academic Board at the end of each year of the appointment.

External Examiners will be consulted by the School about sampling methods and will have access to all students' work submitted for assessment counting towards a reward.

Criteria for appointment of External Examiners

Individually, External Examiners must:

- Have academic and/or professional qualifications that are appropriate to the programme or module(s) to be examined;
- Have competence and experience in the fields covered by the programme of study or module(s) to be examined;
- Have appropriate standing, expertise and experience to carry credibility within higher education to review and report on academic standards and the fairness of operational processes and procedures;
- Have competence and experience relating to designing and operating a variety of assessment tasks appropriate to the subject and operating assessment procedures in assessing students in the subject area concerned;
- Be resident in the UK and have the right to work in the UK;
- Be fluent in English;

Collectively, the External Examiners must:

- Have the breadth of expertise required to cover the programme outcomes and assessment instruments;
- Be drawn from as wide a variety as possible of appropriate institutions;
- Have an appropriate range of cultural and gender diversity;
- Provide an appropriate balance and expertise, in terms of examining experience, academic practising experience, and range of academic perspectives.

Conflicts of interest

An External Examiner must be independent of the module on which s/he serves. In line with the QAA guidance, an External Examiner must not be appointed if any of the following conflicts of interest arise:

- The External Examiner is a member of a governing body or committee of the School, or one of its collaborative partners, or is an employee of the School or one of its collaborative partners;
- The External Examiner has a close professional, contractual or personal relationship with a member of staff or student involved with the programme of study;
- The External Examiner is required to assess colleagues who are recruited as students to the programme of study;
- The External Examiner is, or knows they will be, in a position to influence significantly the future of students on the programme of study;
- The External Examiner is currently, or has recently been, involved in substantive collaborative research activities with a member of staff closely involved in the delivery, management or assessment of the programme or module(s) in question;
- The External Examiner is a former member of staff or student of the School, unless a period of five years has elapsed and all students taught by or with the External Examiner have completed their programme(s);
- The External Examiner would replace a External Examiner from the same department in the same institution;
- The External Examiner is from the same department of the same institution as another member of that team of External Examiners;
- The External Examiner is a consultant to the module or programme team, or have contributed in writing teaching materials.

Where potential or actual conflicts of interest arise during a period of appointment, the External Examiner must advise the Chair of the relevant Board of Examiners and the Chief Executive of the School or their nominee must determine, in consultation with the External Examiner, what appropriate action should be taken.

Terms of office

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

The duration of an External Examiner's appointment will usually be four years, with an exceptional extension of one year to ensure continuity. Every year the School will review the performance and conduct of the External Examiners in relation to their duties and interests.

An External Examiner may be reappointed in exceptional circumstances, but only after a period of five years or more has elapsed since their last appointment.

If External Examiners change jobs, a revised CV must be submitted to the School to ensure that they are still eligible to externally examine the programme or module(s) for which they have been appointed.

If an External Examiner retires whilst in appointment, they will remain as the External Examiner for the remainder of the academic year and up to two years following retirement. If the External Examiner continues to have an affiliation with a UK institution of Higher Education, they can continue to remain in post for the full duration of the contract.

Termination of contracts

An External Examiner may, at their discretion, terminate their appointment subject to providing three months' notice.

The School may terminate the appointment of an External Examiner if they fail to discharge their duties, for example they fail to produce reports in a timely manner or to an appropriate standard. Other circumstances that may constitute grounds for termination are:

- Failure to attend a Board Examiners without good reason;
- A new conflict of interest that cannot be resolved;
- Discontinuation of the programme/module.

Where appropriate, the School would use the annual renewal of External Examiner appointments as a mechanism to review External Examiner performance/conduct. In the first instance, every endeavour will be made to informally resolve non-compliance by an External Examiner with their duties. This may escalate to a warning before a contract is terminated.

External Examiner Reports

External Examiners are required to submit a report following each Board of Examiners to the Academic Board on:

- Whether the standards being set are appropriate for the award by reference to any agreed subject benchmarks, qualifications frameworks, programme specification or other relevant information;
- The quality of the students' work, and their knowledge and skills in relation to their peers on comparable programmes;
- The strengths and weaknesses of the students;
- The quality of teaching and learning, as indicated by student performance;
- The quality of the curriculum, course materials and learning resources;
- The quality and fairness of the assessments, in particular their design and structure, related to state objectives and learning outcomes of the programme;
- Good practice and innovation related to learning, teaching and assessment;

- Where the programme has specific work-related learning outcomes, the assessment and achievement of these outcomes, including employers' involvement where relevant;
- The administration of the assessments, operation of the Examination Boards, briefing of External Examiners, access of External Examiners to essential materials, etc.;
- Whether any issues identified in previous External Examiners' reports have been addressed by the institution.

Reports should be submitted on the School's standard report form for External Examiners but should not be constrained by these; External Examiners should feel free to add comments where appropriate.

An External Examiner may report confidentially directly to the Chief Executive at any time where they are concerned about standards and performance, particularly where they are concerned that assessments are being conducted in a way that jeopardises either the fair treatment of individual students or the standards of the School's awards.

Annual reports should be submitted no later than one month after the meeting of the Examination Board at which the awards are decided.

A final report should be submitted where an External Examiner's period of office has expired. In addition to the matters addressed in the annual report, this final report should include an overview of their impression of the standards and quality of provision at the School, salient issues that have arisen during their period of office and any matters that should be brought to the attention of the incoming External Examiner.

External Examiner reports will be scrutinised at the Academic Board and any changes to the assessment processes, teaching and learning provision and programme standards will be made as appropriate. The School will make any External Examiners' reports available in full to students, with the exception of any confidential report made directly to the Chief Executive.

The Learning Director will give detailed written feedback to External Examiners on action taken in response to their annual or final reports.

Where an External Examiner has a serious concern relating to systemic failings with the academic standards of a School programme and has exhausted internal procedures, including the submission of a confidential report to the Chief Executive, s/he may invoke the QAA's concerns scheme.

Name of policy/procedure:	Examination Regulations and Procedures
Document owner:	Hannah Kohler, Head of Student Experience



Date Originally Created:	01/2019
Last reviewed:	01/2019
Reviewed by:	[name and job title]
Audited by:	[name and job title]
Date of Audit:	MM/YYYY
Date of next review: (annually unless otherwise agreed)	MM/YYYY
Related documents: (eg associated forms, underpinning processes, related policies or overarching policies)	Academic Appeals Procedure Invigilation Guidelines Enrolment and Registration Poli

Version Control			
Version	Author [name]	Date	Brief summary of changes
1	Hannah Kohler	13/01/2019	Original draft